

# **A46 Newark Bypass**

**TR010065/APP/5.2**

## **5.2 Consultation Report Annexes**

**Annex N: Tables Evidencing Regard had to  
Consultation Responses (in Accordance with Section  
49 of the 2008 Act)**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and  
Procedure) Regulations 2009  
Volume 5

April 2024

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and  
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**A46 Newark Bypass**

Development Consent Order 202[x]

---

**CONSULTATION REPORT ANNEXES**

**ANNEX N: TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO CONSULTATION  
RESPONSES (IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 49 OF THE 2008 ACT)**

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Regulation 5(2)(q)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010065
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010065/APP/5.2
<b>Author:</b>	A46 Newark Bypass Project Team, National Highways

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 1	April 2024	DCO Application

## Contents – Annex N

<b>1.</b>	<b>Overview</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Feedback mechanisms</b> .....	<b>8</b>
2.1	Statutory consultation.....	8
2.2	Targeted consultations .....	8
<b>3.</b>	<b>Response analysis</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1	Consultation response text.....	9
3.2	Annex table structure .....	9
3.3	Themes and topics .....	10
3.4	Response IDs and identifiers .....	12
<b>4.</b>	<b>Technical Information</b> .....	<b>13</b>
4.1	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.....	13
4.2	Environmental information.....	14
<b>5.</b>	<b>Annex tables</b> .....	<b>15</b>

### **N.1 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(a) – Prescribed Consultees**

N.1.A:	Cadent Gas Limited.....	16
N.1.B:	Canal and River Trust .....	19
N.1.C:	Coddington Parish Council.....	26
N.1.D:	Environment Agency.....	28
N.1.E:	Farndon Parish Council.....	32
N.1.F:	Forestry Commission.....	33
N.1.G:	Health and Safety Executive – NSIP Consultations Team.....	34
N.1.H:	Historic England.....	35
N.1.I:	Last Mile Asset Management.....	37
N.1.J:	Marine Management Organisation.....	38
N.1.K:	Ministry of Defence.....	40
N.1.L:	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET).....	41
N.1.M:	Natural England.....	43
N.1.N:	Network Rail Limited.....	46
N.1.O:	Newark Town Council.....	48
N.1.P:	North Muskham Parish Council.....	49
N.1.Q:	Northern Gas Networks.....	51
N.1.R:	Royal Mail Group.....	52
N.1.S:	Secretary of State for Transport.....	54
N.1.T:	Severn Trent Water.....	55
N.1.U:	South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council.....	56
N.1.V:	The Coal Authority.....	58

N.1.W:	Transport for the East Midlands.....	59
N.1.X:	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board.....	61
N.1.Y:	UK Health Security Agency.....	62
N.1.Z:	Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council.....	71

## **N.2 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(b) – Local Authorities**

N.2.A:	Ashfield District Council.....	76
N.2.B:	Newark and Sherwood District Council.....	77
N.2.C:	North Kesteven District Council.....	95
N.2.D:	North Lincolnshire Council.....	96
N.2.E:	Nottinghamshire County Council.....	97
N.2.F:	Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team.....	105
N.2.G:	Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum.....	108
N.2.H:	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.....	111
N.2.I:	Rushcliffe Borough Council.....	112
N.2.J:	South Kesteven District Council.....	113
N.2.K:	West Lindsey District Council.....	114

## **N.3 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) – Persons with an Interest in Land**

N.3.A:	Environment.....	115
N.3.B:	Design .....	188
N.3.C:	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.....	204
N.3.D:	Overall scheme.....	209
N.3.E:	Stakeholder engagement and consultation.....	212
N.3.F:	Construction.....	235
N.3.G:	Traffic.....	242

## **N.4 – Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 – Community**

N.4.A:	Construction.....	244
N.4.B:	Design.....	258
N.4.C:	Environment.....	289
N.4.D:	Overall scheme.....	445
N.4.E:	Stakeholder engagement and consultation.....	469
N.4.F:	Traffic.....	492
N.4.G:	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.....	508

## **N.5 – Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 – Community Groups**

N.5.A:	Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents’ Group.....	527
N.5.B:	Friends of the Trent Vale Trail.....	544

N.5.C:	No to Noise - Newark Riverside Residents.....	548
N.5.D:	Sustrans: Bassetlaw Ranger Group.....	561
N.5.E:	Sustrans.....	562
N.5.F:	Newark Bypass Environment Group.....	563
N.5.G:	Protect Newark's Green Spaces.....	607
N.5.H:	Woodland Trust.....	617
N.5.I:	A46 Active Travel Partnership.....	620
N.5.J:	British Horse Society.....	628
N.5.K:	Transport Action Network.....	630
N.5.L:	Crees Lane Residents Association.....	636
N.5.M:	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.....	641
N.5.N:	Nottingham Piscatorial Society.....	646

## **N.6 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(a) – Prescribed Consultees**

N.6.A:	Canal and River Trust.....	647
N.6.B:	Environment Agency.....	648
N.6.C:	Farndon Parish Council.....	649
N.6.D:	Forestry Commission.....	650
N.6.E:	Historic England.....	651
N.6.F:	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET).....	652
N.6.G:	Natural England.....	653
N.6.H:	Royal Mail Group.....	654
N.6.I:	Secretary of State for Transport.....	655
N.6.J:	UK Health and Security Agency.....	656
N.6.K:	Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council.....	657

## **N.7 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(b) – Local Authorities**

N.7.A:	Nottinghamshire County Council.....	659
N.7.B:	Newark and Sherwood District Council.....	661

## **N.8 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) – Persons with an Interest in Land**

N.8.A:	Persons with an interest in land.....	663
--------	---------------------------------------	-----

## **N.9 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 – Community Groups**

N.9.A:	British Horse Society.....	676
N.9.B:	Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group.....	677
N.9.C:	Crees Lane Residents Association.....	679

N.9.D: A46 Active Travel Partnership.....680

**N.10 – Targeted Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) – Persons with an Interest in Land**

N.10.A: Persons with an interest in land.....682

## 1. Overview

This annex (Annex N) contains details of the responses received to the Applicant's statutory consultation and targeted consultations, together with details of how the Applicant has had regard to those responses in accordance with its duty under Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008.

The table below shows the consultations that took place, the responses that were received under each section of the Planning Act 2008 and which annex table the information can be found within.

<b>Table 1-1: Summary of consultation responses and corresponding annex tables</b>		
<b>Consultation undertaken</b>	<b>Section of Planning Act 2008</b>	<b>Annex table</b>
Statutory consultation (26 October to 12 December 2022)	Section 42 (1)(a) - Prescribed consultees	N.1.A to N.1.Z
	Section 42 (1)(b) - Local Authorities	N.2.A to N.2.K
	Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an interest in land	N.3.A to N.3.G
	Section 47 and Section 48 - Community	N.4.A to N.4.G
	Section 47 and Section 48 - Community Groups	N.5.A to N.5.N
Targeted non-statutory consultation (17 March to 16 April 2023)	Section 42 (1)(a) - Prescribed consultees	N.6.A to N.6.J
	Section 42 (1)(b) - Local Authorities	N.7.A to N.7.B
	Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an interest in land	N.8.A
	Section 47 and Section 48 - Community Groups	N.9.A to N.9.D
Targeted statutory consultation (8 September to 6 October 2023)	Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an interest in land	N.10.A

## 2. Feedback mechanisms

### 2.1 Statutory consultation

Throughout the statutory consultation the Applicant encouraged consultees to make use of a Consultation Response Form (see Annex J) as the main response method, which posed questions about the consultee and their view of the preliminary design for the Scheme.

Open text box questions, intended to seek views on a range of topics relating to the preliminary design for Scheme, are outlined in the table below.

The response form question number has been included within the relevant annex tables to indicate which question the consultee responded to.

Some consultees provided their response in the form of a letter or email and did not complete the response form questions. These responses are also considered within this annex and 'N/A' has been added to the 'Response form question' column in the relevant table.

<b>Response form question number</b>	<b>Question</b>
2B	"Please provide any further comments you have on the scheme design using the box below"
2C	"We have described the potential environmental impacts of the scheme and our proposed mitigation solutions in our consultation brochure, Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report and the Non-Technical Summary of the PEI Report. Copies of these are available to view on our scheme webpage. Please use the box below to provide any further comments you may have on the environmental information contained in our consultation materials"
2D	"Please use the box below to suggest any additional measures or opportunities that could further minimise the impact of the scheme on the environment or the local community"
2E/2F	"Are you aware of any potentially suitable and available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements, such as habitat creation or tree and woodland planting? If 'Yes', please provide further details using the box below"
2G	"We have described our plans about proposed floodplain compensation areas in our consultation brochure and the PEI Report. If you wish to make any comments about the proposed floodplain compensation areas presented in our consultation materials, please use the box below"
2H	"Please provide any further comments you have about the proposed scheme"
2I	"Please provide any comments you have on this consultation process, or the information presented in our consultation materials"

### 2.2 Targeted consultations

For both the targeted non-statutory consultation and targeted statutory consultation there was no response form used as a response method. Consultees were advised to submit responses using Freepost and email methods. No set questions were posed for consultees to respond to therefore no response form question numbers have been included within the annex tables relating to these consultations.



### 3. Response analysis

#### 3.1 Consultation response text

Other than as set out below, within each annex table the text shown within the 'Consultation response' column has been included using the same words as were used originally by the consultee. Any errors such as spelling and grammar have not been changed.

The only alterations made to a consultation response is where text has been split up across the annex tables, in order to group responses by theme and topics (explained further below). As part of this process the Applicant has, where required, repeated introductory text to ensure the context of the response can be understood.

Where the same consultation response text has been submitted by multiple consultees, the Applicant has indicated this within the annex table and referred to where the response can be found elsewhere within the annexes.

Some information has been redacted from the original consultee response text in order to protect personal or sensitive data.

#### 3.2 Annex table structure

The complete response text received from all consultees has been included within the annex tables, however, due to the nature and number of the responses received two approaches have been taken in order to demonstrate the Applicant has had full regard, as outlined further below.

Within the following annex tables each response received from a consultee is included in full and in the order in which it was presented by the consultee:

- Statutory consultation:
  - Section 42 (1)(a) – Prescribed Consultees (Annex N.1)
  - Section 42 (1)(b) – Local Authorities (Annex N.2)
  - Section 47 and Section 48 – Community Groups (Annex N.4)
- Targeted Non-Statutory consultation:
  - Section 42 (1)(a) – Prescribed Consultees (Annex N.6)
  - Section 42 (1)(b) – Local Authorities (Annex N.7)
  - Section 42 (1)(d) – Persons with an Interest in Land (Annex N.8)
  - Section 47 and Section 48 – Community Groups (Annex N.9)
- Targeted Statutory consultation:
  - Section 42 (1)(d) – Persons with an Interest in Land (Annex N.10)

The majority of the consultation response text in the above tables has been split across multiple table rows. This has enabled the Applicant to evidence clear regard to comments raised within a response. In order to provide context to the Applicant's consideration of responses, each row has been allocated a topic area (explained in paragraph 3.3) which can be found in the 'Topic area' column of the annex table. Where relevant, multiple topics have been allocated to a consultee response.

In addition, the 'Community Groups' identified within the Annex N.9 include non-statutory organisations and groups identifying themselves as representing the local community or residents. Due to the nature of the responses from the Community Groups, the Applicant has presented the responses in the same way as those presented in the annex tables listed

above (e.g. Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities, etc.).

Within the following annex tables the Applicant has included all of the text from consultee responses, however, where suitable this text has been split up and grouped under themes and topics (explained in paragraph 3.3):

- Statutory consultation:
  - Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an Interest in Land (Annex N.3)
  - Section 47 and Section 48 - Community (Annex N.5)

### 3.3 Themes and topics

In order to identify the relevant themes and topics used within the annex tables, the Applicant undertook a detailed analysis of each response received. During the analysis process, a response was allocated a topic depending on the comments made by the consultee. As described above, where appropriate, responses were then grouped within a high level theme according to the topic/s that had been allocated to them.

Topic areas are shown within the 'Topic area' column of each annex table and tables containing specific topics are listed under a corresponding high level theme. Where possible the environmental topics are the same as those described in the Environmental Statement **(TR010065/APP/6.1)**.

Where relevant, multiple topics have been allocated to a response, the Applicant has used its judgement to decide which high level theme the response should be grouped under. In some cases the topic that has been allocated to a response is the same as the high level theme, for example, 'Construction', 'Walking, cycling and horse-riding' and 'Overall scheme'. The same high level themes and topics have been used across the rest of the annex tables, including the targeted consultations.

During the analysis process a cross checking exercise has taken place to ensure that response text was allocated to a topic area and grouped by high level theme consistently.

The table below lists the high level themes and topics used within the annex tables for the statutory and targeted consultations:

<b>Table 3-1: High level theme: Environment</b>
<b>Topics:</b>
Noise and vibration
Landscape and visual effects
Road drainage and the water environment
Air quality
Population and human health
Biodiversity
Climate
Cultural heritage
Environment - general
Material assets and waste
Geology and soils

<b>Table 3-2: High level theme: Design</b>
<b>Topics</b>
A17
A17/A46
A17/A46/A1
A1/A46
Friendly Farmer Roundabout
A1/A46 Crossing
Brownhills Junction
A1
Winthorpe Roundabout
Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction
Southern Link Road
Farndon Roundabout
Dual carriageway
Traffic lights/signals
Newark Showground
Drove Lane
Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts
Speed limit
Route corridor
Existing A46
Winthorpe village
Road layout
Brownhills Roundabout
Farndon village
Assets

<b>Table 3-3: High level theme: Stakeholder engagement and consultation</b>
<b>Topics</b>
Consultation - positive feedback
Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested
Consultation - general
Consultation - negative feedback/experience
Stakeholder engagement
Introductory text
Options consultation
Land ownership

<b>Table 3-4: High level theme: Overall scheme</b>
<b>Topics</b>
Overall scheme

<b>Table 3-5: High level theme: Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders</b>
<b>Topics</b>
Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders

<b>Table 3-6: High level theme: Construction</b>
<b>Topics</b>
Construction

<b>Table 3-7: High level theme: Traffic</b>
<b>Topics</b>
Traffic forecasts
Newark Castle level crossing
Congestion

### **3.4 Response IDs and identifiers**

Unique response ID references have been created for each consultee that has responded to the statutory and targeted consultation. These are displayed within the annex tables where appropriate to keep responses anonymous. Organisation and community group names have been included against consultation responses where appropriate.

The unique response ID was generated automatically and provided to a consultee when they completed the online version of the response form. If a consultee submitted a response without using the online response form, the Applicant has manually created a response ID.

## 4. Technical Information

### 4.1 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) contains information about current design standards relating to the design, assessment and operation of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads in the United Kingdom. This manual and the individual standards within it are referenced throughout the annex tables, in order to explain what standards have been used for certain elements of the Scheme design or environmental scoping process. Further information about the DMRB can be found online at <https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/>. The below table summarises the main DMRB standards referenced throughout the annexes:

<b>Table 4-1: DMRB standards referenced in annex tables</b>	
<b>DMRB standard</b>	<b>Standard detail</b>
DMRB 109 - Highways link design	Sets out requirements and advice for all aspects of highway link design to be used for both new and improved all-purpose and motorway trunk roads including connector roads.
DMRB CD 116 - Geometric design of roundabouts	Sets out requirements for the geometric design of roundabouts
DMRB CD 169 - The design of lay-bys, maintenance hardstandings, rest areas, service areas and observation platforms	Sets out requirements and provides advice for the location and layout of lay-bys (including parking lay-bys, bus lay-bys and emergency lay-bys), maintenance hardstandings, rest areas, service areas and observation platforms
DMRB LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring	Sets out the requirements for environmental assessment of projects, including reporting and monitoring of significant adverse environmental effects.
DMRB GG 142 - Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review	Sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review (WCHAR) process for highway schemes on motorways and all-purpose trunk roads
DMRB LA 105 - Air quality	Sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highway projects on air quality.
DMRB LA 106 - Cultural heritage assessment	Sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects on cultural heritage as part of the environmental assessment process of construction, operation and maintenance projects.
DMRB LA 110 - Material assets and waste	Sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects on material assets and waste from the delivery of motorway and all-purpose trunk road projects.
DMRB LA 111 - Noise and vibration	Sets out the requirements for noise and vibration assessments from road projects, applying a proportionate and consistent approach using best practice and ensuring compliance with relevant legislation
DMRB LA 112 - Population and human health	Sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the environmental effects on population and health from construction, operation and maintenance of highways projects.
DMRB LA 114 - Climate	Sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of climate on highways (climate change resilience and adaptation), and the effect on climate of greenhouse gas from construction, operation and maintenance projects.

## **4.2 Environmental information**

Throughout the annex tables environmental terminology and abbreviations are used, for example: PM, NO, NO<sub>x</sub>, ha, tCO<sub>2</sub>e. Further details and definitions of these terms and abbreviations can be found within Chapter 17 (Glossary and Abbreviations) of the Environmental Statement (**TR010065/APP/6.1**).

## 5. Annex tables

## N.1 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(a) - Prescribed Consultees

N.1.A: Cadent Gas Limited

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWAA-P	Introductory text	Statutory consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations) I refer to your letter dated 8th November 2022 regarding the above proposed DCO. Cadent has reviewed the consultation documents and has the following comments:	N/A	N	The Applicant has had regard to the comments made by the Consultee and has responded below to the matters raised.
BHLF-559H-RWAA-P	Assets	<p>In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus, Cadent Infrastructure within or in close proximity to the development Cadent has identified the following apparatus within the redline boundary or within the vicinity of the proposed works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment</li> <li>• Intermediate Pressure mains and associated equipment</li> <li>• Medium Pressure mains and associated equipment</li> <li>• Low Pressure mains and associated equipment</li> </ul> <p>Note: No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Cadent Gas Limited or their agents, servants or contractors for any error or omission.</p> <p>Please note that Cadent has existing easements for these pipelines which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has continued discussions with the Consultee since the statutory consultation to ensure comments raised are noted, taken into consideration and addressed. Engagement will continue throughout the detailed design stage and the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> in respect of the Consultee.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's point about existing easements and, where required, the Applicant has allowed for this in the application documents.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAA-P	Assets; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Diversions:</p> <p>Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity. Please be aware that diversions for high pressure apparatus can take in excess of two years to plan and procure materials.</p> <p>Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require the party requesting the diversion works to obtain any necessary planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried out. Details of these consents should be agreed in writing with Cadent before any applications are made. Cadent would ordinarily require a minimum of C4/Conceptual Design study to have been carried out to establish an appropriate diversion route ahead of any application being made.</p> <p>Adequate land rights must be granted to Cadent (e.g. following the exercise of compulsory powers to acquire such rights included within the DCO) to enable works to proceed to Cadent's satisfaction. Cadent's approval to the land rights powers included in the DCO prior to submission is strongly recommended to avoid later substantive objection to the DCO. Land rights will be required to be obtained prior to construction and commissioning of any diverted apparatus, in order to avoid any delays to the project's timescales. A diversion agreement may be required addressing responsibility for works, timescales, expenses and indemnity.</p> <p>Protection/Protective Provisions:</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and will necessitate a Deed of Consent being put in place. Any -s for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions and early discussions are advised.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has been in communication with the Consultee relating to diversion and protection of their apparatus. The Applicant has noted these points and will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops and moves towards and through construction.</p> <p>The Applicant requested budget estimates from the Consultee to identify diversionary requirements and the Consultee has identified indicative routes that satisfy the protection of its assets.</p> <p>The Applicant has allowed for the protection and diversion of the Consultee's apparatus within the application documents. This is included within the works which are to be carried out, the powers to enable rights to be provided on behalf of the Consultee and the inclusion of Protective Provisions for the Consultee in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>; the inclusion of land for diversionary corridors in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Book of Reference <b>(TR010065/APP/4.3)</b>; and the Environmental Impact Assessment in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to work with the Consultee to ensure all necessary measures are in place to ensure the safety of the existing and diverted apparatus.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAA-P	Assets	Key Considerations:	N/A	N	The Applicant has noted these points and the guidance referred to and will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops and moves towards and through construction.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.</li> <li>• Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip and a Crossing Agreement may be required if any apparatus needs to cross the Cadent easement strip.</li> <li>• The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of Cadent's asset shall be subject to review and approval from Cadent's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.</li> </ul> <p>General Notes on Pipeline Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and Cadent's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties GD/SP/SSW22. Digsafe leaflet Excavating Safely - Avoiding injury when working near gas pipes. There will be additional requirements dictated by Cadent's plant protection team.</li> <li>• Cadent will also need to ensure that our pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works.</li> <li>• The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.</li> <li>• If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</li> <li>• Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with Cadent's Plant Protection team is essential: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Demolition</li> <li>– Blasting</li> <li>– Piling and boring</li> <li>– Deep mining</li> <li>– Surface mineral extraction</li> <li>– Landfilling</li> <li>– Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)</li> <li>– Wind turbine installation</li> <li>– Solar farm installation</li> <li>– Tree planting schemes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pipeline Crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations.</li> <li>• The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.</li> <li>• The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation.</li> <li>• No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent.</li> <li>• Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.</li> <li>• The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to Cadent.</li> <li>• A Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline.</li> </ul>			<p>The Applicant has allowed for the protection and diversion of the Consultee's apparatus within the application documents. This is included within the works which are to be carried out, the powers to enable rights to be provided on behalf of the Consultee and the inclusion of Protective Provisions for the Consultee in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order (TR010065/APP/3.1); the inclusion of land for diversionary corridors in the Land Plans (TR010065/APP/2.2) and Book of Reference (TR010065/APP/4.3); and the Environmental Impact Assessment in the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to work with the Consultee to ensure all necessary measures are in place to ensure the safety of the existing and diverted apparatus. The specification for Safe Working referred to by the Consultee will be adhered to by the Applicant.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>New Service Crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.</li> <li>• Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.</li> <li>• A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip.</li> <li>• A Cadent representative shall approve and supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline.</li> <li>• An exposed pipeline should be suitable supported and removed prior to backfilling.</li> <li>• An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding.</li> <li>• For pipe construction involving deep excavation (&lt;1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the model consultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversion is required.</li> </ul> <p>Guidance:</p> <p>To download a copy of the HSE Guidance HS(G)47, please use the following link: (<i>Avoiding danger from underground services - HSG47 (hse.gov.uk)</i>)</p> <p>Dial Before You Dig Pipelines Guidance: (<i>https://documents.cadentgas.com/view/719428500/</i>)</p> <p>Essential Guidance document: (<i>https://cadentgas.com/getattachment/digging-safely/Promo-work-safely-library/Essential_Guidance.pdf</i>)</p> <p>Excavating Safely in the vicinity of gas pipes guidance (Credit card): (<i>https://cadentgas.com/nggdwsdev/media/Downloads/Digging%20Safely/Excavating_Safely_Leaflet_Gas-1.pdf</i>)</p> <p>Copies of all the Guidance Documents can also be downloaded from the Cadent website: (<i>https://cadentgas.com/help-advice/digging-safely</i>)</p> <p>Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent Assets: (<i>https://cadentgas.com/nggdwsdev/media/Downloads/Digging%20Safely/CADSPSSW22-Specification-for-safeworking-in-the-vicinity-of-Cadent-assets-August-2021.pdf</i>)</p> <p>Tree Planting Guidance: (<i>https://cadentgas.com/nggdwsdev/media/Downloads/Digging%20Safely/Tree-planting-guidance-Cadent-forweb.pdf</i>)</p>			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Introductory text	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the proposed A46 Newark Bypass scheme.</p> <p>The Canal &amp; River Trust are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals &amp; rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation.</p> <p>The Trust is the navigation authority for the Trent below the new road route. We also own land in proximity to Nether Weir, which would likely be affected by the widened road, and is within the red line of the proposed site. The Trust also has freehold interests in the River Trent, which could be impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>We note that the proposals include the provision of two new crossings, the provision of attenuation basins in proximity to Nether Weir, and the use of temporary construction compounds (including a temporary bridge over the River Trent) in proximity to Nether Viaduct.</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposed project, we wish to make the following comments:</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comments noted by the Applicant. The Applicant has had regard to the comments made by the Consultee and has responded to the matters raised below.</p> <p>In relation to the River Trent the Applicant can confirm the Scheme includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new three span bridge constructed in parallel and to the existing Windmill Viaduct over the River Trent</li> <li>• A new viaduct over the River Trent and a new bridge over the East Coast Main Line in parallel to the existing bridges at Nether Weir</li> <li>• An attenuation basin in proximity to Nether Weir</li> <li>• Use of temporary construction compounds (including a temporary bridge over the River Trent) in proximity to Nether Viaduct</li> </ul>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Cultural heritage; Assets; Construction	<p><b>IMPACT ON CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSETS:</b></p> <p>The proposed road would potentially affect the setting of existing heritage assets associated with the River Trent. These include the grade II* listed Concrete Footbridge (reference 1297721) and non-designated assets including Nether Weir.</p> <p>The works in proximity to these assets for the construction of the viaduct close to Nether Lock would likely require the construction of temporary compounds for construction in proximity to these assets. The new road and any associated embankments could also impact the setting of these assets. Temporary effects from the temporary footbridge and compounds would also potentially impact their setting.</p> <p>Section 7.7 of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> identifies the likely effects of the development on these assets. We note that this includes an initial scoping assessment of impacts on the Concrete Footbridge and Newark Conservation Area, which lie in proximity to the River Trent. In line with the principles of paragraphs 194 to 195 of the NPPF, we request that supporting information alongside the application should seek to fully assess and clarify the temporary and permanent impacts to these assets, and exact mitigation measures proposed. We agree with the assessment in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> that main temporary and permanent impacts would concern the impact on the setting of the assets and potential impacts of vibrations upon them from both construction plant and equipment and use of the new road by cars during its operation.</p> <p>We wish to highlight that Nether Weir and Nether Lock, due to their age and association with historic river traffic on the River Trent, should be identified as non-designated Heritage Assets. Due to the proximity of works to them, we request that the application should also fully assess the impacts of the development upon these. As per the designated assets mentioned above, the main temporary and permanent impacts would concern the impact on the setting of the assets and potential impacts of vibrations upon them from both construction plant and equipment and use of the new road by cars during its operation.</p> <p>We wish to highlight that it is likely that archaeological remnants associated with past use of Nether Weir may be present, and could be impacted by the new road and any construction compounds associated with the construction works proposed. We request that the desk-based assessment discussed in section 7.3.5 of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> includes an assessment of this area.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides information of the impacts of the Scheme on heritage assets. This includes proposed mitigation measures which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) both temporary and permanent impacts have been assessed for the grade II* listed Concrete Footbridge (reference 1297721) and the non-designated heritage assets Nether Weir and Lock, and Clapper Gates.</p> <p>Effects to non-designated heritage assets Nether Weir, Nether Lock and Clapper Gates have been assessed in accordance with the Applicant's <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The assessment identified a slight adverse impact during the construction period. Due to the non-designated status of these assets and the construction impact being temporary, the assessed impact is considered non-significant and therefore, no mitigation has been identified.</p> <p>Effects to the grade II* listed Concrete Footbridge (reference 1297721) during construction have been assessed as being temporary moderate adverse and structural monitoring would be required to identify impacts and related mitigations. However, given the existing presence of the road and rail bridge the assessment has concluded that any permanent impact due to its construction or impact arising from operation stages would be neutral. Proposed mitigation measures include a monthly monitoring plan secured within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Due to previous construction of the A46 it has been considered that any potential archaeological remains would have been removed/destroyed at this point. This has been included within the historic environment desk-based assessment which has informed the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-	Landscape	IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE WATERWAY CORRIDOR	N/A	N	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
RWDN-6	and visual effects; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>(LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS)</p> <p>The River Trent forms part of the strategic green network within Newark District. Consideration should be given towards ensuring that public access along the green corridor, and the physical continuity of the green corridor is not significantly harmed by the proposal, in line with the aims of core policy 12 from the adopted Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy.</p> <p>The development of two new crossings of the River Trent, and the construction of the viaduct close to Nether Weir (including the provision of construction compounds and temporary crossings of the Trent) would likely result in significant temporary and permanent impacts to the setting of the waterway.</p> <p>We note that the Environmental Report to be submitted alongside the application is to be accompanied with a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). As detailed in our response to the scoping report consultation, we request that boaters, walkers and fishermen in proximity to both proposed crossings of the River Trent should be included within the list of visual receptors included within the report, due to the proximity of works to the river and the fact that users often dwell on our spaces, and would likely experience any changes for a long period and therefore would be highly sensitive to any significant changes to the Landscape.</p> <p>The Trust notes that the construction of new crossings of the River Trent could have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the waterway, as well as potential adverse impacts on the users of the waterway. This is especially pertinent in and around Nether Lock, where temporary impacts during construction could be significant due to the siting of construction compounds in this area accompanied with the fact that the area lies within a Conservation Area and consists of designated and non designated Heritage Assets.</p>			<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides an assessment of likely effects upon landscape character and visual amenity both during construction and operation. Additional receptors, including users of the waterways, have been captured within the assessment as requested.</p> <p>One of the main design objectives is to retain as much existing vegetation as possible, including the green corridor currently presented along the River Trent, and to create an effective blue green corridor (using the river and adjacent lands to establish an interconnected passageway between natural habitats) along the length of the Scheme. This includes the retention of vegetation such as that along the River Trent wherever possible as well as additional planting. Public access would remain during operation, albeit temporary localised re-alignments may be required during construction.</p> <p>While the future setting of the river has not been assessed in itself, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has assessed views as afforded by users of the water way as a recreational asset. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Impact on the conservation area and setting of non-designated heritage assets is assessed as temporary and not anticipated to result in any significant effects. Further detail on this is available in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>We note that an existing pathway lies alongside the river in the location of both crossings. We request that full details should be supplied to demonstrate that these paths will not be unduly obstructed by the new crossings, so as to maintain people's access to the strategic green network.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The new bridges would be built alongside the existing bridges with similar spans and form to maintain full access and use of the existing paths, which would remain unimpeded. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p><b>PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE RIVERSIDE AREA</b></p> <p>The submitted drawings indicate that it is proposed to potentially divert public footpaths and/or bridleways sited next to the River in order to construct the two new crossings. Any closure of this pathway could have adverse impacts upon navigation along the River Ouse. For example, access along the path would be necessary to aid vessels in distress, whilst canoeists are known to use the path to 'portage' around Nether Lock and Weir.</p> <p>We request that any temporary closure of the path should still allow for retention of emergency access for river users, whilst pathways around the lock and weir should remain open for the use of canoeists.</p> <p>In our capacity as Navigation Authority of the River Trent, we wish to advise that the riverside paths were likely to have been constructed by the Trent Navigation Company following its creation under an act of parliament in 1783. Due to its construction specifically for the purposes of navigation, it may be necessary for the Trust to provide consent in our capacity as Navigation Authority for its closure or diversion during works. For additional information, we request that the applicant/developer contacts the Canal &amp; River Trust's Works Engineering Team via switchboard on 0303 040 4040 in order to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained for any footpath diversion/closure, and that all works would comply with the Trust's "Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal &amp; River Trust.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on Public Rights of Way. Paths around the Nether Lock and Weir would remain open at all times. Construction activities would temporarily restrict access to Newark Bridleway BW6 for a period of 10 weeks for the installation of a temporary bridge crossing.</p> <p>As set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> alternative access arrangements would be maintained throughout the construction period. During this time Newark Bridleway BW6 would be marshal controlled, with users escorted along Newark Bridleway BW6 throughout the ten-week construction period. Details regarding walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussions with the Consultee regarding any possible interruption to navigation rights along the River Trent and associated riverside paths. Any relevant legislation applicable to the riverside paths will be considered further during those discussions and will, if required, be addressed within any protective provisions set out in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Further details of engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Biodiversity	<p><b>MEASURES TO REDUCE THE IMPACT ON ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY</b></p> <p>The waterway forms part of the strategic green network for Newark District, and provides a green corridor for the movement of wildlife in the borough. A new road bridge, and widened crossing, could result in a significant the increased level of disturbance and a break in habitat connectivity, which could seriously affect protected species such as bats and bat habitats.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>We understand from the Scoping Consultation that the Environmental Report will be accompanied with an ecological assessment. We wish to highlight that the Trust does have records of barn owls and otters being present in proximity to the river, and we therefore request that surveys include assessments on the potential presence of these species.</p> <p>We request that any site-specific enhancements and compensation should be considered as a priority alongside the development, as opposed to off-site measures. This could help to limit any potential severance of existing habitats, which could otherwise impact the linear role of the River Trent corridor as a wildlife habitat. We note that paragraph 9.10.4 in the PIER highlights that compensatory habitats adjacent to, or as close to the affected habitats will be sought. We request that the supporting details should demonstrate that all on-site and off-site areas enhancement areas close to or within the boundary of the works are unavailable before off-site areas distant from the development are considered.</p> <p>New planting proposed in volume 2, figure 2.3 could help to compensate for any loss in biodiversity in locations next to and close to the order limits.</p> <p>With regards to any submitted ecological information to support the application, we wish to highlight that Summer 2022 has been unusually warm, which may have dried out typical wetland habitats. Should the Environment Statement and its supporting documents choose to rely on Summer 2022 data, then we request that the document should address the risk that wetland habitats suitable for some species (such as grey crested newts and grass snake) may be affected that may not have been adequately recorded due to the extreme weather events of 2022.</p>			<p>Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors, and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. These are secured within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme. Regarding biodiversity net gain, compensation habitat has been prioritised within the Scheme Order Limits where applicable and where there has been space to do so. Where habitat creation or enhancement has not been possible adjacent to or near to the affected receptor, or within proximity to the Scheme, offsite creation and enhancement would be provided.</p> <p>Several ecological surveys have been undertaken, including for bats, otters and barn owls. The methodology and limitations applicable to these surveys are detailed in Appendices 8.1 to 8.15 of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, including consideration of atypical seasonality/weather events. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders. It is noted in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> that the summer of 2022 was atypically warm which may have resulted in low water levels of ponds which could have limited aquatic invertebrate sampling and rapid pond surveys. In the absence of survey data, or where data may be considered atypical, a realistic precautionary approach has been adopted.</p> <p>With regards to habitat connectivity, construction work would result in habitat loss and visual, audible and vibrational disturbance. However, with the adoption of embedded mitigation measures as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and habitat/species-specific mitigation measures as shown in (Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>), no significant impacts to habitat connectivity would occur during construction. Examples of measures include the avoidance of night-time works, where possible, or otherwise the use of task lighting with cowl, and the use of suitable piling equipment to minimise noise and vibration, where possible, and slow start ups to piling works. During operation, compensatory planting would replace lost habitats, to re-instate habitat connectivity and would seek to enhance the existing resource of connective habitat.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Geology and soils	<p><b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b></p> <p>Works in proximity to the River Trent have the potential to increase the risk of pollution to the River through the runoff of silt-laden deposits or the release of dust during construction. There is a significant risk of contamination through poor sediment management from exposed soils, with specific risks likely associated with excavation and piling works in proximity to the river.</p> <p>Part 10.10 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report outlines a list of measures to help address pollution risks, including the provision of a Contaminated Land Risk Assessment, First and Second Iteration EMP and supplementary investigations of flood storage areas and borrow pit sites. These would be expected to provide adequate information to ensure that the mitigation measures are adequate to prevent any risk of contamination towards the water environment.</p> <p>Table 10.4 details a range of effects of works on the local environment. With regards to the impact on Controlled Waters, proposed mitigation measures, including stockpile locations, cut of ditches and the provision of Surface water and groundwater management plans would help to reduce the risk of contamination. We request that these are detailed prior to the commencement of works, such as within a Construction and Environmental Management</p>	N/A	N	<p>The assessment of the Scheme on hydrology, geology and soils is included in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Both chapters consider the potential for the Scheme to impact the River Trent, including potential risks of contamination and sediment run-off. Both Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes that there will be a slight effect on the River Trent during construction or operation following the application of further mitigation measures.</p> <p>All details of mitigation are included in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, this details the reasonable and practicable steps to be taken to protect the water environment including during excavation and foundation works. Furthermore, it details that works would be monitored by the Environmental Manager, including an auditing programme, to ensure the protection of controlled waters. Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> provides that a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, so the measures outlined are committed to ensure they are implemented.</p> <p>Management of excavated topsoil and subsoils would be in line with the guidance provided within Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Plan (CEMP).			Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> to minimise soil being entrained in run-off water.
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Road drainage and the water environment	<p><b>ROAD DRAINAGE AND THE WATER ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>Paragraph 14.7 highlights a variety of potential impacts of the development upon the water environment. During construction, as stated in our response to the Geology and Soils Chapter, there are risks of pollution to the River during construction. Key examples of risk include the runoff of silt-laden deposits or the release of dust during construction, and the risk of hydrocarbon contamination from any runoff from the road during its operation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures, including surface water quality monitoring and provision of an Environmental Management Plan, both identified as measures in the PIER, would help to address these risks.</p> <p>Our records show that there is a likelihood that the existing road does drain into the River Trent close to Nether Weir on the right bank. Changes to any existing discharge or the creation of any new discharge could have an impact on the environment of the waterway, and the management of water within the river. We understand that drainage designs have not been finalised. We request that full details of any changes to discharges to the Trent should be identified alongside the main application.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The assessment of impacts of the Scheme on receiving watercourses is included in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. There are at least four existing outfalls to the River Trent. The function of these outfalls would become known at stage five design once CCTV surveys have been completed.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures would be provided to ensure that water quality is not adversely affected. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The details of the surface water drainage strategy for the Scheme are included in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, and the assessment of water quality impacts is included in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Landscape and visual effects; Construction; Road layout	<p>The Trust request that consideration should be given to the following aspects of the scheme:</p> <p><b>IMPACT OF CONSTRUCTION COMPOUNDS</b></p> <p>The proposals include the provision of large construction compound areas in close proximity to the River Trent. We request that special consideration should be given towards ensuring that the visual impact of these on river users is minimised appropriately. This may require the provision of appropriately designed boundary fencing, and the siting of construction activities in a manner to site more disruptive activities away from the waterway and associated neighbouring footpaths.</p> <p><b>BRIDGE DESIGN</b></p> <p>The design of new crossings of the river should consider the underside of the bridge structure so that any impact for river users below is minimised. Measures to prevent drips and bird roosting below should be considered, whilst efforts should be undertaken to reduce shading impacts to the waterway below.</p> <p>A standardised concrete bridge could result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the waterway. We therefore request that efforts are taken to ensure that the design of any replacement bridge addresses the waterway positively, to partly offset its potential harm to the visual character of the area. Features common to road crossings, such as visible exposed Armco barriers, concrete framing, tall sound barriers, and roadway decks positioned at an angle to the waterway (as opposed to at 90-degrees) could significantly harm the appearance and character of the green corridor, and we advise that efforts are taken to minimise the presence of such features when designing any new crossing.</p> <p>To limit the visual intrusiveness of the bridge crossings to the river, we request that efforts are sought to position the piers of any new structure to either side of the river as far enough away from the navigation as possible. This would help to maintain the open aspect of the waterway, as well as maintain visibility for boaters to see hazards ahead. Efforts to utilize anti-graffiti measures at the base of the piers should also be sought.</p> <p>We request that the application should include information to demonstrate what impact the new crossings will have over light levels and shading over the river.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Table 2-8 within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the location of each of the compounds and the proposed usage. Compounds are located away from the river with exception of those required adjacent to bridges/viaducts, such as Windmill Viaduct, or Nether Lock. These compounds are referred to as satellite compounds as they are typically smaller and used for a temporary duration whilst works on a specific structure, such as Windmill Viaduct, are undertaken.</p> <p>Typically, the fencing used would be 'Heras' style fencing dependent on the level of site security required. The siting of activities would be sensitively considered in-combination with other environmental factors, for example, potential dust generating activities would be preferably sited away from various sensitive receptors, which may or may not correspond to siting in a manner which places activities furthest away from the waterway and associated towpath.</p> <p>Impacts on light levels and shading have been included in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> as well as the Habitat Regulations Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/6.6)</b> and Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Shading would provide habitat diversity and facilitate avoidance of large predators (eg heron).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has considered the potential for changes in lighting/shading as a result of the Scheme ecological receptors. Indirect sunlight would splay between the two distinct carriageways over the viaducts (space between the new northbound carriageway and the existing A46). This spacing, the height of the viaducts and grade separations and the movement of shadows through the day are anticipated to result in a localised reduction of habitat of poor ecological value (habitat consists of bramble scrub, tall ruderal, bare ground, improved grassland). This would have a negligible effect on aquatic wildlife, as little in-channel and riparian vegetation exists along the modified banks.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provide information regarding the impact of the Scheme on amenity. A receptor/resource is assessed as experiencing an amenity effect when two significant residual effects (stemming from changes in landscape and visual amenity, air quality and noise) coincide at the same location and/or on the same receptor. The assessment of population and human health as presented in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, considers the potential impacts on river users and navigation during construction of the new bridges, to conclude no significant effects are anticipated. Once operational any localised changes to light levels are not expected to impact users of the waterways.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> , both crossings of the River Trent comprise a new independent bridge alongside the existing; with broadly similar spans, clearances, skews and features as the existing, except for the use of weathering steel rather than a painted finish that would require additional maintenance across the lifetime of the bridge. None of the piers would be positioned within the river and all works would be positioned away from the riverbank wherever possible. Shading to the river would be minimised by the provision of a 2m clear gap between the existing and proposed bridges. These aspects were discussed with the Consultee at an initial liaison meeting in February 2023. Structures would be specified to a construction standard (in line with British Standards and best practice), in relation to drip prevention, anti-graffiti, and bird roosting prevention.
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Road layout; Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested; Construction	<p><b>IMPACT ON NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY</b></p> <p>We assume that the crossing would be at a relatively high level. We would, however, wish to highlight that sufficient headroom should be provided to allow boats to pass underneath; and should not be lower than that available upon the existing bridge across the navigation. This would also apply to the temporary bridge proposed.</p> <p>To maintain navigational safety, it is necessary for boaters to have a clear sightline around the bend of the river towards Nether Lock. We therefore recommend that the piers of any new bridge or widened road bridge is set as far away as possible from the bank edge, so that a clear sightline can be provided. We request that appropriate information is provided alongside the application to demonstrate that this can be achieved.</p> <p>Although we appreciate that the initial design will likely seek to avoid piers in the waterway, we wish to provide a reminder that any new bridge should seek to avoid the placement of piers within the river itself, which would otherwise form a visual obstruction, and could provide a navigation hazard.</p> <p>During construction, we advise that the maintenance of navigation for boaters along the river, and 'portage' route for canoeists around Nether Weir should be considered. Details could be agreed as part of a Construction Management Plan.</p>	N/A	N	<p>As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, both crossings of the River Trent comprise new independent bridges alongside the existing; with broadly similar spans and clearances as the existing.</p> <p>Sufficient headroom would be provided to allow boats to pass underneath, proposed piers would be set well back from the bank edge and all works would be positioned away from the riverbank wherever possible. Shading to the river would be minimised by the provision of a 2m clear gap between the existing and proposed bridges. These aspects were discussed with the Consultee at an initial liaison meeting in February 2023.</p> <p>Construction activities at the Nether Lock Viaduct would restrict navigation along the River Trent during the night (for one night) for the installation of a temporary bridge crossing at Nether Lock. Navigation activities would not be possible during this time. The temporary bridge would be set at a level to provide navigation clearance and headroom underneath it. As set out in Article 26 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> the Applicant must consult with the Consultee prior to suspension of any navigation rights along the River Trent.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Construction	<p><b>RETENTION OF VEHICULAR ACCESS TO NETHER LOCK AND WEIR</b></p> <p>The submitted drawings indicate that the access road to nether lock and weir, including the associated hydroelectric plant, may be diverted during the works. We request that any application submission should clarify the nature of any diversion, and should demonstrate that access to the Lock and Weir (including the hydroelectric plant) is retained. This would be required in order to enable any essential maintenance activities to be undertaken to these items of infrastructure.</p>	N/A	N	Access to Nether Lock and Weir and the hydroelectric power plant would be maintained on a 24/7 basis during the period of works.
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Landscape and visual effects; Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	<p><b>LIGHTING</b></p> <p>Lighting columns could increase the visual intrusion of the new road development in proximity to the River Trent. This could impact upon the setting of the riverside area, and could also impact upon the wildlife habitats alongside the River Trent.</p> <p>We note that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report report highlights that efforts will be undertaken to minimise the height of lighting columns and light spill (e.g. paragraphs 7.10.3 and 9.10.3). We request that the application should include information to demonstrate that this will be the case, such as the provision of light spill data.</p> <p>Due to the distance of the new river crossings from existing junctions, we advise that efforts to avoid the need for external lighting in these locations should be sought if possible.</p>	N/A	N	<p>No additional operational lighting would be provided along the A46 in proximity to the River Trent. Lighting would only be provided at junctions and not along the main carriageway.</p> <p>Lighting impacts upon the river and its habitat, such as disturbance to ecological receptors associated with works during construction, have been assessed as part of the Biodiversity Assessment for the Scheme as captured in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> as well as the Habitat Regulations Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/6.6)</b>, with further assessment of lighting impacts and visual intrusion during construction considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation measures identified as a result of this assessment are contained within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, and include measures such as using the minimum luminosity necessary, use of low energy consumption fittings and the use of directional task lighting.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Construction; Noise and vibration	<p><b>IMPACT ON THE STRUCTURAL STABILITY OF THE RIVER AND NETHER WEIR AND LOCK</b></p> <p>We request that careful consideration is given to ensure that the construction works, and loading of any permanent structures, do not result in damage to the river bank, nor Nether Weir and Lock. This may affect the placement of supports in relation to the channel, and the method of construction on site.</p> <p>Vibrations from car movements on the bridge, and from piling works likely required to construct the bridge, could result in damage to Nether Weir or Nether Lock. We therefore request that assessments are undertaken to demonstrate that no damage will be caused to the waterway assets from the works. This could be achieved through an assessment of the current condition/stability of the lock and analysis (potentially modelling) of the impact of any ground vibration resulting in the construction and then operation of the bridge on the lock. We would recommend that this information is provided as part of the future application submission so that any impact can be fully assessed.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Thorough consideration has been given to both the location of the permanent and temporary construction works. The supports for the new Nether Lock Viaduct structure would be located sufficiently away from the existing riverbank to avoid the risk of damage to the riverbank. The location of construction equipment and materials have been determined to ensure no impact on the existing riverbank. Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides further information with regards to construction works at Nether Lock Viaduct.</p> <p>Mitigation measures which would ensure damage to the riverbanks are avoided are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes the preparation of an Erosion Prevention and Sediment Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to mitigate sediment disturbance and measures such as locating materials (including stockpiles) a minimum of 8m from watercourses to avoid pollution into watercourses. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to noise and vibration changes around the Scheme, during construction and operation.</p> <p>The assessment has been carried out in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>, which scopes out operational vibration citing: 'a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.' Furthermore, this is supported in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Schedule of Scoping Opinion Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which states that 'Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out.'</p> <p>Construction vibration has been assessed and is presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment of construction vibration concluded that there would be no residual significant effects from piling and any other activities. Furthermore, there would be no residual damage to buildings and structures, including Nether Lock due to construction vibration.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Population and human health; Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	<p><b>IMPACT ON RIVER ANGLING CLUB</b></p> <p>There is an existing angling club located in close proximity to the eastern river crossing at Nether Weir. Any closure of access to the riverside area during construction could adversely impact upon the ability of anglers to access this area. In line with Spatial Policy 8 from the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy 'Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities', the loss of existing community and leisure facilities through new development requiring should be avoided. We therefore advise that any temporary loss to angling facilities should be compensated as part of the completed scheme during construction, and that construction activities should be designed to limit any potential impact on angling.</p> <p>We request that the application submission should include details detailing the impact of works on access to fishing pegs and locations on this part of the River Trent, including details of how any obstructions to access will be compensated during development.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on Public Rights of Way. Construction activities at the Nether Lock Viaduct would temporarily restrict access to fishing pegs along the River Trent near Nether Lock. The Applicant has consulted with the angling club as part of the statutory consultation and will continue to engage with the angling club with regards to any temporary effects on angling facilities.</p> <p>The installation of a temporary bridge crossing at Nether Lock would temporarily disrupt access on the eastern bank, between Fiddlers Elbow Bridge BR25 and Nether Rail BR27 for a period of around ten weeks. During this time, Newark Bridleway BW6 (which provides access to the fishing pegs) would be marshal controlled, allowing controlled access to the fishing pegs. The use of the fishing pegs would need to be closed during night-time bridge beam lift operations.</p> <p>Fishing pegs on the west bank of the River Trent, between Fiddlers Elbow Bridge BR25 and Nether Rail BR27 would be inaccessible for a 30 month period as a result of the new bridge deck construction works.</p>
BHLF-559H-	Road	<b>IMPACT OF PROPOSED ATTENUATION BASIN ON NETHER WEIR</b>	N/A	N	Further information relating to the design, operation and benefits associated with the use of



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
RWDN-6	drainage and the water environment; Assets; Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	The proposals indicate that an attenuation basin is proposed at the base of the new viaduct, close to Nether Weir, on the left bank of the river Trent. This area would likely hold water during floods, that would then be released to the wider environment following a period of high ground saturation. The location of the attenuation basin could result in the channeling of flows around the back of the hydro-scheme at Nether Weir, which could result in erosion towards the structure. We request that this attenuation basin should be relocated, or that information should be provided to demonstrate that flows from the basin will not adversely impact the weir structure.			<p>attenuation basins can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Locations of the attenuation basins can also be found on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation the attenuation basin has been moved south next to the River Trent. A spillway will divert flows from the dissipating flood waters away from the hydro station.</p> <p>Exceedance flow plans would be produced as part of the detailed design stage of the Scheme. A bund is included as part of the basin design, which would connect to the River Trent, helping to manage the exceedance volume during periods of high flow and discharge it directly into the River Trent. As a result of these mitigation measures, the Applicant does not anticipate any flows towards the hydro-scheme at Nether Weir which could result in erosion or scour that may adversely impact the weir structure.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDN-6	Land ownership; Stakeholder engagement	<p><b>COMMENTS AS LANDOWNER AND NAVIGATION AUTHORITY</b></p> <p>In addition to the comments above, we also wish to raise the following matters in our capacity as Landowner and Navigation Authority in relation to the River Trent.</p> <p><b>Estates Consent:</b></p> <p>The Trust owns land in proximity to Nether Weir. We also have freeholder interests in parts of the Trent. The proposed new road bridges would cross land in Trust ownership. A Licence and necessary permissions would be required from the Trust in our capacity as both landowner and navigation authority for these works.</p> <p>Please note that the Canal &amp; River Trust is a statutory undertaker which has specific duties to protect the waterways. Accordingly, it is likely that we will resist the use of compulsory purchase powers which may affect our land or undertakings. We reserve the right to seek protections under S16 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 should any proposals affect land which has been acquired for the purposes of our undertaking.</p> <p>Accordingly, we require that the acquisition of any Trust land or rights over Trust land should be secured by agreement. The applicant has initially approached the Trust's Estates section to discuss any agreements or land purchase needed. The applicant is due to provide the Trust with detailed plans of what land they require when available, which is still being awaited in order to allow us to negotiate terms. Consent from the Secretary of State may also be required with regards to the disposal or use of Trust owned infrastructure property.</p> <p>The Trust is still awaiting this information, with our last direct contact being on 1st September. To avoid any delay, we request that the applicant should send this information to the Trust's Estates section at their earliest convenience.</p> <p><b>Surface water drainage to the Trent:</b></p> <p>Should the proposals seek to discharge surface water to the Trent, consent may be required from the Trust in our capacity as landowner. For more information, the applicant may wish to contact our utilities section on [redacted] or at [redacted] who would be happy to assist.</p> <p>The Trust's records show that an existing discharge from the road may exist into the Trent in a location close to Nether Weir. We would request that any changes to this outfall are indicated in any submission.</p> <p><b>Third Party Works Consent:</b></p> <p>Alterations to the crossings on the River Trent (including both bridges) would require our consent as Navigation Authority. We therefore would recommend that the Highways Agency contact the Canal &amp; River Trust's Works Engineering Team via switchboard on [redacted] to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained prior to the development of a fully drawn up design.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Consultee has been engaged by the Applicant. Continued engagement in relation to specific protections, legal agreements and requirements will occur as necessary throughout the Scheme's development.</p> <p>Comments on Estates Consents have been noted and the Applicant is currently in discussions with the Consultee on land plans, licenses and necessary permissions.</p> <p>Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>As part of ongoing engagement, the Applicant will be reviewing Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> with the Consultee and will continue to engage with them regarding the use and acquisition of land as required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee, including as part of a Flood and Drainage Steering Group, to discuss proposals relating to the discharge of surface water to the River Trent, as a result of the Scheme. Further information regarding this and required consents will continue to be discussed with the Consultee as the Scheme develops.</p> <p>Information relating to the discharge locations for the Scheme can be found within the Outline Drainage Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b> and are described in the drainage strategy which forms Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWD7-F	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Coddington Parish Council makes the following observations in response to the statutory consultation on the A46 Newark Bypass.</p> <p>Reconnection of Winthorpe Footpaths 2 and 3:</p> <p>Coddington Parish Council are pleased to read on page 33 of the Consultation Brochure, that there are proposals to remove the existing severance of Winthorpe Footpaths 2 and 3, which provide a public right of way between Coddington and Winthorpe via Coddington Footpaths 4A and 5:</p> <p>“Reconnecting Footpaths 2 and 3 which are currently severed by the A46 between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts. A new public right of way would be created under the new A1 bridge and across the old A46 to the south of Friendly Farmer roundabout. This would provide a safer crossing point between Winthorpe and the A17.”</p> <p>The Parish Council seek reassurance that this proposal will be delivered as part of the scheme, including details drawings showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A safe pedestrian connection to the severed end of Winthorpe Footpath 3</li> <li>• A safe pedestrian route to the crossing point over the old A46</li> <li>• Pedestrian crossings over the old A46 to connect with the new public right of way to Winthorpe under the new A1 bridge</li> </ul> <p>These are required to comply with the NPPF, including provision for Non-Motorised Users, as the scheme will result in a change from limited severance between Footpaths 2 and 3, where crossing is difficult during busy periods, to completely extinguishing the route:</p> <p>“Producing an NMU strategy which includes the provision and locations for diversions of existing NMU routes, new crossings, potential cycle routes and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) to be extinguished, as well as ensuring access for key NMU routes.”</p>	N/A	N	<p>Winthorpe Footpath FP2, which historically linked Winthorpe to Newark Showground, was formally stopped up when the existing A46 was constructed. It would be unsafe to have an at-grade crossing at this historic crossing location.</p> <p>A new walking and cycling route would be provided and would connect Winthorpe to Newark Showground connecting into the existing Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and FP3, and Hargon Lane. The new walking and cycling route would then connect to Winthorpe Roundabout and provide a safer route to Newark Showground on the southern side of the A46 via new at-grade crossings, which are signalised when crossing the A46. This is shown on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>The new walking and cycling route would form part of a new circular route which would also travel under the new A1/A46 Crossing, linking back into the existing footway infrastructure. The route would provide a link from Winthorpe to Godfrey Drive. This would provide a continuous route from Coddington to Winthorpe.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD7-F	Traffic forecasts; Newark Showground; Winthorpe roundabout	<p>Traffic Impact on Coddington Village:</p> <p>Coddington Parish Council anticipate that the implementation of the scheme will result in lower traffic volumes travelling past Coddington School along Beckingham Road as access from the A17 to the A1 will improve with reduced traffic from the A46 approaching the Friendly Farmer roundabout.</p> <p>The Parish Council is however concerned about the impact of large scale events at Newark Showground on traffic volumes in Coddington Village. We wish to understand how signage and traffic lights at the new Winthorpe roundabout will be designed to limit traffic driving through Coddington along Drove Lane from such events, that currently lead to long queues in the wider vicinity.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the positive comments relating to the reduction in traffic volumes travelling past Coddington School.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling as these are considered as abnormal activities and cannot be assessed as part of the strategic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking.</p> <p>The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be utilised by the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.
BHLF-559H-RWD7-F	Brownhills junction; A1	<p>Improved access for A1 Northbound traffic:</p> <p>Coddington Parish Council note that a new roundabout is to be connected to the A46 eastbound exit slip road:</p> <p>"A new A46 exit slip road would be constructed to link the eastbound A46 to the existing Brownhills roundabout. This slip road would incorporate a new roundabout to provide access to the adjacent properties and to provide a link to Brownhills roundabout that passes beneath the new dual carriageway."</p> <p>Coddington Parish Council believes this new roundabout could readily provide a direct access route to the A1 northbound, avoiding the need for the large volumes of good vehicles to navigate the Brownhills roundabout to reach the A1 northbound. There are currently long queues at this roundabout on a daily basis, and providing another more direct access to the A1 would ease traffic flows by segregating vehicle travelling onto the A1 northbound from the A46 northbound and the A17 northbound. This would also significantly reduce the risk of traffic tailing back onto the A46 bypass at times of congestion.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions in order to understand how the new flows and turning movements would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts to optimise their operation, such as changes to signing and road markings.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXA-D	Road drainage and the water environment; Population and human health	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>We are regularly engaging with the design team through our attendance at the monthly Drainage and Flood Risk Steering Group meetings. Options for the provision of a floodplain compensation scheme are being gradually progressed. Floodplain compensation is fundamental component of the overall project, and this is identified and reiterated throughout the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information emphasises the desire to ensure that floodplain compensation areas are provided close to where the respective floodplain volume is lost. This is particularly relevant on spatially large projects to ensure that floodplain compensation is hydraulically linked to the floodplain area lost.</p> <p>As more detailed hydraulic modelling is developed, a range of return periods should be simulated, including the more frequent flood events. The project should ensure that there is no increase in flood risk to third parties for all events unless this forms part of a formalised floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>In our response to the Scoping Opinion, we sought to raise awareness of a vulnerable Gypsy and Traveler site at Tolney Lane who are located adjacent to the proposed scheme in Flood Zone 3. This has not been referenced within the Preliminary Environmental Information. We are aware of work being undertaken by Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) to investigate means of reducing the risk to this community. There is potential for cross over between the Newark and Sherwood District Council works and those proposed for dualling of the A46 Newark Bypass. We would encourage the applicants to engage with Newark and Sherwood District Council at the earliest opportunity to support identification of joint working opportunities and methods of reducing the risk to this highly vulnerable community.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme, including floodplain compensation, to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme also includes measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The mitigation for the Scheme can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXA-D	Biodiversity	<p>Biodiversity</p> <p>The Environment Agency are happy to see that although its not currently a legal requirement National Highways are looking to meet the 10% target as will be required going forward. They will need to ensure that they submit a Biodiversity Net Gain calculation as per the NE metric and guidance documents to show how they are meeting the target requirements for the varying habitat types; Hedgerows, terrestrial and rivers and streams. We would be very keen to be involved in the improvement and Biodiversity Net Gain requirements around watercourses to ensure that improvements are made accordingly in this area.</p> <p>We also note that water vole and otter surveys are ongoing. We know that otter use the area around Newark and there is potential for holts to be present in and around the development site therefore it is good to see that otter surveys are to be completed. Regarding water voles, the ditches in and around the development area are likely to be suitable for water vole especially in those more botanically rich drains and ditches which hold water all year round. We would also encourage the project team to look at improvements to the area for water vole through habitat creation for example through ditch creation and sustainable suds schemes whereby suds ponds contain water all year round and have a diverse range of aquatic, semi aquatic and terrestrial plant species within and around them. This will benefit water vole and a range of other species (amphibians, birds, inverts etc).</p> <p>The Environment Agency would also encourage the development team to ensure that any habitat creation is in keeping with the surroundings of the site, including historical habitats, environmental conditions (for example in terms of soil water and chemical make-up) to ensure any habitats that are created on site have the best chance of succeeding and require less human intervention.</p> <p>Finally we welcome that a Waste Framework Directive assessment will be submitted as part of the future Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project application and this needs to be of relevant detail for the potential impact of the development.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> has been applied to the Scheme. The Scheme would achieve a predicted net gain in biodiversity for hedgerows, terrestrial habitat and rivers and streams. Further details such as methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Principles of mitigation, including design of post development habitats are set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, and opportunities to benefit species have been included where practicable. These mitigation and compensation measures have been discussed with the Consultee and Natural England. Surveys for otters and water voles have been completed to inform the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation requirements are set out in in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Suitable planting that would be provided to benefit water vole and other wildlife is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Water Framework Directive Assessment has been undertaken and shared with the Consultee, which can be found in Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Mitigation measures, as explained in greater detail in the aforementioned assessment, include construction best practices (including pollution prevention plan and emergency response procedures, and groundwater protection measures), as well as the requirement to obtain appropriate environmental permits for the works. These measures and results of the assessment have been discussed and presented to the Consultee and no objections were raised.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXA-D	Biodiversity; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Fisheries</p> <p>We have the following comments from a fisheries perspective. The borrow pits at Farndon would provide a good opportunity to create fish habitat with a gravel pit connected to the river. This would benefit Waste Framework Directive (boosting fish stocks) and also wider biodiversity. If the borrow pit at Brownhills will hold water all year it could be a good site for an angling venue for the local community. The design for both sites would need careful consideration and the Environment Agency would be happy to discuss further.</p> <p>The potential flood compensation area around Kelham and Averham needs to ensure there is no detrimental impact to the river habitat as it is an incredibly important area for fish and fish spawning, including protected species such as lamprey. The Humber SAC is downstream but functionally linked as the lamprey move up river to spawn. Any change to habitat or water quality would need an HRA. It sounds however that the compensation area is most likely in the floodplain rather than works to the river itself but it this is something that will need to be considered due to the importance of the area.</p> <p>Within table 14.5 there are various sections which have the potential for slight adverse effect on water quality. Information will need to be provided to show how this risk will be removed. The River Trent has a number of protected and sensitive species of fish and a reduction in water quality could adversely impact them.</p> <p>The red line boundary for the A46 proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is situated next to the Areham Weir on the River Trent. The Areham Weir has been highlighted as a barrier to fish passage and therefore is one of the key sites highlighted by the Trent Gateway partnership to provide a new fish pass and support the opening up of the River Trent. This proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project should look at opportunities to support the provision of a fish pass at Areham weir and we would be happy to discuss further.</p>	N/A	N	<p>As a result of the Scheme design development, the Brownhills borrow pit is no longer required as a floodplain compensation area and so the intention is that this land is returned to the landowner after construction works have been completed. The Brownhills floodplain compensation area was proposed to cater for mitigating floodplain lost between 8-10m Above Ordnance Datum (baseline for ground levels in the UK) ground elevations. This mitigation would now be provided in access track drainage ditches and Farndon East floodplain compensation area, which is a more suitable site due to its hydraulic connectivity to local watercourses. In addition, the specific location of the borrow pit within this area is being heavily driven by the archaeology findings (e.g. avoiding high impact areas).</p> <p>The borrow pits at Farndon would be both borrow pits and floodplain compensation areas and would also be designed to provide ecological enhancements to the area. An assessment of how fish would use these habitats and the impact of the Scheme on fish has been included in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1), the Habitat Regulations Assessment (TR010065/APP/6.6), and Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Although a combination of residual light spill and noise and vibration disturbance during night works at Nether Lock Viaduct and Windmill Viaduct would act as a barrier to lamprey migration, the northern branch of the River Trent would act as a bypass to the upper reaches during this construction period. Furthermore, works at Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area would be completed prior to commencement of main alignment works. The integrity of the river and sea lamprey population and the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation is not considered to be affected during construction as there would be no habitat loss, severance of migration routes or degradation of lamprey spawning substrate.</p> <p>As long as silt curtains are maintained, residual sediment deposition is unlikely to smother habitats that support spawning river or sea lamprey population associated with the Special Area of Conservation, due to high dilution of low quantities of residual particles entering the River Trent and the distance from suitable spawning substrate. Further detail with regards to this mitigation is outlined within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5).</p> <p>The Consultee has been involved in discussions regarding the Farndon floodplain compensation area design as well as the mitigation and conclusions of both Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (TR010065/APP/6.6).</p> <p>As the Scheme is not impacting on Averham Weir there are no alterations to this structure or to provide fish passage at this location.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXA-D	Geology and soils	<p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</p> <p>On the topic of land contamination, we have reviewed Chapter 10 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. We are satisfied that all appropriate investigations have been undertaken to date and will be undertaken as the project progresses. We are happy with the proposed 500m study area. Baseline conditions have been established within Atkins 2021 report and we agree with the proposed supplementary investigations proposed.</p> <p>We are particularly keen to understand any potential sources of contamination associated with the elevated aromatic hydrocarbons and naphthalene encountered at WS46.</p>	N/A	N	<p>These matters are considered in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1), and Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3). Potential impacts to soil resources would be mitigated through the implementation of measures set out in Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5).</p> <p>The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5) includes a commitment to prepare a Materials Management Plan and a Site Waste Management Plan, which can be found in Appendix B.2 (Outline Materials Management Plan) and Appendix B.1 (Outline Site Waste Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5), in accordance with the Contaminated Land: Application in the Real Environment's code of practice <i>The Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice</i>.</p> <p>Any soils that do not meet chemical acceptability criteria for reuse on site would be treated or disposed of to a suitable licensed facility. A Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment in respect of Controlled Waters can be found appended to the Ground Investigation Report contained in Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The potential source of the contamination encountered at the location of WS46 is likely the adjacent historical Quibell Brothers chemical manure factory. Supplementary ground investigation work undertaken at the footprint of WS46, identified the contamination to be localised. During the enabling and construction earthworks of the existing A46 carriageway, it is possible that a small volume of site won material from the demolition location of the chemical manure factory was deposited at the location of WS46. It should be noted that no earthworks would be provided in the footprint of the WS46 contamination hotspot area and the contamination would therefore remain in-situ at this location.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXA-D	Material assets and waste	<p>Waste</p> <p>The developer must apply the waste hierarchy as a priority order of prevention, re-use, recycling before considering other recovery or disposal options. Government guidance on the waste hierarchy in England can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69403/pb13530-waste-hierarchy-guidance.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69403/pb13530-waste-hierarchy-guidance.pdf</a></p> <p>The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 for dealing with waste materials are applicable to any off-site movements of wastes. The code of practice applies to you if you produce, carry, keep, dispose of, treat, import or have control of waste in England or Wales.</p> <p>The law requires anyone dealing with waste to keep it safe and make sure it's dealt with responsibly and only given to businesses authorised to take it. The code of practice can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/506917/waste-duty-care-code-practice-2016.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/506917/waste-duty-care-code-practice-2016.pdf</a></p> <p>If you need to register as a carrier of waste, please follow the instructions here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/register-as-a-waste-carrier-broker-or-dealer-wales">https://www.gov.uk/register-as-a-waste-carrier-broker-or-dealer-wales</a></p> <p>If you require any local advice or guidance please contact your local Environment Agency office: [redacted]</p> <p>In order to meet the applicant's objectives for the waste hierarchy and obligations under the duty of care, it is important that waste is properly classified. Some waste (e.g. wood and wood based products) may be either a hazardous or non-hazardous waste dependent upon whether or not they have had preservative treatments.</p> <p>Proper classification of the waste both ensures compliance and enables the correct onward handling and treatment to be applied. In the case of treated wood, it may require high temperature incineration in a directive compliant facility. More information on this can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/how-to-classify-different-types-of-waste">https://www.gov.uk/how-to-classify-different-types-of-waste</a></p> <p>If materials that are potentially waste are to be used on-site, the applicant will need to ensure they can comply with the exclusion from the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) (article 2(1)(c)) for the use of, 'uncontaminated soil and other naturally occurring material excavated in the course of construction activities, etc...' in order for the material not to be considered as waste. Meeting these criteria will mean waste permitting requirements do not apply.</p> <p>Where the applicant cannot meet the criteria, they will be required to obtain the appropriate waste permit or exemption from us</p> <p>A deposit of waste to land will either be a disposal or a recovery activity. The legal test for recovery is set out in Article 3(15) of Waste Framework Directive as:</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comments and guidance noted by the Applicant. Waste hierarchy and circular economy principles would be implemented by the Applicant throughout the construction phase to minimise disposal and maximise reuse and recycling of waste arisings. Opportunities for reuse and recycling of waste include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reusing excavated soils that includes stored topsoil on-site in the landscaping features of the A46 or in floodplain compensation areas. Excavated materials would also be considered to create flood bund when possible. Surplus soils would be offered to projects near the Scheme for reuse on land, whenever possible</li> <li>Chipping green waste on-site for use in the landscaping for the Scheme</li> <li>Composting of green waste</li> <li>Recycling inert materials by crushing, blending and subsequent reuse, as an aggregate</li> <li>Reusing waste on other nearby Schemes which includes reuse of Construction and Demolition waste from bitumen road surfaces, existing walking route, highway kerb stone, concrete, mortar, drainage pipes, rock, steel and asphalt</li> <li>Reusing waste for uses with clear benefits to the environment, for example in the remodeling of agricultural land or in the restoration of nearby quarries or other excavation sites</li> <li>Providing on-site facilities to separate out waste to enable the recovery of material through recycling</li> </ul> <p>Where waste must be taken to a recycling or disposal site, the Principal Contractor would ensure that the site has the appropriate permits. In addition, the suitable facility would be located as close to the works as possible to minimise the impacts of transportation, in particular the release of carbon emissions. The Principal Contractor would identify the closest and relevant treatment and disposal sites.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an Outline Site Waste Management Plan, which can be found in Appendix B.3 (Outline Site Waste Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. It will be developed into a full Site Waste Management Plan by the Principal Contractor for the construction period. The Site Waste Management Plan would ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy and other relevant legislation and would detail information on the waste carriers and waste management facilities that would be used. In finalising the Site Waste Management Plan, the Principal Contractor would act in accordance with the legislative requirements identified by the Consultee.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any operation the principal result of which is waste serving a useful purpose by replacing other materials which would otherwise have been used to fulfil a particular function, or waste being prepared to fulfil that function, in the plant or in the wider economy.</li> <li>• We have produced guidance on the recovery test which can be viewed at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/deposit-for-recovery-operators-environmental-permits/waste-recovery-plans-and-deposit-for-recovery-permits#how-to-apply-for-an-environmental-permit-to-permanently-deposit-waste-on-land-as-a-recovery-activity">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/deposit-for-recovery-operators-environmental-permits/waste-recovery-plans-and-deposit-for-recovery-permits#how-to-apply-for-an-environmental-permit-to-permanently-deposit-waste-on-land-as-a-recovery-activity</a>.</li> </ul> <p>You can find more information on the Waste Framework Directive here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-permitting-guidance-the-waste-framework-directive">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-permitting-guidance-the-waste-framework-directive</a></p> <p>More information on the definition of waste can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/legal-definition-of-waste-guidance">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/legal-definition-of-waste-guidance</a></p> <p>More information on the use of waste in exempt activities can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/waste-exemptions-using-waste">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/waste-exemptions-using-waste</a></p> <p>Non-waste activities are not regulated by us (i.e. activities carried out under the CL:ARE Code of Practice), however you will need to decide if materials meet End of Waste or By-products criteria (as defined by the Waste Framework Directive). The 'Is it waste' tool, allows you to make an assessment and can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/isitwaste-tool-for-advice-on-the-by-products-and-end-of-waste-tests">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/isitwaste-tool-for-advice-on-the-by-products-and-end-of-waste-tests</a></p> <p>Where waste soil is to be exported from site it must be classified as either a Hazardous waste with the waste code 17-05-03 (soil and stones containing hazardous substances) or as a Non-Hazardous waste code 17-05-04 (soil and stones other than those mentioned in 17-05-03). This classification is carried out in accordance with the guidance provided by the Environment Agency's publication WM3 Waste Classification - Guidance on the classification and assessment of waste.</p> <p>The developer must apply the waste hierarchy as a priority order of prevention, re-use, recycling before considering other recovery or disposal options. Government guidance on the waste hierarchy in England can be found here: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69403/pb13530-waste-hierarchy-guidance.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69403/pb13530-waste-hierarchy-guidance.pdf</a></p> <p>Site Waste Management Plans (SWMP) are no longer a legal requirement, however, in terms of meeting the objectives of the waste hierarchy and your duty of care, they are a useful tool and considered to be best practice.</p> <p>The circular economy is a concept designed to keep materials in use as long as possible, thus promoting resource efficient practice and deriving economic benefits. Adherence to the waste hierarchy and adoption of best practice in relation to site waste management planning will help you deliver against circular economy objectives.</p> <p>It is important to take a precautionary approach and ensure that you follow the regulatory waste legislation. Ensure that you seek advice from the Environment Agency if required.</p>			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWD2-A	Construction; Noise and vibration	<p>Members noted the information circulated regarding the proposals for the A46 Newark Bypass. As the Parish Council were Statutory Consultees, Members now needed to consider their response to the proposals.</p> <p>After discussion it was AGREED that while Members supported the proposals they would want to see measures put in place so that construction traffic did not come through the village.</p> <p>Additionally, there was the capacity for the village to be affected by noise from the construction and following completion of the work. Given that established screening would be removed during the construction, it was AGREED that a request for noise attenuation measures be made along the existing dual carriageway, to protect the village from noise nuisance.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>An Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>), submitted as part of the development consent application, has been developed in consultation with the local highways authority. This details how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. Construction traffic accessing works on Windmill Viaduct near to Farndon would enter the site from the existing Farndon Roundabout.</p> <p>Following comments provided as part of the statutory consultation on the Scheme and engagement with landowners, the construction strategy has been reviewed for works required on Windmill Viaduct. Further information relating to this was included within a targeted consultation on the Scheme. This took place between March and April 2023 and included consultation with the Consultee, further information relating to this can be seen in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>A noise assessment has been carried out, please see Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which sets out where mitigation is considered necessary to reduce the impact of noise and further details of the noise modelling that has been undertaken.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Construction noise mitigation would be present in the form of site hoardings, plant control, and where necessary adjustment to plant usage and working hours. These mitigation measures can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6N-R	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity; Stakeholder engagement	From an environmental point of view the new bypass will reduce the number of standing vehicles and hopefully reduce the number of polluting gasses. Hopefully the new bypass will have some landscaping that will take into consideration the value of wildlife refuges along the proposal and with some consideration to species planted or maintained this will become a value ecologically.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has developed its biodiversity and landscape mitigation package in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors, and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>To ensure the ecological baseline is suitable to inform the detail of required mitigation measures at construction phase, a number of baseline ecological surveys will be updated prior to construction.</p> <p>A full assessment of landscape and visual effects has been undertaken as part of the Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> alongside continuing design work. A linear corridor of blue green infrastructure would be provided. This would form part of the Scheme's drainage solution whilst providing habitat continuity and appropriate landscape integration. Species rich grassland is included as part of the design, moving into shrub planting and then trees and woodland further away from the carriageway.</p>
		With smart design incorporating woodland along the linear length of the bypass, utilising high forest on the furthest verges and graduating to a shrub layer to grass verges closest to the highway, this will give great benefit to wildlife and planting high forest species further away from the carriageway will reduce the immediate need for remedial works when these trees become tall and pose a strike hazard, this method will give the vistas from the road softer appeal.	2C		
		As above, use appropriate species slow growing closer to the carriageway and faster tall growing further away, using a mixture of wooded and open areas to provide glades for wildflowers.	2D		
		From the edge of the highway to the outer envelope of the development area using the Linier verges would be very beneficial.	2E/2F		
		The only other consideration to this application is that if the proposals are to plant woodland along the sides and verges that if the proposals is to plant more than 0.5 hectare of woodland then an EIA consultation will be required to ensure that the woodland does not have any contentious issues and that the planting is fit for purpose. This is no major issue and is just a case of submitting a planting design and any supporting evidence from your consultations.	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZV-4	Overall scheme; Assets	<p>HSE's Land Use Planning Advice</p> <p>Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances?</p> <p>According to HSE's records the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project does not encroach on any Major Accident Hazard Site or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline. This is based on the Preliminary Red Line Boundary (RLB) as illustrated in, for example, A46 Newark Bypass General Arrangement Drawings.pdf (<a href="#">A46 Newark Bypass General Arrangement Drawings.pdf (citizenspace.com)</a>)).</p> <p>Based on the information in the <a href="#">A46 Newark Bypass Statutory Consultation Brochure.pdf (citizenspace.com)</a>, it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice and the information which has been provided. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.</p> <p>Hazardous Substance Consent: It is unlikely that Hazardous Substances Consent will be required for the improvement of the road and so there are unlikely to be any risks to the public from the scheme.</p> <p>Consideration of risk assessments: Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is summarised in the following Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G –The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments on page 3.</p> <p>Explosives sites: CEMHD 7's response is no comment to make in regards to the proposed development as there are no HSE licenced sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>Electrical safety: No comment from a planning perspective. During this time, please send any further communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project applications at [redacted]. We are currently unable to accept hard copies, as our offices have limited access.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comments noted by the Applicant, Assessments have been carried out in line with the guidance provided.</p> <p>An assessment for major accidents and disasters in relation to the Scheme has been undertaken and is available in Appendix 4.2 (Assessment of Major Accidents and Natural Disasters) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDJ-2	Introductory text	<p>Historic England are in ongoing pre-application discussions with National Highways on the A46 Junctions Project via your contractor Mott-Skanska as previously agreed with National Highways, please can you address all correspondence on this NSIP to me and copy to [redacted] so that it can be logged. A46 Newark Junctions correspondence should not be sent to other HE contacts.</p> <p>We welcome the scope of work set out in the PEIR thus far, we note the preliminary nature of these investigations and that much work remains to be done on the ES prior to submission of DCO. We are working closely with Mott-Skanska and our local government colleagues through the Environmental Technical Working Group for National Highways. With regards to cultural heritage please give particular attention to the following areas:-</p>	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWDJ-2	Cultural heritage	<p>Impacts of habitat creation / flood compensation / borrow pits / screening planting and other ancillary installations, these have the capacity to impact more substantially upon buried archaeological remains that the junction and carriageway work itself. Earliest attention should be given wherever possible to understanding the potential impact of these works and caution should be paid to making any commitments in respect of these sites or the benefits they may offer in advance of a sound understanding of the archaeological significance of assets affected (through geophysical survey and trenching / structured metal detecting etc). This is a very complicated landscape which has undergone significant alteration since the last ice-age and even since the 17th century.</p> <p>We note that in-operation impacts are seen as unlikely in respect of buried remains, whilst it is correct that most impacts will relate to construction , it should also be born in mind that hydrological / preservation impacts upon buried organic remains can occur at a distance from actual physical interventions and can occur over time as the impacts of changes in water composition and oxygen saturation take effect.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides information on the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on heritage assets. This includes proposed mitigation measures which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Cross discipline working has been undertaken during design and production of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) to consider impacts upon buried archaeological remains arising from habitat creation, floodplain compensation, borrow pits, screening planting and other ancillary installations. In addition, the Order Limits of the Scheme has been subject to a programme of fieldwalking, metal detecting, geophysical survey, geoarchaeological coring and archaeological monitoring to understand the significance of the assets affected by the Scheme.</p> <p>Hydrological and preservation impacts upon buried remains have also been considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDJ-2	Cultural heritage	<p>With respect to both the Late Upper Palaeolithic and Civil War landscapes around Newark there remains the potential for sites of nation importance to identified through the ES process and hence for substantial environmental effects to be identified, at present field work is not sufficiently progressed to cap-off this potential in any part of the scheme. Whilst some areas may not be immediately accessible for intrusive field work or survey work due to weather, ground conditions or access issues, every effort should be made to get on and advance investigations where possible, in particular in those areas of emerging archaeological, environmental and engineering complexity where the greatest pressures will be felt in terms of delivery timescales.</p> <p>Radius of search as discussed PEIR 7.4.2 should be regarded as indicative and manual consideration given to the potential for longer range impacts upon designed landscapes and highly graded heritage assets. The process of EIA can tend towards the atomisation of impacts such that whilst each receptor is assessed individually appropriate weight and consideration can fail to be applied to the impact upon a landscape such as in this instance that of the sieges of Newark during the civil war of the 17<sup>th</sup> century - as a whole landscape asset in its own right rather than simply the sum of known sites and fortification. Likewise the landscape of the Late Upper Palaeolithic around Farndon requires to be drawn out through deposit modelling led characterisation alongside test pitting and field walking . We will expect to see these matters well addressed through discursive text and mapping in the emerging ES. A sound understanding of the significance and development of the designed landscape at Winthorpe should inform landscaping and planning proposals and lead that design process.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings, and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies and agreed with key heritage stakeholders including Nottinghamshire County Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and the Consultee. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Later Upper Palaeolithic and Civil War landscapes around Newark-on-Trent have been assessed and one potential site of national importance has been identified, known as Farndon Fields. This is included within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment for the Scheme has been informed by a cultural heritage desk-based assessment produced for the Scheme, which can be found in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), alongside a programme of archaeological investigations designed in consultation with stakeholders, including a programme of walkover, metal detector and geophysical surveys. In addition, a ground investigation undertaken within the Order Limits of the Scheme allowed for geoarchaeological monitoring to occur and a programme of dedicated geoarchaeological coring has been undertaken.</p> <p>Further intrusive investigation was commenced in autumn 2023 and would be completed in early 2024. This work includes a programme of trial trenching and test pitting developed in consultation with cultural heritage stakeholders. The purpose of these investigations is to confirm and establish the origin and extent of those remains/deposits identified during previous surveys. The results of the trial trenching and test pitting will help to have been used to develop specific post consent mitigation measures to be detailed within Phase 3 (Archaeology Mitigation Strategy) of the Archaeological Management Plan which is secured</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>by Requirement 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. This approach has been accepted by heritage stakeholders including Nottinghamshire County Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and the Consultee.</p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has included an assessment of the value and potential effects of the Scheme upon potential unknown archaeological remains. The assessment is based upon professional judgement using the known baseline gathered for the cultural heritage desk-based assessment alongside the results of non-intrusive and intrusive archaeological investigations undertaken as part of the Scheme. The assessment has predicted potential significant effects upon unknown archaeological remains and as such the completion of the trial trenching and test pitting would not change the effects predicted within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDJ-2	Stakeholder engagement	We look forwards to continued discussions via you principal contractor and remain as Government's adviser on the historic environment also available to advise you and the Planning Inspectorate directly.	N/A	N	<p>Comment noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>

N.1.I: Last Mile Asset Management

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXR-X	Overall scheme	After extensive searching, there does not appear to be any LMAM Projects in the area specified in the coordinates supplied.	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWX9-5	Overall scheme	<p>Please be aware that any works within the Marine area require a licence from the Marine Management Organisation. It is down to the applicant themselves to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark. Response to your consultation</p> <p>The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.</p> <p>Marine Licensing Works activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence.</p> <p>Applicants should be directed to the MMO's online portal to register for an application for marine licence</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application</a></p> <p>You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in English waters.</p> <p>The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining Harbour Orders in England, together with granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species. The MMO is a signatory to the coastal concordat and operates in accordance with its principles. Should the activities subject to planning permission meet the above criteria then the applicant should be directed to the follow pages: check if you need a marine licence and asked to quote the following information on any resultant marine licence application: local planning authority name, planning officer name and contact details, planning application reference. Following submission of a marine licence application a case team will be in touch with the relevant planning officer to discuss next steps.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment</p> <p>With respect to projects that require a marine licence the EIA Directive (codified in Directive 2011/92/EU) is transposed into UK law by the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (the MWR), as amended. Before a marine licence can be granted for projects that require EIA, MMO must ensure that applications for a marine licence are compliant with the MWR.</p> <p>In cases where a project requires both a marine licence and terrestrial planning permission, both the MWR and The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukSI/2017/571/contents/made">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukSI/2017/571/contents/made</a> may be applicable.</p> <p>If this consultation request relates to a project capable of falling within either set of EIA regulations, then it is advised that the applicant submit a request directly to the MMO to ensure any requirements under the MWR are considered adequately at the following link <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application</a></p> <p>Marine Planning</p> <p>Under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 ch.4, 58, public authorities must make decisions in accordance with marine policy documents and if it takes a decision that is against these policies it must state its reasons. MMO as such are responsible for implementing the relevant Marine Plans for their area, through existing regulatory and</p>	N/A	N	The Consultee was consulted on a precautionary basis and following the statutory consultation it has been identified that the extent of work on the Scheme is outside of England's marine area and therefore no licence is required.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>decision-making processes.</p> <p>Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Proposals should conform with all relevant policies, taking account of economic, environmental and social considerations. Marine plans are a statutory consideration for public authorities with decision making functions.</p> <p>At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark.</p> <p>A map showing how England's waters have been split into 6 marine plan areas is available on our website. For further information on how to apply the marine plans please visit our Explore Marine Plans service.</p> <p>Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist. If you wish to contact your local marine planning officer you can find their details on our gov.uk page.</p> <p>Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments</p> <p>If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below;</p> <p>The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.  The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.  The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.  The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.</p> <p>The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p> <p>If you require further guidance on the Marine Licencing process, please follow the link <a href="https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences">https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences</a></p>			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXJ-P	Overall scheme	<p>The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence (MOD) as a consultee in UK planning and energy consenting systems to ensure that development does not compromise or degrade the operation of defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites or training resources such as the Military Low Flying System.</p> <p>The application is: A46 Newark Bypass – Notification of Statutory Consultation. Proposal to improve the A46 Newark bypass by widening 6.5km of the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway, to provide two lanes in each direction between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts near Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The application site occupies the statutory safeguarding zone(s) surrounding RAF Syerston. In particular, the aerodrome height &amp; technical safeguarding zones surrounding the aerodrome and is approx. 6.98 km from the centre of the airfield.</p> <p>After reviewing the application documents, I can confirm the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.</p>	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZ6-4	Assets; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Due to the proximity of some of our assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation, while the impact on our assets is still being assessed.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission has high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines and substations in close proximity to the order boundary. The overhead lines and substations form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.</p> <p>Overhead Lines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4VK 400kV Cottam – Eaton Socon – Wymondley 2</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, as outlined in the Holistic Network Design, a new 400kV AC double circuit between Chesterfield and Ratcliffe on Soar has been proposed. This is an emerging project but will be in close proximity to the scoping area. The route of this new OHL is still under review. The following points should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Electricity Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Grid's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset</li> <li>Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for "overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004).</li> <li>If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.</li> <li>The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</li> <li>Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.</li> <li>If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.</li> <li>Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained using the contact details above</li> <li>National Grid Electricity Transmission high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide National Grid full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence, we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.</li> <li>Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these points and the guidance referred to and will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops and moves towards and through construction, with the Consultee's emerging scheme proposal in the area, specific protections, legal agreements and requirements to be discussed as more information becomes available.</p> <p>Works are minimal in the vicinity of the Consultee's apparatus and are not anticipated to impact the existing infrastructure. Concerns over construction techniques and working under UHV cables would be addressed at a more appropriate design stage.</p> <p>In any event, should any diversions or protections be required this Consultee would benefit from the generic protective provisions for electricity transmission as contained in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented.			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWX8-4	Introductory text; Stakeholder engagement	<p>NSIP Reference Name / Code: TR010065/S42 Natural England's comments in respect of A46 Newark Bypass, promoted by National Highways Examining authority's submission deadline 12 December 2022</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We understand that you are consulting us in line with paragraph 67 of the Planning Act 2008 "Guidance on pre-application consultation", and that further consultation may be required in line with paragraph 85, particularly if/when the draft Environmental Statement has been prepared. We also appreciate that this consultation under S42 of the Planning Act 2008 also encompasses consultation on the preliminary environmental information, and that some overlap exists between these various requirements. Natural England welcomes both formal and informal pre application consultation and refers you to our annex C to the NID advice note 11 We have reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and supporting documents, and have provided comments on the areas relevant to our remit based on this information. Our comments are provided in Annex 1 to this letter.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWX8-4	Air quality	<p>1. Air quality</p> <p>During the construction phase the inclusion of dust mitigation as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) should reduce the risk of any impacts.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the intention to assess the impacts of construction traffic in the forthcoming ES as set out in para 6.3.3.</p> <p>Natural England also welcomes the assessment of operational traffic impacts which will use updated modelling including the latest monitoring data referenced in paragraph 6.3.9.</p> <p>Natural England agree with the sections related to ecologic receptors, study area and the use of pre covid traffic data as set out in the existing baseline section.</p> <p>Natural England agree that the critical load used for Twenty Acre Piece SSSI is correct and agree that background data from the most recent APIS update should be used for the ES.</p> <p>Natural England welcome the intention to consider enhancement measures at the ES stage (6.10.6), in particular tree shelter belts have been shown to reduce the impact of atmospheric pollutants on terrestrial habitats. Natural England would encourage National highways to consider this or any other measures where existing sites are greatly exceeding their critical loads and APIS apports a significant amount of these emissions to road transport.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the potential air quality impacts of the construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes an assessment of the potential impacts associated with construction dust, construction traffic and operational traffic on sensitive human health receptors and designated habitats within the study area.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to suppress dust would, for example, include avoiding double handling of materials, minimising height of stockpiles and locating these out of the wind, ensuring vehicles with open loads and dusty materials are securely sheeted and closed, providing means to remove mud and debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving site, maintaining a low speed on site, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and spraying water during cutting or grinding operations, switching vehicle engines and plant motors off when not in use and locating high dust generating activities away from nearby receptors where possible.</p> <p>This mitigation is included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments in relation to assessing the impacts of construction traffic and operational traffic and can confirm these assessments have been carried out and are included in the application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) includes details on how traffic movements would be managed during construction period. Further information on operational traffic is available in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges Natural England's agreement relating to ecological receptors, the study area, use of pre-covid traffic data in the existing baseline section, and use of the latest Air Pollution Information System background data and can confirm these have all been reflected in the final assessment.</p> <p>Sensitive ecological designations located within 200m of roads affected by operational traffic have been considered in this assessment, in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. As per <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>, designated sites considered in the assessment include Ramsar sites, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Nature Improvement Areas, ancient woodlands and veteran trees. There are 38 ecological receptors within 200m of the affected road network of the Scheme, consisting of one Local Nature Reserve, one ancient woodland (which is also</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Spring Wood, Kelham Local Wildlife Site), eight veteran trees and 28 Local Wildlife Sites. Following consultation with the competent expert for biodiversity, four of the 28 Local Wildlife Sites were found not to have any qualifying features sensitive to nitrogen deposition and, as such, were not considered further in the assessment. There are no sites of national importance located within 2km from the Scheme, none have hydrological links to the Scheme and none are within 200m of the affected road network.</p> <p>Whilst Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> acknowledge that an increase in the total nitrogen deposition rate would occur as a result of the Scheme, it is unlikely that the Scheme would affect the integrity of any sensitive ecological receptors within 200m of the affected road network, due to habitats continuing to function at current nitrogen level exceeding critical loads.</p> <p>A conservative assessment of the operational phase of the Scheme has been taken in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which does not consider the effects of tree cover on air quality in any modelled scenario, as this is not a requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> and quantification of the interaction between air quality and vegetation is still subject to ongoing research. For example, whether tree shelter belts affect dispersion of emissions (redirection) and reduce dispersal distance away from the source (emission retention is localised due to barrier effect). Whilst broadleaved species are better at capturing particulates, conifers are generally better at purifying air from pollutants, which is particularly important in winter when air pollution is usually at its highest and deciduous trees are leafless.</p> <p>As the assessment predicts a worst case with Scheme concentrations and impacts are concluded to be not significant, no mitigation measures are required for impacts on air quality during operation. However, the tree belts provided as part of the Scheme parallel to the A46 carriageway, as seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provide a multipurpose function. For example, once established it would provide habitat and commuting routes for wildlife, contribute to no net loss of woodland for the Scheme, act as visual screening and as root networks develop, improve soil stability and therefore water surface run-off.</p> <p>Twenty Acre Piece Sites of Special Scientific Interest does not fall within 200m of the affected road network (20.5km south) at the latest assessment of sensitive ecological designations. In accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> guidance, this site has not been assessed further within the Environmental Statement.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWX8-4	Landscape and visual effects	<p>2. Landscape</p> <p>The proposed development is not located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscapes. As a result, Natural England have no specific comments to make on the landscape implications. We welcome the assessment of impacts on Natural England's National Character Areas, Regional Character Areas as well as considering local character.</p> <p>Natural England advise that the development should complement and where possible enhance local distinctiveness. We would also like to stress the importance of cumulative landscape impacts from the development.</p> <p>Natural England would like to advise that National Highways have asked us to provide discretionary advice on the the assessment of landscape impacts and mitigation required for the scheme. This will be delivered as part of our ongoing discussions on the project.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Planting has been informed via a number of sources including national and local character assessments. These assessments included identifying key actions for landscape in the district as set out in in the Newark and Sherwood District Council Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document which is based around a sense of place, local distinctiveness, characteristic wildlife and natural features. Additionally, key aspirations are highlighted for each policy zone and lists potential species for inclusion within the regional character areas identified.</p> <p>The development of the environmental design has considered the species, pattern and distribution of planting, hedgerows, shrubs and trees along the Scheme to reflect the distinctive local character of vegetation of the adjacent landscape. Further illustrative information is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the potential for cumulative effects on landscape receptors that are in the same zone of influence as a result of both the Scheme and other developments.</p> <p>Engagement with the Consultee, including on the assessment of landscape impacts and mitigation, has continued throughout the Scheme development and assessment via Environmental Technical Working Groups which have included key environmental stakeholders including Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Historic England and the Consultee.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWX8-4	Biodiversity	<p>3. Biodiversity</p> <p>Natural England would welcome the opportunity to review the Affected Road Network used to scope the assessment of impacts from traffic emissions. This is likely to be submitted with the Environmental Statement and will provide greater understanding of what designated sites could be impacted by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Natural England agree with the assessment methodology section however the study area does indicate that impacts to the habitat that supports populations of nightjar and/or woodlark present in the Sherwood Forest area will be considered, although the PEIR does state that an updated ARM will be used to produce the ES. Nightjar and Woodlark present in Sherwood are estimated to be nationally significant according to surveys in 2004 and 2006, impacts to habitat as a result of atmospheric pollutions generated during the construction and/or the operational phase may need to be considered in line with the Birds Directive.</p> <p>Protected Species</p> <p>Natural England have no specific comments to make regarding protected species. However, we refer you to our Standing Advice for Protected Species. As referenced in section 9.8 Natural England have provided advice through our Discretionary Advice service on access issues for certain ecology surveys. Natural England expect to deliver further advice on protected species to National Highways.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain, mitigation and enhancement</p> <p>Natural England welcome the intention for the scheme to move from a net loss to a net gain for biodiversity. It is also welcome that National Highways are using the latest Defra Biodiversity Net Gain metric that will use extended phase 1 habitat data collected on site. This should ensure that all biodiversity net gains can be confidently quantified. Natural England will provide further advice on mitigation and enhancement via our participation in the working group.</p> <p>Priority Habitats</p> <p>Natural England note the adverse impacts of the scheme on priority habitats, as part of our ongoing engagement they have outlined predicted losses and have expressed a desire to seek advice on mitigation measures as part of our discretionary advice service. This advice will depend on the outcome of the remaining ecological surveys due to be undertaken.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors, and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the Scheme design from the outset. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on air quality. These outputs have also fed into Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/6.6</b>). The updated affected road networks have been presented to the Consultee as part of the Scheme's ongoing engagement with them. The assessment has shown that there would be no air quality impacts on European designated sites.</p> <p>Sherwood Forest has been scoped out of further assessment as it is not within the survey area for the assessment and is also outside the 200m buffer for the affected road network. Therefore, no impacts to nightjar and woodlark are anticipated as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>There would be a slight adverse effect as a result of the Scheme upon priority habitats (now known as Habitats of Principal Importance) specifically upon lowland meadows, lowland mixed deciduous woodland and coastal and floodplain grazing marsh during construction with the permanent and/or temporary loss of these habitats. Therefore no significant effect is predicted in relation to Habitats of Principal Importance. The loss of any habitat of conservation value would be replaced like-for-like (in condition) as a minimum requirement providing a greater area than was lost to mitigate for these losses. Replacement habitat would be located as close to the impacted receptor (or other receptors of the same type) wherever possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the development of the Scheme and a Discretionary Advice Service agreement was signed to cover the period November 2022 to December 2023. Representatives from the Consultee have attended the Scheme's quarterly technical working group, as well as a specific monthly meeting and been engaged in email correspondence to ensure they have been informed of the impacts of the Scheme on biodiversity, agree with mitigation and compensation and scope of ecology surveys undertaken. The Consultee's comments have been used to inform the design development of the Scheme, impact assessment and any mitigation and compensation for the Scheme, details of which can be found in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWX8-4	Geology and soils	<p>4. Geology and soils</p> <p>Natural England have provided detailed advice in our EIA scoping response. As part of our DAS contract we have asked to review National Highways soils survey methodology and soil handling plan for this project.</p> <p>Following this National Highways have recently provided us with this information however we have not been able to review this and therefore cannot provide a detailed response. Natural England intend to respond as part of our ongoing engagement so that any potential amendments can be included for the first draft of the ES.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Following the end of the statutory consultation the Consultee has now provided advice to confirm it was content with the methodology proposed for soil surveys and the soil handling plan. Further details can be found in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Introductory text	Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure and associated estate. It owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests, will need to be carefully considered.	N/A	N	The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Land ownership; Stakeholder engagement; Assets	Impact on Network Rail Infrastructure  Network Rail has been reviewing the information provided and note that proposals include the widening of the road over the railway in two places on the Newark-Lincoln Line (NOB1 at 16m 470yds and 17m 560yds) and over the East Coast Main Line (ECM1 at 120m 1280yds). It will be imperative that the developer liaise with Network Rail well in advance to discuss and agree the works and enter into any licenses and agreements required for the new structures over operational railway land. We note that the developer has already engaged with Network Rail in relation to these proposals and this dialogue must continue in order to ensure that the scheme and work to implement it does not impact on operational railway safety.	N/A	N	The Applicant will continue to liaise with the Consultee as necessary as the Scheme develops, including items relating to specific licensing and agreements as more information becomes available.
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Construction; Stakeholder engagement	In order to ensure that the scheme does not impact on operational railway safety, the developer must liaise closely with Network Rail Asset Protection to ensure that construction haulage routes are appropriate, and the design and construction of the widened bridges and associated infrastructure will not have an adverse impact on railway operations. It is therefore assumed that a condition of the Order would be that detailed specifications of the proposed scheme and traffic management plans are to be provided and agreed in writing before development can commence.	N/A	N	The Applicant will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops if necessary, including items relating to specific agreements to be agreed as more information becomes available. The Applicant is working to create a Statement of Common Ground with the Consultee in regards to these comments which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Land ownership; Assets	Network Rail will be seeking protection from the exercise of compulsory purchase powers over operational land either for permanent or temporary purposes. In addition, Network Rail will wish to agree protection for the railway during the course of the construction works and otherwise to protect our undertaking and land interests. Network Rail reserves the right to produce additional and further grounds of concern when further details of the application and its effect on Network Rail's land are available. In addition, any rights for power or other lines under, over or alongside the railway line will require appropriate asset protection measures deemed necessary by Network Rail to protect the operational railway and stations. We have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum therefore contact should be made to [redacted], email: [redacted] to obtain a copy of the relevant wording In addition a number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, asset protection agreements, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements and all other relevant legal and commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between the parties.	N/A	N	The Consultee has been engaged by the Applicant. Continued engagement in relation to specific protections, legal agreements and requirements will occur if necessary throughout the Scheme's development. The Applicant is currently in discussions with the Consultee in relation to draft protective provisions as set out in Schedule 10 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Land ownership	Consideration should be given to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land. In addition, security of the railway boundary will require to be maintained at all times. In any event you must contact Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineers as soon as possible in relation to this scheme on the following e-mail address [redacted].	N/A	N	The Applicant has been liaising with the Consultee since September 2022. The structures as part of the Scheme have been designed to be on land outside of the Consultee's boundary. Where required, the Consultee's boundary would be maintained with palisade fencing or the existing type of fencing that is currently on the land. The Applicant will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops with specific protections, agreements, and requirements to be agreed as more information becomes available.
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Land ownership; Assets	Network Rail is prepared to discuss the inclusion of Network Rail land or rights over land subject to there being no impact on the operational railway, all regulatory and other required consents being in place and appropriate commercial and other terms having been agreed between the parties and approved by Network Rail's board.	N/A	N	The Applicant does not intend to acquire any of the Consultee's land for the Scheme, however there is a requirement for land access agreements to be in place relating to the inspection and maintenance of bridge structures. The Applicant will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops, including items relating to specific consents and agreements to be agreed as more information becomes available.
BHLF-559H-RWDV-E	Stakeholder engagement	Network Rail also reserves the right to make additional comments once we have evaluated the proposals in more detail.  Summary  Network Rail would be grateful if the comments and points detailed within this consultation	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant, the Applicant has had regard to the comments from the Consultee, as shown above. The Applicant will continue to liaise with the Consultee as the Scheme develops.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		response are considered by National Highways. Network Rail would welcome further discussion and negotiation with National Highways in relation to the proposed development as required going forward.			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6H-J	Overall scheme; Air quality; Traffic forecasts; Construction	Newark Town Council's Planning Committee has resolved that it opposes the A46 bypass. The Committee considered and supported the view of a Councillor who felt that the bypass was simply an exercise to get lorries between Hull and the M5 more quickly and that instead, we should be encouraging goods and freight to be transported by rail. The Councillor expressed concerns around the amount of dust that will be created during the construction phase and the wide impact of that dust for many residents of Newark. The Councillor identified that the scheme is unlikely to lessen the number of cars physically in Newark itself. The Councillor expressed concern that local businesses will be prejudiced by fewer people coming to Newark as a consequence of the disruption the construction will cause. After a split vote with 3 for and 3 against, opposing the bypass, the Chairman used their casting vote to oppose the A46 bypass.	2H	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee, including concerns regarding encouraging goods and freight to be transported by rail rather than road. Whilst the Scheme would carry HGV traffic, (predicted to be around 13% in the opening year, 2028), the majority of road traffic is made up from other vehicle types. Even if HGV traffic is not taken into account, there would still be considerable delays on this stretch of the Scheme due to increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>The Government is also investing in several rail schemes across the country. These projects will improve rail links and provide more capacity for rail freight.</p> <p>Further to the statutory consultation response from the Consultee objecting to the Scheme, the Applicant attended a Planning Committee meeting of the Consultee on 2 February 2023 to present the Scheme design and clarify Scheme objectives and benefits.</p> <p>The presentation was well received, and the Applicant maintained open lines of communication with the Consultee. In March 2023, the Consultee Planning Committee approved a motion proposed by members to support the Scheme. Following a vote, the Consultee Planning Committee revised and updated its position as follows:</p> <p><i>"[the Consultee] supports the proposals for the A46 bypass recognising the many advantages for our town with regard to safety; congestion alleviation; connectivity and economic development, and the necessary mitigation and environmental enhancement measures required both during and after construction. In so doing, the [Consultee] calls upon all agencies to expedite the development of the Southern Link Road in order that there can be effective traffic management solutions during the construction phase of the A46 such that the traffic impact for residents and businesses, especially retail, is minimised."</i></p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWGW-J	Traffic forecasts	<p>We and indeed South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council have concerns that the proposals state that it is predicted that there will be some 20% additional traffic using the A616, Newark to South Muskham and some 7% from Nth Muskham to South Muskham on the same road. We are not sure when the predictions were made given that we suggest there has been an appreciable increase already in the last 12 months and that further increases will lead to similar congestion from the North as currently experienced on the approaches to the Cattle Market roundabout notwithstanding that there will be one less route coming into the roundabout.</p> <p>If similar congestion is predicted can we ask that measures of mitigation are considered. These may include weight restrictions or period traffic lights at peak times? I am told that widening of the approach road to the Market is problematic due to the listed Smeeton's Arches and that monies may not be further available for such. We do however endorse and support the general scheme which is greatly needed for Newark and our surrounding area.</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling shows that the A616 between the A46 and South Muskham was forecast to carry around 12,600 vehicles per day in 2019, increasing to around 13,300 vehicles per day in 2028 without the Scheme (+6%). The Scheme is forecast to increase traffic on the A616 from 13,300 vehicles per day to 15,400 vehicles per day, an increase of around 2,100 vehicles (+16%).</p> <p>Microsimulation modelling of the Cattle Market Junction indicates that without the Scheme, the junction is forecast to operate over capacity by 2043. The analysis indicates that the junction is forecast to carry an additional 40-60% of traffic as a result of the Scheme in 2028 and 2043. The new grade-separated layout and partial signalisation of the junction is forecast to lead to a substantial improvement in performance. The junction is forecast to operate well within capacity in both the AM and PM peak hour. Further information relating to traffic modelling is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As the A616 is a local highway authority road, any measures regarding weight restrictions would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highways authority for the area.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGW-J	Air quality; Biodiversity	<p>The improvements to air quality we believe will be significant, especially around the Cattle Market roundabout. Sufficient and suitable animal travel ways under the new road network are essential given the existence of Otters, Badgers and deer in that area</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on air quality at human health and ecology receptors. The assessment concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality at any of the human health and ecology receptors. Changes at the human health receptors close to Cattle Market Roundabout are also considered imperceptible.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Existing safe passage under Windmill Viaduct, Nether Lock Viaduct and access tracks under the A46 carriageway (between Windmill Viaduct and the railway line to the north, and access to Severn Trent Water Ltd. Sewage Treatment Works) would be maintained during operation and construction. Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do pre-construction.</p> <p>There is no safe access currently between habitat around Cattle Market Roundabout, other than under the arches of Great North Road. The culverts around Cattle Market Roundabout do not offer passage for otter and dense habitat between the River Trent and British Sugar is the only habitat around Cattle Market Roundabout with connectivity for otter to utilise. Otters would still have this available to them during construction and operation. Badgers and deer can cross Kelham Road and would be able to continue to do so during construction and operation. The disturbance from the A46 carriageway and directional planting, once established, during operation are considered to deter and direct deer and badger from crossing the A46 carriageway. Furthermore, though the highways boundary fence would not be an impermeable barrier to wildlife movement, it would act as a deterrent to deer crossing the A46 if on the far side / away from the carriageway.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGW-J	Biodiversity; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Suitable greening to embankments and grading to water catchment areas to encourage wildlife and insects.</p> <p>Engagement with schools and the community and early discussions with Newark and Sherwood District Council and Newark Town Council to manage mitigation to impacts to the sustainability of the town centre and its retail and services community.</p>	2D	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Planting would be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>visual screening. Mitigation for biodiversity has been integrated into the Environmental Masterplan, and planting would also be provided to enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. Further details on the mitigation strategy for biodiversity can be found in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant contacted local schools and community groups as part of the statutory consultation, providing them with the opportunity to provide feedback on the Scheme, including its potential impacts. The Applicant will continue to engage with these stakeholders as the Scheme progresses as necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant has regular meetings with Newark and Sherwood District Council, as a host local authority, where the impact of the Scheme on Newark-on-Trent, including the town centre, retail and community services are discussed.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGW-J	Stakeholder engagement	Given that there will be short term impact with the construction phase, it will be important to champion and promote the huge potential long term generational benefits to the Newark area and an effective engagement strategy with the community will be highly beneficial going forwards. This should include Parish Councils to the North and west, served with the A616 and A617	2H	N	The Applicant will continue to engage with community representatives and local parish councils as the Scheme progresses. The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information on the engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW XF-J	Overall scheme	Northern Gas Networks do not cover this area. Please use this online tool to find out which gas distribution network you need to contact: <a href="https://www.energynetworks.org/operating-the-networks/whos-my-network-operator">https://www.energynetworks.org/operating-the-networks/whos-my-network-operator</a>	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWX7-3	Introductory text; Construction; Traffic forecasts; Assets	<p>Proposed DCO Application by National Highways for A46 Newark Bypass Royal Mail Group Limited's response to Section 42 Consultation</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Reference the email dated 21 October 2022 from National Highways' A46 Newark Bypass Project Team to Royal Mail as a prescribed consultee inviting a Section 42 consultation response by 12 December 2022.</p> <p>In order to assess this road scheme's potential impacts on Royal Mail's property assets and business interests, Royal Mail's consultants BNP Paribas Real Estate have reviewed the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoping Report dated August 2022</li> <li>• Statutory Consultation Brochure</li> <li>• PEIR dated October 2022</li> </ul> <p>Royal Mail notes that an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared and submitted as part of the DCO application. The Scoping Report states "the construction phase will introduce additional construction vehicle movements to the road network and traffic management which have the potential to affect traffic flows and speeds". Temporary traffic management arrangements are expected to take place on the A46, A1 and local road networks during the construction phase of this scheme. The Scoping Report considers changes in traffic during the construction phase are unlikely to lead to a significant effect, however the extent of the impact on the highway network cannot be assessed as "traffic forecasts are currently unavailable as they are being updated".</p> <p>The Consultation Brochure indicates that National Highways is developing its traffic modelling which will result in an updated set of traffic forecasts that will be used to update the scheme design. It does not contain any information on anticipated construction phase traffic impacts.</p> <p>The PEIR does not contain a chapter on Traffic and Transportation, construction traffic impacts or information on construction traffic management / mitigation (reference paragraph 6.3.3).</p> <p>Royal Mail – relevant information</p> <p>Under section 35 of the Postal Services Act 2011, Royal Mail has been designated by Ofcom as a provider of the Universal Postal Service. Royal Mail is the only such provider in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>The Act provides that Ofcom's primary regulatory duty is to secure the provision of the Universal Postal Service. Ofcom discharges this duty by imposing regulatory conditions on Royal Mail, requiring it to provide the Universal Postal Service.</p> <p>Royal Mail is under some of the highest specification performance obligations for quality of service in Europe. Its performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and this should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project.</p> <p>The Government imposes financial penalties on Royal Mail if its Universal Service Obligation service delivery targets are not met. These penalties relate to time targets for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collections,</li> <li>• clearance through plant, and</li> <li>• delivery.</li> </ul> <p>Royal Mail's postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications. Royal Mail's ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comments relating to the Consultee's operation, regulatory duties and local operational properties are noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>Updated traffic forecasts, construction traffic impacts and mitigations are included as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Construction phase traffic impacts are addressed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> which is included as part of the development consent application. With regards to the Consultee's concerns around access, the Applicant has stated in Table 2-1-1 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> that roadwork embargo dates will be complied with, a minimum of seven working days advance notice provided and suitable alternative diversion routes for double deck trailers would be facilitated.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee as the Scheme develops and the Consultee has noted in their response to the targeted consultation that they will continue to monitor the Scheme and will review it again at development consent application submission when more transportation impact information will be available.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network.</p> <p>Royal Mail is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on Royal Mail's operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to Royal Mail's business.</p> <p>Royal Mail has 4 operational properties within 11 miles of the proposed works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BE 1328, Newark DO, NG24 4XE – c. 0.6 miles south of the Cattle Market junction;</li> <li>• BE 4355, Newark PAR, NG24 4AE – c. 0.7 miles south of the Cattle Market junction;</li> <li>• BE 3410/4112, Bingham DO/PAR, NG13 8AS – c. 9 miles south-west of the Fandon roundabout; and</li> <li>• BE 3452, Tuxford PAR, NG22 0LF – c. 10.5 miles north of the Cattle Market junction</li> </ul> <p>Every day, in exercising its statutory duties Royal Mail vehicles use all of the main roads that may potentially be affected by the proposed A46 Newark Bypass.</p> <p>Any periods of road disruption / closure, night or day, on or to the roads immediately connected to the A46 Newark Bypass or the surrounding highway network will have the potential to impact operations and may consequently disrupt Royal Mail's ability to meet its Universal Obligation service delivery targets.</p> <p>Royal Mail's performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project. Accordingly, Royal Mail seeks to take all reasonable steps to protect its assets and operational interests from any potentially adverse impacts of proposed development.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWX7-3	Construction; Overall scheme; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Royal Mail position on A46 Newark Bypass as at December 2022</p> <p>Royal Mail wishes to ensure the protection of its future ability to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivering service to the public from and to the above identified operational facilities in accordance with its statutory obligations.</p> <p>Once built, this road improvement will undoubtedly improve traffic movement and congestion to the benefit of all road users, including Royal Mail. Therefore Royal Mail does not wish to stop or delay the A46 Newark Bypass works from occurring.</p> <p>However, Royal Mail is of the view that the construction phase of this road improvement has potential to impact on its operational interests.</p> <p>Due to insufficient information presently being available by which to assess the level of potential risk to its operations presented by the construction phase and any proposed mitigations for such risk, at this point in time Royal Mail is not able to provide a detailed consultation response. Therefore, Royal Mail wishes to reserve its position to submit a consultation response/s later in the DCO consenting process when sufficient information is available. Royal Mail also wishes to reserve its position to submit representations to the future Public Examination, if required.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee, regarding traffic management during the construction phase of the Scheme. The Applicant has produced an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) which details how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) will be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and will aim to minimise disruption to the traveling public during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new A1/A46 Crossing. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's intention to reserve its position until later in the Development Consent Order process.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWUY-2	Overall scheme	This is to confirm that the Secretary of State acknowledges and notes your letter dated 26th May 2023 in relation to a statutory public consultation and targeted consultation for the A46 Newark Bypass scheme. The Secretary of State has no comments on the consultation.	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW8B-E	Assets	In reference to pdf 'A46 Newark Bypass – Plan and Profile Drawings', I wish to inform you of the assets as follows; Pg 2 no assets affected Pg 3 watermain in various locations Pg 4 sewer present but not affected Pg 5 watermain in various locations Pg 6 no assets affected	21	N	The Applicant has noted comments from the Consultee and ongoing engagement will take place as the Scheme design stages progress, with specific protections, legal agreements, and requirements to be agreed as more information becomes available.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXY-5	Traffic forecasts	<p>2b. We, and indeed North Muskham Parish Council, have concerns that the proposals state that it is predicted that there will be some 20% additional traffic using the A616, Newark to South Muskham and some 7% from Nth Muskham to South Muskham on the same road. We are not sure when the predictions were made given that we suggest there has been an appreciable increase already in the last 12 months and that further increases will lead to similar congestion from the North as currently experienced on the approaches to the Cattle Market roundabout notwithstanding that there will be one less route coming into the roundabout.</p> <p>If similar congestion is predicted can we ask that measures of mitigation are considered and implemented. These may include weight restrictions or period traffic lights at peak times? We are told that widening of the approach road to the Market is problematic due to the listed Smeatons Arches and that monies may not be further available for such. We do, however, endorse and support the general scheme which is greatly needed for Newark and our surrounding area.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Traffic modelling shows that the A616 between the A46 and South Muskham was forecast to carry around 12,600 vehicles per day in 2019, increasing to around 13,300 vehicles per day in 2028 without the scheme (+6%). The Scheme is forecast to increase traffic on the A616 from 13,300 vehicles per day to 15,400 vehicles per day, an increase of around 2,100 vehicles (+16%).</p> <p>Microsimulation modelling of the Cattle Market Junction indicates that without the Scheme, the junction is forecast to operate over capacity by 2043. The analysis indicates that the junction is forecast to carry an additional 40-60% of traffic as a result of the Scheme in 2028 and 2043. The new grade-separated layout and partial signalisation of the junction is forecast to lead to a substantial improvement in performance. The junction is forecast to operate well within capacity in both the AM and PM peak hour. Further information relating to traffic modelling is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As the A616 is a local highway authority road, any measures regarding weight restrictions would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highways authority for the area.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXY-5	Air quality; Biodiversity	<p>2c. The improvements to air quality we believe will be significant, especially around the Cattle Market roundabout. Sufficient and suitable animal travel ways under the new road network are essential given the existence of Otters, Badgers and deer in that area</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on air quality at human health and ecology receptors. The assessment concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality at any of the human health and ecology receptors. Additionally, changes at the human health receptors close to Cattle Market Roundabout are considered imperceptible. In addition, the Scheme results in improvements in air quality within Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Existing safe passage under Windmill Viaduct, Nether Lock Viaduct and access tracks under the A46 carriageway (between Windmill Viaduct and the railway line to the north, and access to Severn Trent Water Ltd. Sewage Treatment Works) would be maintained during operation and construction. Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do pre-construction.</p> <p>There is no safe access currently between habitat around Cattle Market Roundabout, other than under the arches of Great North Road. The culverts around Cattle Market Roundabout do not offer passage for otter and dense habitat between the River Trent and British Sugar is the only habitat around Cattle Market Roundabout with connectivity for otter to utilise. Otters would still have this available to them during construction and operation. Badgers and deer can cross Kelham Road and would be able to continue to do so during construction and operation. The disturbance from the A46 carriageway and directional planting, once established, during operation are considered to deter and direct deer and badger from crossing the A46 carriageway. Furthermore, though the highways boundary fence would not be an impermeable barrier to wildlife movement, it would act as a deterrent to deer crossing the A46 if on the far side/away from the carriageway.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXY-5	Biodiversity; Stakeholder engagement	<p>2d. Suitable greening to embankments and grading to water catchment areas to encourage wildlife and insects.</p> <p>Engagement with schools and the community and early discussions with Newark and Sherwood District Council and Newark Town Council to manage mitigation to impacts to the sustainability of the town centre and its retail and services community.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Planting would be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. Mitigation for biodiversity has been integrated into the Environmental Masterplan, and planting would also provided to enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. Further details on the mitigation strategy for biodiversity can be found in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant contacted local schools and community groups as part of the statutory consultation, providing them with the opportunity to provide feedback on the Scheme, including its potential impacts. The Applicant will continue to engage with these stakeholders as the Scheme progresses as necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant has regular meetings with Newark and Sherwood District Council, as a host local authority, where the impact of the Scheme on Newark-on-Trent, including the town centre, retail and community services are discussed.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXY-5	Stakeholder engagement	2h. Given that there will be short term impact with the construction phase, it will be important to champion and promote the huge potential long term generational benefits to the Newark area and an effective engagement strategy with the community will be highly beneficial going forwards. This should include Parish Councils to the North and west, served with the A616 and A617.	N/A	N	The Applicant will continue to engage with community representatives and local parish councils as the scheme progresses. The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information on the engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWX4-Z	Overall scheme	Further to your email below regarding the A46 Newark Bypass, I can confirm that as the project site lies outside the coalfield area, the Coal Authority's Planning team have no comments to make on this project.	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZQ-Y	Introductory text; Overall scheme	<p>Transport for the East Midlands (TfEM) brings together the 10 local transport authorities in the East Midlands under the auspices of East Midlands Councils.</p> <p>TfEM provides collective leadership on strategic transport issues for the East Midlands and works to develop and agree investment priorities that will support economic growth, working closely with Midlands Connect and other sub-national transport bodies. The Chair of TfEM is Sir Peter Soulsby, City Mayor of Leicester and the Vice Chair is Cllr Richard Davies of Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>This is an officer response based on priorities previously agreed by the TfEM Board which does not focus on matters of detail, but which has been informed by discussions with officers from Nottinghamshire County Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council and Midlands Connect.</p> <p>The A46 Newark Northern Bypass is TfEM's top SRN priority for the East Midlands. As such TfEM welcomes this statutory consultation and is keen to ensure that the scheme can be progressed quickly and delivered in full as soon as possible.</p> <p>The A46 around Newark from farndon to the interchange with the A1 and A17 has been a 'bottleneck' for some time which has caused congestion, pollution and safety issues, and which as a result has undermined trade, economic growth and development.</p> <p>At strategic level, the A46 forms a nationally significant 250 km 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' linking the Humber and East Midlands Freeports with Bristol. Enhancing the route will promote much needed trade and investment across a large swathe of central England.</p>	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWZQ-Y	Overall scheme; Stakeholder engagement	<p>More locally, the scheme will enable ambitious plans for growth and development in an around Newark to be fully realised, including the proposed MHCLG funded 'Town Deal'. In this context, it remains important for National Highways to continue working closely with the County and District Councils on the early delivery of the Newark Southern Relief Road, which when complete also has the potential to relieve congestion during the construction of the A46 scheme.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the county and district councils regarding the Southern Link Road as the Scheme develops and further information becomes available.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by Spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road is considered within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), as it falls within 2km of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZQ-Y	Road layout; Stakeholder engagement	<p>TfEM also supports improved links by rail between Lincoln, Newark and Nottingham. As such, it will be important to ensure that the detailed design of the enhancement does not preclude removal of the 'flat crossing' between the East Coast Main Line and the Lincoln to Nottingham line, which will require a grade separated rail junction to be constructed. Further and ongoing dialogue between Highways England and Network Rail to maintain this opportunity will therefore be required as the scheme develops.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme design does not preclude a future grade separation of the Nottingham to Lincoln Line over the East Coast Main Line and ongoing engagement has taken place between the Department for Transport and the Applicant regarding this. Several meetings were held between the Applicant and the Department for Transport's design consultant to verify that the preliminary design for the Scheme does not create an adverse impact on the feasibility design for grade separation of the rail junction, for example the Scheme wetlands area identified at the Nether Lock Viaduct has been relocated to the south side of the bridge so as not to create a priority habitat area in the location of the bridge foundations for the grade separated rail junction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZQ-Y	Southern Link Road	<p>In the short term, it will also be important for the passenger rail service between Lincoln, Newark and Nottingham to return to a full hourly service by May 2023, when construction is due to start of the first phases of the Newark Southern Link Road, to provide a reliable alternative for road users.</p>	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWZQ-Y	Construction	<p>Finally, TfEM is mindful delivery that delivery of the National Highways scheme is programmed to coincide with that of the North Hykeham Relief led by Lincolnshire County Council. Significant civil engineering projects at both ends of the A46 between Newark and Lincoln will need careful co-ordination and management to avoid short-term economic disruption, and to maximise any positive construction synergies.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has consulted with Lincolnshire County Council as part of the statutory consultation. The North Hykeham Relief Road is considered within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The zones of influence of this development do not overlap with any for the Scheme and therefore no cumulative effects are anticipated for this Scheme in combination with the North Hykeham Relief Scheme. A zone of influence is the area where</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>activities associated with a scheme could result in adverse or beneficial effects at relevant receptors. The Applicant will continue to engage with Lincolnshire County Council to avoid economic impacts, either in the short or long-term, and to maximise any construction synergies.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXD-G	Overall scheme; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The site is within the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board district. There are numerous Board maintained watercourses in close proximity to the proposed works. The Board's consent is required to erect any building or structure (including walls and fences), whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within 9 metres of the top edge of any Board maintained watercourse or the edge of any Board maintained culvert.</p> <p>The Board's consent is required for any works, whether temporary or permanent, in, over or under, any Board maintained watercourse or culvert.</p> <p>The erection or alteration of any mill dam, weir or other like obstruction to the flow, or erection or alteration of any culvert, whether temporary or permanent, within the channel of a riparian watercourse will require the Board's prior written consent. The Board's Planning and Byelaw Policy, Advice Notes and Application form is available on the website – <a href="http://www.wmc-idbs.org.uk/TVIDB">www.wmc-idbs.org.uk/TVIDB</a></p> <p>The Board's consent is required for any works that increase the flow or volume of water to any watercourse or culvert within the Board's district (other than directly to a main river for which the consent of the Environment Agency will be required). The Board's consent is required irrespective of any permission gained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Board's consent will only be granted where proposals are not detrimental to the flow or stability of the watercourse/culvert or the Board's machinery access to the watercourse/culvert which is required for annual maintenance, periodic improvement and emergency works.</p> <p>Surface water run-off rates to the Board maintained Winthorpe Airfield Drain must not be increased as a result of the development. The culvert carrying this drain under the A46 at NGR 481553 – 356044 is known to be at or around capacity added to which existing and further committed development on the airfield site will further exasperate this situation. Enhancements to this culvert should be considered as a part of the scheme. Any surface water from the Northern section of the scheme, which discharges into the Winthorpe Airfield Drain should take into consideration the potential impact down stream within the village of Winthorpe.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>Details of the floodplain compensation areas are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> whilst details of the drainage attenuation basins for the road are set out in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The Scheme would not result in any major adverse effects to road drainage and the water environment receptors during both construction and operation, including Winthorpe Airfield drain, with mitigation in place.</p> <p>The Consents and Agreements Position Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/3.3)</b> for the Scheme sets out the Applicant's intended strategy for obtaining consents and agreements. Land drainage consent would be sought from the Consultee for any temporary or permanent changes to ordinary watercourses.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Introductory text	<p>The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) welcomes the opportunity to comment on your proposals and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) at this stage of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID.</p> <p>Please note that we have replied to earlier consultations as listed below and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence: Request for Scoping Opinion 10/10/2022</p> <p>As stated above, UKHSA responded to the scoping consultation for this project on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2022. It is not clear if the Promoter had the opportunity to review our scoping comments before the release of the PEIR documentation. The comments below therefore complement, rather than supersede our scoping response.</p> <p>The health of an individual or a population is the result of a complex interaction of a wide range of different determinants of health, from an individual's genetic make-up to lifestyles and behaviours, and the communities, local economy, built and natural environments to global ecosystem trends. All developments will have some effect on the determinants of health, which in turn will influence the health and wellbeing of the general population, vulnerable groups and individual people. Although assessing impacts on health beyond direct effects from, for example emissions to air or road traffic incidents is complex, there is a need to ensure a proportionate assessment focused on an application's significant effects. We have assessed the submitted documentation and wish to make the following comments</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Scoping Opinion was received from the Secretary of State on 21 October 2022 which included the Consultee's response. The Applicant has had regard to the comments made by the Consultee relating to inclusion of the assessment of potential health impacts, vulnerable groups and recommendations for consideration of pollutant exposure and has responded to the matters raised below as part of the assessment undertaken in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Air quality; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Environmental Public Health</p> <p>This section details UKHSA's comments in relation to the environmental public health aspects of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>In general terms, the additional information supplied at this stage of the application offers a limited context of the scheme and precludes full conclusions being drawn about the potential public health impacts.</p> <p>We would like to make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing public exposures to non-threshold pollutants (such as particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide) below air quality standards has potential public health benefits. We support approaches which minimise or mitigate public exposure to non-threshold air pollutants, address inequalities (in exposure), and maximise co-benefits (such as physical exercise) and encourage their consideration during development design, environmental and health impact assessment, and development consent.</li> <li>We note that data from the baseline monitoring that commenced in May 2022 and was completed in November 2022 has not been made available in the PEIR. We will await baseline data before providing further comments.</li> <li>The scoping consultation states that it is unlikely that construction traffic will trigger the assessment criterion as set out in DMRB 105 and the traffic forecast data will be scoped into the Environmental Statement (ES) for consideration. At the current stage of the application, the construction traffic forecast data remains unavailable.</li> <li>The Promoter has indicated that the scheme, once operational will not give rise to significant air quality effects at human health receptors within the study area. In this regard, the modelled NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations for the 2028 DS (and DM) scenario are projected to not exceed the relevant AQOs, however we note that the air quality assessment incorporates data from a previous assessment of the scheme. A further assessment that incorporates updated traffic data is being developed. UKHSA awaits the data from the revised assessment.</li> <li>We note that the ground investigation is ongoing with further information required on the borrow pit and Flood Plain Compensation Area. We await additional information about</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This has incorporated the most up to date data and traffic modelling outputs which are presented as part of the development consent application, including the human health baseline, undertaken in 2022 and updated in 2023 with the most recent data available, to ensure the most reliable baseline.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes, but is not limited to, dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>Furthermore, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives during operation of the Scheme (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) concludes that the Scheme is expected to improve journey time reliability where it provides more capacity, which reduces congestion. In addition, it is forecast that accidents would reduce with the Scheme in place, further details of which can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>ground conditions that are reflective of the whole scheme and expect these details to be made available during the preparation of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Promoter states that an assessment will be done that considers the scheme's vulnerability to major accidents and disasters with findings presented within the ES.</li> </ul> <p>Preliminary information or assessment of this aspect have not been provided at this stage of the application.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>We recommend that the identified information gaps identified above be considered, and the data presented within the ES.</p>			<p>Ground investigation data has also been provided and is considered as part of Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The Environmental Statement includes the results from floodplain compensation area and borrow pit ground investigations. Full details of the ground investigation environmental analysis can be found in Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>An assessment of the Scheme's vulnerability to major accidents and disasters is presented in Appendix 4.2 (Assessment of Major Accidents and Natural Disasters) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). The assessment has concluded that the identified risks would not result in major accidents, during either construction or operation of the Scheme, with risk mitigation measures in place. Additionally, the risks associated with natural disasters would be sufficiently managed. Consequently, there would be no additional environmental effects caused by major accidents or natural disasters with mitigation in place, and the Scheme would not increase the chances of these events occurring.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Human Health and Wellbeing – OHID</p> <p>This section of OHIDs response, identifies the wider determinants of health and wellbeing we expect the ES to address, to demonstrate whether they are likely to give rise to significant effects. OHID has focused its approach on scoping determinants of health and wellbeing under four themes, which have been derived from an analysis of the wider determinants of health mentioned in the National Policy Statements. The four themes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>Traffic and Transport</li> <li>Socioeconomic</li> <li>Land Use</li> </ul> <p>Having considered the consultation documents, OHID wish to make the following comments and recommendations.</p> <p>General</p> <p>The PEIR notes a significant level of further consultation will be undertaken with the local community and stakeholders. As such the PEIR provides assumed impacts and lacks the detail available from the traffic assessment, walking cycling and horse-riding survey and input from the community, owners or users of community assets to inform the assessment of sensitivity or significance. This situation also prevents the full consideration of potential benefits and opportunities presented by the scheme, particularly to reduce severance and improve Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) infrastructure.</p> <p>The report proposes to provide further detail within the final ES. This prevents early dialogue and changes to the scheme design, mitigation or delivery of additional benefits.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Further targeted consultation should be undertaken when the assessment for significant effects on population and human health is more advanced.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage. This enabled consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>The full environmental assessment and presentation of the likely significance of environmental effects of the Scheme is presented within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) submitted as part of the development consent application. These assessments include the updated traffic assessment and walking, cycling and horse-riding surveys.</p> <p>To ensure that local knowledge supported design updates and to gain comments on the Scheme, the project team engaged with a number of walking, cycling and horse-riding groups and representatives. These included the Local Access Forum, Newark Sports Association, Castle Cycling Club, British Horse Society, East and West Midlands, and the Ramblers.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health	<p>Methodology – Determination of significant effects</p> <p>It is noted that Chapter 13 is drafted with reference to LA112 and as such no assessment of significance is provided for human health. The assessment methodologic approach does propose to identify sensitivity and magnitude, yet does not include a methodology to convert these indicators into an assessment of significance.</p> <p>This approach does not conform to the requirements of the EIA Regulations and as such an assessment of significance will be required to form part of the ES. This was also raised within the Secretary of State Scoping Opinion (ID 37.7).</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comment noted by the Applicant with regard to Chapter 13 (Population and Human Health) of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. The likely significance of population and human health effects of the Scheme is presented within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) in accordance with all relevant legislation, policy, standards, and guidance. Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidance '<i>Health in Environmental Impact Assessment: A primer for a proportionate approach</i>' and '<i>Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment</i>' have been taken into account during the assessment. The assessment does consider significant effects in relation to human health with consideration of mitigation.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Regulation 18 4(b) requires an Environmental Statement to 'include the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment, taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment'.</p> <p>In addition, Schedule 4 (5) requires a description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from, inter alia:</p> <p>(d)the risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment (for example due to accidents or disasters)</p> <p>Para 13.3.7 appears to wrongly reference sensitivity and magnitude tables. It notes the use of Tables 13.4 and Table 13.5, with the likely significance category and overall significance of effects assessed by using the matrix provided in Table 5.2. This should be using Tables 13.1 and 13.2 and using table 5.3 for the significance matrix.</p> <p>Chapter 13 uses Table 13.7 to differentiate level of impact magnitude for human health and references this as from LA112, yet the content of this table cannot be found within LA112 (rev1).</p> <p>The report notes enhancement measures will not be taken into account when determining whether effects are significant or not (Para 13.10.7). The Environmental Statement should report on all positive or negative significant effects.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The ES must provide an assessment of significance for those health determinants scoped into the population and human health chapter.</p> <p>As there is not a defined approach to the assessment of significance for population and human health, it is strongly advised that any proposed approach is agreed with OHID/UKHSA and the local Directors of Public Health. The guidance issued by the Institute of Environmental Management &amp; Assessment (IEMA)<sup>1</sup> should be used as a basis for the assessment of significance. (Footnote 1: 1 Pyper, R., Waples, H., Beard, C., Barratt, T., Hardy, K., Turton, P., Netherton, A., McDonald, J., Buroni, A., Bhatt, A., Phelan, E., Scott, I., Fisher, T., Christian, G., Ekermawi, R., Devine, K., McClenaghan, R., Fenech, B., Dunne, A., Hodgson, G., Purdy, J., Cave, B. (2022) IEMA Guide: Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment.)</p> <p>The referencing of tables should be checked for accuracy</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health	<p>Health Baseline Data and vulnerable populations</p> <p>The report indicates health baseline data will comply with LA112. Local data sets and publications may assist in providing this data to understand baseline and inform sensitivity, for example the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), Health and Wellbeing Strategy and any Integrated Care System (ICS) strategies.</p> <p>The impacts on health and wellbeing and health inequalities of the scheme may have particular effect on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations, including those that fall within the list of protected characteristics. The Environmental Statement and any Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) should not be completely separate.</p> <p>The large gypsy and traveller community off Tolney Lane, should be considered within the EqIA and as a vulnerable population within the population and human health chapter.</p> <p>LA112 does not include mental health and wellbeing baseline data, but physical and mental health should receive parity of esteem within the assessment. Mental health and wellbeing data should be provided and indicate if any further assessment of suicide risk is required.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the likely significance of population and human health effects of the Scheme. The assessment considers all relevant population and human health datasets and is in accordance with all relevant legislation, policy, standards, and guidance. The Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on protected characteristic groups, including gypsy and traveller groups. Impacts reported within the Equality Impact Assessment have been cross-referenced with relevant topics in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Human Health assessment draws on guidance outlined in the Institute of Environmental Management &amp; Assessment: <i>Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment</i>, and as such does include mental health and wellbeing data and places mental health on parity with physical health. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> also includes deprivation and other socio-economic factors.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>In addition to LA112 health data this should include deprivation, demographics and other socio-economic factors from local data sources or the review of local publications such as the JSNA. Local mental health and wellbeing data should be reported within the health baseline.</p> <p>The assessments and findings of the ES and any Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) should be cross referenced between the two documents. In particular, to ensure the comprehensive assessment of potential impacts for health and inequalities for vulnerable populations and where resulting mitigation measures are mutually supportive.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Physical activity and active travel</p> <p>The report identifies how walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) will be impacted through the loss or change in formal Public Rights of Way (ProW), open space and the existing road network.</p> <p>Active travel forms an important part in helping to promote healthy weight environments and as such it is important that any changes have a positive long-term impact where possible. Changes to WCH routes have the potential to impact on usage and create displacement.</p> <p>We welcome the schemes opportunity to enhance the existing infrastructure that supports active travel and physical activity. We expect good consultation with local agencies and the community to further identify improved provision for active travel, physical activity and access to green space. Given the likely potential impacts on WCH and the opportunity for enhancements a WCH survey should be completed.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The overall risk to WCH and impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, the number and type of users and the effect that the temporary traffic management system will have on their journey and safety. As such a WCH survey should be completed.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Development Consent Order regime established by the Planning Act 2008 places significant importance on pre-application consultation. The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through engagement, options consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation are described within the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Details regarding walking, cycling and horse-riding provision can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on walkers, cyclists and horse-riders in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 112 - Population and human health</i>. This assessment was informed by a walking, cycling and horse-riding survey that can be found within Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Walkers cyclists and horse-riders; Construction; Traffic forecasts; Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>Traffic &amp; Transport</p> <p>The scoping report identifies (para 13.7.4) increases in traffic from construction activities could impact access to private property and housing in Newark and Winthorpe. Community land and assets, such as Winthorpe Community Centre, development land, businesses within the LIA may also be affected. The report provides no indication of how this is to be assessed and the exact scope of the impacts which are to be assessed.</p> <p>The impacts on the local road network resulting from construction or operation of the scheme should be identified. It should consider issues of community severance, WCH safety and amenity.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The ES should consider the potential effects on the local highway network, including amenity, safety and severance. The ES should confirm the methodology used for such an assessment. The normal approach would be to use the IEMA GEART framework.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The traffic impacts of the construction period can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b> and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assess the impact of the Scheme on the local population and assets, including, where applicable, impacts on amenity, safety and severance.</p> <p>The methodology applied to the assessment of population and human health follows the Applicant's <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 112 - Population and human health</i>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Noise and vibration	<p>Noise and Public Health</p> <p>This section of the response detailed in the annex, pertains to the noise and public health aspects of the scheme. Please refer to the annex in the following pages.</p> <p>If you require any clarification on the above points or wish to discuss any particular issues please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human	Annex: A46 Newark Bypass Preliminary Environmental Information Report Response: Noise and Public Health	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	health; Noise and vibration	Background  This annex to the UKHSA's response refers primarily to the content presented in the Preliminary Environment Information Volume 1 Main Report (PEIR) Chapters 12 (Noise and Vibration) and 13 (Population and Human Health).			
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration	Legislation, standards and guidance  UKHSA welcomes the inclusion of the WHO (2018) Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (1) as relevant guidance. The PEIR states that, "unlike other guidance and the aims of the NPSE, the WHO ENG recommendations do not take context or sustainability policies into account" (12.2.32). The aim of the WHO ENG is to provide expert recommendations on the health effects of noise based on the growing noise and health evidence base, and we therefore recommend consideration of its recommendations when assessing the effects of noise on the local population.  UKHSA recommends that in Section 12.2 (Legislation and Policy context) the following document is added as relevant guidance:  Defra (2014) Environmental Noise: Valuing impacts on sleep disturbance, annoyance, hypertension, productivity and quiet (2)	N/A	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. World Health Organization <i>Environmental Noise Guidelines</i> have been considered within the context of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111- Noise and vibration</i> , which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> provides the most robust means for assessing a development of this size and nature, and therefore has been implemented within this chapter.
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration	Assessment methodology  The Promoter has followed the DMRB LA111 method for establishing significance of effects (12.3.1). UKHSA welcomes the Promoter's acknowledgement of contextual factors, such as the absolute exposure, in the determination of significance (Table 12.8). UKHSA encourages consideration of further contextual factors in the final ES (as per our scoping response). It is important that the consideration of these additional factors follows a clear and transparent methodology, which ideally should be agreed with local stakeholders.  UKHSA believes that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) should not only limit significant adverse effects, but also explore opportunities to improve the health and quality of life of local communities already adversely affected by noise, and to reduce inequalities. This is particularly applicable to areas with very high noise exposure, such as Noise Important Areas (NIAs). Several NIAs were identified within the study area (12.4.6 and Figure 12.1). It is not yet clear if those receptors predicted to experience an increase in noise exposure fall within the NIAs, however UKHSA encourages the Promoter to explore every opportunity for reducing the existing noise exposure in these areas, together with complimentary mitigation measures that can enhance health and quality of life as discussed in the Mitigation measures section in this response.	N/A	N	The Applicant has applied a mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ). A noise assessment has been submitted, please see Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which sets out where mitigation is considered necessary to reduce the impact of noise and further details of the noise modelling that has been undertaken. Consideration of impacts on noise important areas around the Scheme is given in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and it is noted that short-term noise impacts in operation would result in either a negligible change or be slightly better in all noise important areas within the study area. Barriers, bunds and low noise road surfacing would be provided along the Scheme where necessary. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. This would ensure no significant effects at any noise receptor during operation with mitigation in place, as reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ).  The following enhancement measures for the construction and operation of the Scheme have been included in the design which would provide health and quality of life benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to rectify existing severance problems in the area and encourage greater use of walking and cycling routes</li> <li>• Access in and around proposed junctions to accommodate walking and cycling routes as required</li> </ul>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Noise and vibration	Baseline sound environment and modelling  UKHSA notes that a baseline sound survey was carried out at two locations short term and eight locations long term, although one was disregarded due to a calibration issue (Table 12.9 and Figure 12.2). The long-term survey results should be used to test the assumption that the proportionate traffic flow volumes within the study area between daytime and nighttime, and different days of the week, can be considered as typical (within the context of DMRB terminology).  UKHSA recommends that baseline sound surveys combine traditional averaged noise levels with a qualitative characterisation of the sound environment, including any particularly valued characteristics (for example, tranquillity) and the types of sources contributing to it.	N/A	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation has formed the basis of the assessment for noise and vibration. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> stipulates the need to assess operational noise on the basis of Annual Average Weekday Traffic 18 within the context of the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise. As this traffic data is annualised, it is not reasonable or feasible to make a direct comparison between any survey data and calculated levels that would form realistic equivalence.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		A variety of metrics can be used to describe the sound environment with and without the Scheme – for example, levels averaged over finer time periods, background noise levels expressed as percentiles, and number of event metrics (e.g. N65 day, N60 night). This suite of metrics could be used to inform judgements of significance. There is emerging evidence that intermittency metrics can have an additional predictive value in addition to traditional long term time-averaged metrics for road traffic noise (3).			
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Noise and vibration	<p>LOAELs/SOAELs</p> <p>Tables 12.2 and 12.7 set out the proposed construction and operational noise LOAEL and SOAEL values for the Scheme, respectively. The Promoter has chosen to use the default values suggested in DMRB LA 111. UKHSA recommends that the Promoter expresses its chosen LOAELs and SOAELs in health terms, referring to the evidence in the WHO 2018 guidelines (1) for this purpose. For example, stating what the expected percentage of the population highly annoyed at the chosen day-time LOAELs and SOAELs would be for operational noise (making conversions from LA10,18h to Lden), as well as the percentage of the population highly sleep disturbed due to night-time noise exposure.</p>	N/A	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation has formed the basis of the assessment for noise and vibration. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> promotes the use of the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise as its calculation standard which calculates noise levels in LA10,18hr. As such, there is no recognised nor robust method for assessing noise in Lden in the UK. Therefore, the default values provided by <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> are most appropriate considering the context of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Assessment of effects</p> <p>UKHSA welcomes the information in Section 12.11 (Assessment of effects – operation) showing the number of receptors predicted to experience noise levels between LOAEL and SOAEL, those above SOAEL, and the magnitude of change in noise level (Tables 12.16, 12.17 and 12.18). UKHSA recommends additional information on how noise exposure will change within a broader context of DM absolute noise levels, NIAs and other contextual factors in the ES, and how these factors informed conclusions on significance.</p> <p>Non-residential receptors appear to be assessed as one category (e.g., Tables 12.17 and 12.18) with no apparent consideration of their specific sensitivities. For example, educational facilities in the area are likely to require very specific consideration of the existing and future outdoor and indoor noise environment, and the impacts on the health and quality of life (including cognitive development) of their occupants. UKHSA recommends that a more bespoke assessment is carried out for non-residential noise sensitive receptors in the ES, and one-to-one discussions are held with those receptors deemed as highest risk from increased road-traffic noise exposure as a result of the scheme (both in terms of their existing and future external and internal noise exposure, and appropriate mitigation measures).</p>	N/A	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation has formed the basis of the assessment for noise and vibration. The presentation of the results within the noise and vibration assessment is comprehensive according to the principles expressed in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> . The assessment of significant effects of non-residential receptors has been carried out on a more granular level than the assessment of magnitude of impact, in each case the sensitivity of each non-residential receptor has been considered in isolation.
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Noise and vibration; Construction; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Construction noise</p> <p>UKHSA notes that a quantitative assessment of construction noise impacts has not been undertaken at this stage (12.11) but that the Promoter plans to include one in the ES. UKHSA would welcome a quantitative assessment of construction noise impacts, including details of the construction traffic, diversion routes, construction schedule, construction methodology and plant requirements, when confirmed, and in addition, a proposed strategy of communicating the length and duration of noisy works to local communities, and methods of liaison between local communicates and contractors.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction. This assessment has been fully quantitative in accordance <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> and <i>British Standard 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 'Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites' Part 1: Noise</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Health outcomes</p> <p>UKHSA recommends that the ES documentation gives a much clearer acknowledgement of the strengthening body of evidence that road traffic noise is associated with adverse health effects, including annoyance, sleep disturbance, and cardiovascular and metabolic health outcomes (1, 5, 6), in both the Noise and Vibration and Population and Human Health chapters, including reference to the expected health impacts as a result of the scheme. UKHSA encourages the Promoter to carry out a quantitative assessment of the expected health impacts of the Scheme, by quantifying the change in the number of people that will be chronically highly annoyed and sleep disturbed, and any predicted additional (or a reduction of) cases of cardiovascular disease, using established methodologies (1, 2, 7-9).</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, these would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination of both depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) for the Scheme considers the impacts of the Scheme on community receptors. Impacts identified within the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) have been cross-referenced in relevant chapters within the Environment Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) provides a summary of evidence over the links between road traffic noise, construction noise, vibration and adverse health effects and draws upon the conclusions of the Noise Assessment to assess if any groups with protected characteristics would be disproportionately impacted by adverse health impacts of noise. The findings of the assessment conclude that no significant noise impacts on human health receptors have been identified. There would be no equality impact on groups with protected characteristics.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Amenity space and tranquillity</p> <p>The scientific evidence suggests that areas valued for their tranquillity, acoustic character, and/or quiet areas can have a direct and beneficial health effect and can help restore or compensate for adverse health effects attributed to noise within the residential environment (10-14). Therefore, UKHSA requests clarity in Chapter 12 whether any such areas were found within the study area, and if so, how this was considered in the assessment of noise impacts. UKHSA recommends that the Promoter liaises with national and local stakeholders (such as Natural England, local authorities and communities) to identify any such areas and agree a strategy on how to assess significant effects and design effective mitigation to protect those areas.</p> <p>There is emerging evidence to suggest that the use of green spaces, can decrease as a result of increased noise levels (15, 16). The Promoter may also wish to consider the potential impacts of the Scheme on private and public amenity spaces, referring to specific types and places (e.g., ProW, parks), within the Noise and Vibration chapter.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) present an assessment of the potential impacts on amenity on the local community. In Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) this includes amenity on spaces including residential receptors, green and designated open space, community receptors, and businesses. An amenity effect is experienced where two residual significant effects stemming from relevant environmental factors occur. It is currently assessed that there will be no amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Relevant mitigation measures are identified in the Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects), and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Such measures to reduce visual amenity and vibration effects during construction would for example include using boundary or timber hoarding around all compounds and material storage areas, constructing screening mounds for the permanent works as early as possible to provide screening, using minimum luminosity lighting, the use of temporary acoustic barriers where required and applying best practicable means in line with the <i>British Standard 5228 'Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites'</i> to manage noise and vibration. Mitigation in operation would, for example, include the provision of planting where necessary, landscape bunds and noise barriers. No residual significant adverse effects are predicted on amenity with mitigation in place.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Construction; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Mitigation measures</p> <p>UKHSA welcomes the commitment to use best practicable means to mitigate the effect of construction noise (12.10.3). The full strategy should be described in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) at ES stage to guide best practices in construction activities. It is important that affected communities are given a meaningful say in the choice of mitigation measures, and therefore effective communication between contractor and communities at all stages is key.</p> <p>Sound insulation packages are proposed for dwellings where significant impacts remain after mitigation (12.10.8). Any proposals to acoustically insulate buildings, whether for construction or operation noise mitigation, need a holistic consideration of indoor environmental quality to</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. The assessment includes both construction and operational mitigation including site hoardings, plant control measures, noise barriers, acoustic bunding, and a low noise running surface. The mitigation would aim to reduce noise at source where possible. The current mitigation strategy is successful in removing all significant adverse effects. Therefore, acoustically insulating buildings does not form part of the noise mitigation strategy of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>ensure that control of external noise ingress does not come at the expense of poorer indoor air quality, an increased risk of overheating, or exposure to high levels of noise from mechanical ventilation. UKHSA also recommends that socio-acoustic surveys are undertaken pre and post interventions to ensure that the insulation has the desired effect for residents.</p> <p>UKHSA welcomes the acknowledgement that noise may still affect health and wellbeing even when noise levels are below SOAEL (12.13.2). Given the large number of people (8.5k+) predicted to experience an increase in noise exposure due to the Scheme in the long term, UKHSA recommends that the Promoter considers a much broader set of mitigation measures. Whilst the primary focus should rightly be at reducing noise at source (low-noise road surfaces and noise barriers), there are many other mitigation measures that can be considered, some of which involve addressing the so-called non-acoustic factors that moderate the causal relationship between noise and health [17]. Potential mitigation measures not mentioned in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report include speed restrictions, access to quiet (either as a quiet side for dwellings or access to good quality local tranquil spaces [18,19]), education and communication [17]. Some of these measures may have co-benefits for other topic areas, such as air quality and carbon. It is important that local communities are given a meaningful say in the choice of mitigation measures.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWD3-B	N/A	<p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WHO. Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region. 2018.</li> <li>2. DEFRA. Environmental noise: valuing impacts on sleep disturbance, annoyance, hypertension, productivity and quiet. 2014.</li> <li>3. Brink M, Schäffer B, Vienneau D, Foraster M, Pieren R, Eze IC, et al. A survey on exposure-response relationships for road, rail, and aircraft noise annoyance: Differences between continuous and intermittent noise. <i>Environment international</i>. 2019;125:277-90.</li> <li>4. World Health Organisation. Burden of Disease from Environmental Noise. 2011.</li> <li>5. Van Kamp I, Simon S, Notley H, Baliatsas C, van Kempen E. Evidence Relating to Environmental Noise Exposure and Annoyance, Sleep Disturbance, Cardio-Vascular and Metabolic Health Outcomes in the Context of IGCB (N): A Scoping Review of New Evidence. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i>. 2020;17(9).</li> <li>6. Sakhvidi MJZ, Sakhvidi FZ, Mehrparvar AH, Foraster M, Dadvand P. Association between noise exposure and diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Environ Res</i>. 2018;166:647-57.</li> <li>7. Department of Transport. Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal. 2019.</li> <li>8. Guski R, Schreckenberg D, Schuemer R. WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Annoyance. <i>Int J Env Res Pub He</i>. 2017;14(12).</li> <li>9. Basner M, McGuire S. WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Effects on Sleep. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i>. 2018;15(3).</li> <li>10. Aletta F, Oberman T, Kang J. Associations between Positive Health-Related Effects and Soundscapes Perceptual Constructs: A Systematic Review. <i>Int J Env Res Pub He</i>. 2018;15(11).</li> <li>11. Ratcliffe E. Sound and Soundscape in Restorative Natural Environments: A Narrative Literature Review. <i>Front Psychol</i>. 2021;12.</li> <li>12. Cerwen G, Pedersen E, Palsdottir AM. The Role of Soundscape in Nature-Based Rehabilitation: A Patient Perspective. <i>Int J Env Res Pub He</i>. 2016;13(12).</li> </ol>	N/A	N	The Applicant notes the references provided by the Consultee as part of their consultation response. The Applicant has referred to the World Health Organization <i>Environment Noise Guidelines</i> for the European Region 2018 within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . The Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal 2019</i> is the basis of the Applicant's Transport Analysis Guidance assessment.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>13. Booi H, van den Berg F. Quiet Areas and the Need for Quietness in Amsterdam. <i>Int J Env Res Pub He.</i> 2012;9(4):1030-50.</p> <p>14. Buxton RT, Pearson AL, Allou C, Fristrup K, Wittemyer G. A synthesis of health benefits of natural sounds and their distribution in national parks. <i>P Natl Acad Sci USA.</i> 2021;118(14).</p> <p>15. Liu J, Xiong YC, Wang YJ, Luo T. Soundscape effects on visiting experience in city park: A case study in Fuzhou, China. <i>Urban for Urban Gree.</i> 2018;31:38-47.</p> <p>16. Gozalo GR, Morillas JMB, Gonzalez DM, Moraga PA. Relationships among satisfaction, noise perception, and use of urban green spaces. <i>Sci Total Environ.</i> 2018;624:438-50.</p> <p>17. Brown AL, van Kamp I. WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review of Transport Noise Interventions and Their Impacts on Health. <i>Int J Env Res Pub He.</i> 2017;14(8).</p> <p>18. TNO LIFE09 ENV/NL/000423, QSIDE. The positive effects of quiet facades and quiet urban areas on traffic noise annoyance and sleep disturbance. 2013.</p> <p>19. Health Council of the Netherlands. Quiet Areas and Health 2006 [Available from: <a href="https://www.healthcouncil.nl/documents/advisory-reports/2006/07/04/quiet-areas-and-health">https://www.healthcouncil.nl/documents/advisory-reports/2006/07/04/quiet-areas-and-health</a></p>			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Road layout	We are pleased that National Highways have moved a fair way from their original plan options to accommodate concerns expressed by the Winthorpe Village community, specifically by planning to use the existing A46 roadway and locating the additional access road to the south of the A46.	2B	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Construction	We would expect that National Highways and their partners will continue to exercise the utmost care to minimise noise, and visual and environmental impacts both during the construction phase and for the operational phase of the new bypass.	2B	N	<p>The development consent application describes how the Applicant intends to minimise noise, visual and environmental impacts during the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. Relevant mitigation measures are identified in the Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects), and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Such measures during construction would, for example, include using boundary or timber hoarding around all compounds and material storage areas, constructing screening mounds for the permanent works as early as possible to provide screening, using minimum luminosity lighting, the use of temporary acoustic barriers where required and applying best practicable means in line with <i>British Standard 5228 'Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites'</i> to manage noise and vibration.</p> <p>Mitigation in operation would, for example, include the provision of planting where necessary, landscape bunds, acoustic barriers, floodplain compensation areas and ecological mitigation in the form of bird, barn owl and bat boxes and hibernacula.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Stakeholder engagement	Members of the Parish Council met with National Highways on the 21 <sup>st</sup> of November to discuss feedback on the A46 Consultation process. It is clear we need to work strongly together with all those involved to make sure that normal life around Winthorpe, Langford and all surrounding villages can go on in as normal a way as possible. We have particular concerns over the potential impact on Winthorpe School, The Lord Nelson, bus timetables and routing, and access into and out of the village onto the A1133. With this in mind, we are in the process of developing links with all parties involved to form a group to oversee the discussion.	2B	N	Comment noted by the Applicant. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b> present an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on community receptors. The assessments confirm that the Scheme does not have a significant impact on community assets in Winthorpe during the construction or operation of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	<p>And asks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tree planting rather than just grassland alongside the A1 east side between A46 and Trent Valley way (to reduce noise impact on the southern part of Winthorpe village from the new bridge over the A1).</li> <li>2. Tree planting, landscape bunds and additional landscaping along the north side of the A46 from the A1 to the A1133 roundabouts.</li> </ol>	2B	N	The environmental design has evolved during the Scheme development and these changes are now incorporated in the Scheme design and included within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> submitted as part of the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Public footpath from the new service road at Winthorpe roundabout along the west side of A1133 to link with Thoroughfare Lane (running alongside the primary school) in order to allow pedestrian access to Winthorpe roundabout and complete village walking circuit. (Improved public amenities). You agreed to consider this proposal and we realise that the feasibility to do this will need checking out particularly as the local farmers have raised concerns about how the fields concerned, used for grazing sheep, will work with this suggestion.</li> <li>4. Service road along A46 between Winthorpe roundabout and A1 should be also available for public walkway (but with restrictions to prevent unauthorised motorised bikes or vehicles). (Improved public amenities). Any public access to the non-vehicular access path must be agreed upon with all relevant landowners and tenant farmers.</li> <li>5. Investigate the possibility of the footpath passing under the existing A46/A1 bridge to connect to the footpath to the showground to prevent the light-controlled crossing proposal over the old A46 currently in the consultation document on the grounds of improved pedestrian safety. Appropriate safety barriers would need to be present to prevent any issues with A1 traffic.</li> </ol>	2B	N	<p>The proposals for the new walking and cycle routes in this area are detailed in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>. These are as follows (responding to the points using the same numbering as the Consultee):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (3) With regard to the Consultee's comment about a public footpath to link with Thoroughfare Lane, a new walking and cycling route would only be provided from Hargon Lane to provide walking and cycling routes to the new crossings over Winthorpe Roundabout. This provides the same connectivity as the proposed Thoroughfare Lane route without impacting local farmers.</li> <li>• (4) This walking and cycling route would continue from Hargon Lane to the A1. The shared access route would have restrictions to prevent unauthorised use. This would cross the proposed A46 beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing that passes over the A1.</li> <li>• (5) A signalised pedestrian crossing would be provided over the existing A46 between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts to provide access south of the existing A46. This would link to Winthorpe Footpath FP3 via a new section of walking and cycling route north of Friendly Farmer Roundabout that links to this crossing via the existing pedestrian bridge over the A1 slip roads and the existing pedestrian crossing over the A17. The proposed route by the Consultee beneath the existing A46 next to the A1 is not viable as it would require the majority of trees to be removed next to the A1 exit slip road</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					to create a 1:12 ramp up to the existing A46 and a long length of retaining wall along the edge of the A1.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Speed limit	6. Confirm that the speed limit between Winthorpe Roundabout and the Cattle market roundabout will be no greater than 50mph (point S proposal, P25). (Environmental – noise and air pollution, especially considering the proximity of Winthorpe Primary).	2B	N	The current proposal is that the new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon Roundabout and Cattle Market Junction and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout. The speed limits on side roads, including the A1133 which is in proximity to Winthorpe Primary School, would be retained. The only exception being a short length of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Junction which would be reduced from national speed limit to 30mph. Further information is included within the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	7. That the detail of the mitigations proposed e.g., bund height, landscaping, retention of as many of the existing trees as possible, additional tree planting, confirmation of noise reduction surfacing, and the possibility of noise reduction fencing be clarified and confirmed.  8. Actions to address light pollution from vehicle headlights (linked to 6 above).	2B	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has details the noise assessment and mitigation measures to be provided.  Suitable noise mitigation measures that would be provided would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. This would also provide screening of vehicle headlights going across to Winthorpe.  Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.  Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Winthorpe roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Traffic forecasts	9. Confirmation of how the A1133 / A46 roundabout will work in terms of priority, traffic light sequencing and potential for queuing? Has the peak time flow been modelled on the proposed through about and if so, what do they propose will be the longest wait? At the meeting held with the PC, you acknowledged the need to re-look at the roundabout design.	2B	N	The operational aspects of the Winthorpe Roundabout (including traffic light sequencing) will continue to be developed as the Scheme design progresses.  The current traffic model forecasts an improvement on the existing Winthorpe Roundabout design as set out in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> . The signals around the roundabout would operate in three phases over a 60 second cycle, the maximum time a signal would be at red is 45 seconds.  The traffic emerging from the A1133 and Drove Lane would have clear inter-green gaps between each of the three phases to safely enter the roundabout. The queues at the approaches of Winthorpe Roundabout vary significantly but none exceed 91% capacity in 2043 (15 years from Scheme opening) with the Scheme.  The design of Winthorpe Roundabout has been further developed since statutory consultation, which was consulted upon as part of a targeted consultation in March to April 2023. The Consultee was invited to provide comments as part of this targeted consultation. Further information regarding this can be found in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>A model of the updated Winthorpe Roundabout design has been developed for peak hour traffic. The outputs of this modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Air quality	10. What actions are proposed to address air quality and emissions pollution, particularly as impact the east side of the village and the primary school?	2B	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. This includes mitigation measures to be implemented during construction which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Such mitigation measures to suppress dust would, for example, include avoiding double handling of materials, minimising height of stockpiles and locating these out of the wind, ensuring vehicles with open loads and dusty materials are securely sheeted and closed, providing means to remove mud and debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving site, maintaining a low speed on site, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and spraying water during cutting or grinding operations, switching vehicle engines and plant motors off when not in use and locating high dust generating activities away from nearby receptors where possible.</p> <p>Human health receptors included in the operational phase assessment have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>, as this guidance considers that no significant air quality effects are likely to occur at receptors more than 200m away. The east side of Winthorpe village and the primary school are located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore have not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the Scheme and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. These receptors are likely to experience the highest pollutant concentrations or highest level of change in pollutant concentrations within the vicinity of Winthorpe village and primary school.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>11. Confirmation of the drainage management proposals to remove excess water from the new road and not to overburden the River Fleet or Slough Dyke such that both have the potential to flood the village centre by the Lord Nelson pub.</p> <p>12. Confirmation of the safety provision around attenuation ponds.</p>	2B	N	<p>All flood attenuation basins, including those near the River Fleet and the Slough Dyke, have been sized to attenuate run-off and discharge this to the nearest water course at a rate agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority, calculated using the upper limit of MicroDrainage's Quick Storage Estimate. Detailed attenuation calculations would be completed at the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the floodplain compensation areas are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> whilst details of the drainage attenuation basins for the road are set out in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The Scheme would not result in any major adverse effects to road drainage and the water environment receptors during both construction and operation, including at the Winthorpe village centre by the Lord Nelson pub, with the mitigation in place.</p> <p>The basins have been designed with safety in mind and engagement with various stakeholders including the Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council and Canal and River Trust. This engagement included regular steering group meetings where designs were presented and discussed, as well as comments on the drainage strategy, which was issued at regular intervals to all relevant stakeholders. The locations of the basins are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The basins have been designed with banks set at shallow gradients to allow ease of access and egress in accordance with design and safety standards. The provision of fencing, signage and life rings would be assessed at detailed design stage where appropriate.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Traffic forecasts; Drove Lane	13. Concern that the scheme will create a rat run along Drove Lane and therefore the need for appropriate signage and speed restrictors to prevent this.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling has been carried out to support the development of the Scheme. The results of this traffic modelling indicate that there would be a reduction in traffic on Drove Lane, with daily traffic reducing from around 2,900 vehicles per day in 2028 to around 2,200 vehicles per day in 2028 with the Scheme (-24%). The outputs of this modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>There are no proposals to introduce signage or speed restrictions along the length of Drove Lane as part of the Scheme, however new signage would be provided in the vicinity of Winthorpe Roundabout providing information relating to the new junction layout for road users.</p> <p>As Drove Lane road is managed by the local highway authority, any measures relating to signage or speed restrictions on this road would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council rather than the Applicant.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Brownhills Junction	14. Concern over the kennel's roundabout and the volume of traffic making pedestrian access and vehicular access difficult.	2B	N	The walking and cycling route mentioned has a signalised crossing across the slip road to support pedestrian access across the slip road. Traffic modelling has shown that gaps are available during peak hours for vehicles to enter the roundabout safely from the nearby residential properties and business premises. The outputs of this modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Road layout; Brownhills Junction	15. Concern that the roundabout next to the kennels is unnecessarily high (by at least 2 metres), which has a direct knock-on effect to surround flyover structures. Could we ask you to look at a more pragmatic, cost-effective solution of lowering the new roundabout to ground level, which will also bring visual and pollution benefits?	2B	Y	<p>As a result of comments received to the statutory consultation, including from the Consultee, the Applicant has revised the design of the Brownhills Junction Roundabout reducing its height to levels which match those of the A1. The adjacent embankment and bridge height is not influenced by the roundabout.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed on that basis to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of the local area to flooding. This Flood Risk Assessment identifies existing flood risk in this area; therefore, the proposed roundabout has to be raised to protect it from flooding.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Landscape and visual effects	<p>1. Retain as many of the existing trees as possible particularly the small copse at the side of the A46 northbound between the Esso garage, the A1/A46 existing bridge, and the through about.</p> <p>2. Maintain as much of the mature tree screening on the showground side as possible</p> <p>3. Landscape the A1133 side of the village.</p>	2D/2E	N	<p>There will be some removal of trees within the copse alongside the existing A46. In addition, the majority of the copse within the existing Winthorpe Roundabout would be retained. The Scheme has also been designed to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and no veteran trees would be removed. Some of the trees on the Newark Showground side would be retained and a new hedgerow with trees interspersed would be provided alongside the A1133.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Traffic forecasts	1. Please provide details of current (2022) traffic levels across all roads, so we can put in context the anticipated traffic volumes, with and without the scheme (Overview brochure, P31).	2H	N	The Applicant has considered current traffic levels as well as anticipated traffic volumes, with and without the Scheme. The Applicant has assessed a Do Minimum scenario (without the Scheme) and a Do Something scenario (with the Scheme) for the opening year of the Scheme (2028) and 15 years after the Scheme opening (2043). The Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> provides a comparison of current traffic levels and anticipated traffic levels in 2028 and 2043. This information is provided for a selection of A-roads (A1, A46, 17, A617, A616, A1133) and local roads through Newark-on-Trent.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>2. We understand that there will also be a footpath/cycleway constructed on the showground side of the feeder road again running in parallel with the A46, can this be confirmed?</p> <p>3. Can this link to an existing footpath/cycleway alongside the A46 at Brough and with the new route of the Winthorpe to Coddington footpath</p>	2H	N	<p>A 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided alongside the new Friendly Farmer Link Road, this extends to the first Showground entrance on Drove Lane.</p> <p>Linking the route to Brough was considered when the previous A46 to Lincoln was dualled but could not be done primarily due to landowner objections.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		4. Can the new route of the Winthorpe/Coddington footpath with this footpath/cycleway and with the current foot access into Newark be included in the footpath/cycleway proposals? Details of this are sketchy at the moment but we understand NH is working with the showground, Lindum construction and other landowners in this area to find an appropriate route which works			The new walking and cycling route beneath the new A46 alongside the A1 that then crosses the existing A46, via a new signalised crossing, would connect to the existing network to the south of the A46, including the existing crossing of the A17 to Godfrey Drive providing links to Coddington. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Road layout	5. Confirmation of the new bus stop installed on the showground site, something which the showground is very keen on	2H	N	With regards to the Consultee's comment requesting a new bus stop installed on the Showground site, the Applicant is not the relevant authority regarding the provision of bus stops. This provision would be dependent on the local council's consideration and implementation.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Road layout	6. Confirmation of improved access direct into the showground which looks as though will be from the new feeder road.	2H	N	Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) show the amendment of access to the Showground to allow effective operation. A new left turn in only access from the Friendly Farmer Link Road is included and the existing access to the Newark Golf Centre would be changed to a left out only. This has been implemented to prevent queues on Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Link Road.
ANON-559H-RW97-4	Construction; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	7. Concern over the likely disruption during the construction phase and a commitment to ensure that children using this route from Winthorpe Road to get to the primary school are able to maintain footpath access.	2H	N	The route from Winthorpe Road to get to Winthorpe Primary School would be segregated and retained during the construction period.  As part of the Scheme, a new walking and cycling path would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A new signalised crossing would be provided across the exit slip road at the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safer crossing of the carriageway. Details of this can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).

## N.2 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(b) - Local Authorities

N.2.A: Ashfield District Council

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWUG-G	Introductory text; Overall scheme	<p>The Local Planning Authority has received a consultation request from National Highways in relation to the proposed A46 Newark Bypass scheme, which proposes to widen 6.5km of the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway, to provide two lanes in each direction between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts near Newark-on-Trent. The proposed scheme includes, but is not limited to, additional carriageway width, addition of traffic signals on roundabouts to improve traffic flows at peak times, new bridge, enlarging and addition of traffic signals and the diversion of some utilities.</p> <p>The Council considers that the widening of the carriageway and associated ancillary works will provide a more reliable and consistent journey times for residents and businesses within the District of Ashfield, and consequently have no further comments to make on the proposal.</p>	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Introductory text; Stakeholder engagement; Overall scheme	<p>RE: A46 NEWARK BYPASS – PRELIMINARY DESIGN STATUTORY CONSULTATION</p> <p>I write in response to National Highway's Statutory Consultation on the preliminary design of the A46 Newark Bypass Scheme. Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council (NSDC) welcomes the work that has been undertaken to address concerns raised in previous iterations of the Scheme and we are pleased to see it progress to this stage. The Council continues to give its full support to the Newark Bypass Scheme to dual and grade separate the remaining sections from Winthorpe to Farndon. We greatly appreciate the close working relationship and dialogue to date and welcome the opportunity to continue to engage with National Highways on the latest preliminary design, including any likely and needed future amendments.</p> <p>The Council remains of the opinion that the successful delivery of an appropriate Bypass Scheme is essential nationally, regionally, and locally. Working with colleagues at Midlands Connect and partners along the Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor we want to continue to promote the positive benefits this Scheme has in maintaining and enhancing growth aspirations across the centre of England from the Humber to the southwest.</p> <p>Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council welcomes National Highway's ongoing meetings with the Council to discuss the technical details of the Scheme. This will additionally help to ensure the Scheme is designed to coordinate with other infrastructure Schemes in and around Newark. It is also enabling the Council, alongside National Highways, to keep local residents and businesses informed of developments as the Scheme progresses.</p> <p>To provide an update, the Council has submitted comments on the Scoping proposals sent to us by the Planning Inspectorate (our reference 22/SCO/00001). I have attached this report separately to this response for completeness. This reply should be read in conjunction with that report.</p> <p>The Council has consulted within its various teams and engaged with its Councillors who have been consulting residents in order to prepare this response. The letter sets out a number of questions regarding the preliminary design. As you are aware the Council is also an affected landowner, a matter we also address. Whilst we are aware of ongoing engagement and are expectant of a future revision to the preliminary design this response focusses on the proposals formally published as part of the Statutory Consultation. The Council would expect to see and have appropriate time to digest full details of any revisions before making further and, in due course, final comments in advance of the Development Consent Order application being made.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has consulted with the Newark and Sherwood District Council as both section 42 (1)(b) and section 42 (1)(d) Consultee under the Planning Act 2008 on both the statutory and targeted consultation undertaken on the Scheme, providing appropriate time for them to form an understanding of the full details of the Scheme proposals and provide feedback. Continued engagement in relation to the Scheme and the consideration of wider infrastructure schemes will occur, if necessary, throughout the Scheme's development. The Applicant also acknowledges receipt of the Scoping Opinion comments.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Road layout; Land ownership	<p>PRELIMINARY DESIGN OF THE A46 NEWARK BYPASS</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the General Arrangement Drawings and 'fly through' video and would like National Highways to take into consideration and provide a response to the following points:</p> <p>1. The proposed carriageway layout on Great North Road southeast of the A46 Cattle Market junction depicts a Ghost-Island right turn into the former cattle market / lorry park site but no Ghost-Island right turn into the former Council Depot site on the opposite side of Great North Road. Vehicles turning right into the former Council Depot site would therefore impede the free flow of southbound through-traffic in the offside lane and may raise safety concerns. An understanding of this position is required in order for the District Council (and County Council as landowner of the former Council Depot site) to access the likely impacts on the existing accesses to both sites and on any aspirations to redevelop the existing Newark lorry park, if it can be relocated elsewhere in Newark, as part of the Newark Town Fund proposals for the Gateway/SiSCLog site shared with National Highways (Newark-Place-Strategy-TIP-Final.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk))</p>	N/A	Y	<p>A similar access to the existing would be provided into the former council depot site without a ghost island, which is deemed appropriate during operation due to the very low anticipated usage of this access. Since the statutory consultation the Scheme design has been updated so that a signalised junction with ghost islands would be provided into the lorry park site which would be 'future-proofed' to allow conversion into signalised cross-roads by others if deemed appropriate at a later stage.</p> <p>During the construction phase the former depot would be used as the main compound and offices. Discussions have been held with the Consultee and Nottinghamshire County Council where it was broadly agreed that the access would either be off the existing Cattle Market Roundabout or the existing depot access for goods vehicles and that the egress would be the same location, as a left turn only . Office staff would enter and leave the site using Kelham Road. This separation of goods vehicles from office staff reduces conflict risks and hazards.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee to seek technical and local expertise if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the Development Consent Order examination. Further information on the ongoing engagement can be found within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Speed limit	2. Will the A46 Scheme reduce the existing speed limit on Great North Road through this section? (Currently national speed limit – 60mph for single carriageway).	N/A	N	The speed limit would be reduced to 30mph on this section. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b> ). The approach has been discussed with the Consultee.
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Landscape and visual effects	3. On the fly-through video the structure of the elevated over-pass at the Cattle Market junction appears as a stark and imposing concrete structure. This may be in part due to the animation which depicts it as being very bright in colour and therefore standing out vividly. The Council would want to understand proposals to ensure the visible impact of the final structure is minimised and/or mitigated as far as practicable.	N/A	N	<p>Consideration has been given to the aesthetic finish of the structure during the design development of the Scheme, to help to reduce the visual prominence of the structure and to reflect finishes of existing structures such as that of Smeaton's Arches just to the north of the new Cattle Market Junction. Further details of these can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Planting of trees and shrubs has also been considered and would be provided wherever feasible to help break up the visual mass of the structure, with planting softening the built form, particularly from properties such as those in Sandhills Park affording near distance views.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and associated design and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	4. Will all proposed new Non-Motorised User (NMU) routes and crossings be designed to be LTN 1/20 compliant?	N/A	N	Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings would be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification would be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Brownhills Junction	5. The proposed new roundabout at the Brownhills Junction adjacent to [redacted] looks large. Does the diameter of this roundabout need to be so big to serve three arms, one of which is essentially a private access and the other a one-way slip road?	N/A	N	The new Brownhills Junction Roundabout has an inscribed circle diameter of 60m. This is slightly smaller than the existing Brownhills Roundabout which has an approximate diameter of 70m. The size of the Brownhills Junction Roundabout has been designed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i> and with consideration to vehicle tracking to allow the number of vehicles predicted by traffic modelling, including HGVs, to safely turn right at the roundabout from the slip road.
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Brownhills Roundabout; Brownhills Junction	6. At the existing Brownhills roundabout that is being retained there is a two-lane exit towards the A46 westbound where the nearside lane becomes the A46 westbound merge, and the offside lane provides access to [redacted]. The Council is concerned there may be a risk of drivers confusing the off-side lane for a second lane towards the A46 westbound or using this lane for overtaking when heading towards the A46 westbound, which could lead to safety concerns when they need to join the nearside lane, or end up doing a loop around the [redacted] roundabout.	N/A	Y	The Scheme design has been developed to provide clear road markings that filter the two lanes from Brownhills Roundabout into one lane before the right turn to the boarding kennels, compared to the layout presented at statutory consultation that did not provide a filter. A more notable right turn and the appropriate signage would be provided to avoid the likelihood of people making an incorrect turn. The new layout is presented in the General vArrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Speed limit; Brownhills Junction	7. Residents have raised concern about pedestrian and cycle safety at Brownhills roundabout. It is a popular route for lorries and the crossing will be used by pedestrians and cyclists, including school children. What will be the speed limit on the slip road and how will this affect stopping times at the pedestrian crossing?	N/A	N	The speed limit on the exit slip road would be 50mph and an appropriately designed signalised crossing would be provided for walkers and cyclists to improve safety. Appropriate visibility to this crossing and appropriate signal timings would be provided to allow vehicles, including lorries, adequate time, and distance to slow down and stop in advance of the crossing. The proposed speed limits are detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Friendly Farmer Roundabout	8. At the A17 / A46 roundabout, the northern arm (towards Lincoln) tapers sharply and there is a tight bend in the carriageway immediately to the north. The exit from the roundabout travelling towards Lincoln tapers very abruptly from two lanes at the roundabout to a narrow single lane on the bend which raises safety concerns. Can this alignment be amended to provide a longer taper distance from two lanes to one lane and a smoother bend?	N/A	Y	The Scheme design has been developed to provide a give way rather than a free flow link from the existing A46 heading north as was shown at the statutory consultation. This is a more standard layout and means that two lanes are no longer required to merge into one on a bend, making it safer for road users. The new layout is presented in the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Single carriageway link between Friendly	9. The parallel road that connects the Friendly Farmer roundabout to the Winthorpe roundabout is single carriageway. This road will carry all trips travelling between the A1 / A17 / Newark to/from Lincoln. The Council is concerned and would like to understand the details of traffic flow modelling and design in order to ensure this single carriageway road has	N/A	N	Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme opens to traffic (2028) and fifteen years on (2043) and showed that the single carriageway would have no significant delays and therefore no capacity issues for normal operation of the road.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Traffic forecasts	sufficient capacity to the design year to accommodate forecast flows and whether there is enough redundancy with a single carriageway road, for example if a vehicle breaks down, or during periods of peak traffic activity when events are held at the adjacent Newark Showground.			The traffic modelling shows that removal of the A46 traffic from the Friendly Farmer Roundabout has freed up capacity in this location to allow traffic to flow easily with acceptable queue lengths.
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Traffic forecasts; Newark Showground	10. Has the capacity of the parallel connector road been tested considering event traffic at the Newark Showground site? Please provide details.	N/A		<p>A signal control has been added to the link between Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout to provide gaps in traffic heading eastbound to the A17 therefore allowing traffic to enter the roundabout from Lincoln.</p> <p>The design of Friendly Farmer Link Road includes 1m wide hard strips providing a total carriageway width of 9.3m, this allows vehicles to safely pass in the event of a broken down vehicle.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking.</p> <p>The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be utilised by the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <p>Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</p> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts	11. Will a visual screen be provided between the parallel connector road and the A46 to avoid potential issues with driver confusion and/or headlight dazzle at night?	N/A	N	Anti-dazzle louvres would be provided on top of the safety barrier to avoid driver confusion and prevent headlight dazzle and glare as detailed in the Road Safety Audit within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Speed limit	12. What is the proposed speed limit on the parallel connector road between the Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts?	N/A	N	The proposed speed limit is 50mph on the Friendly Farmer Link Road. The proposed speed limits are detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Winthorpe Roundabout	13. It's unclear how the signal controlled 'through-about' arrangement at the Winthorpe roundabout will work in practice. The parallel connector road arm joins the roundabout very close to where the signal stop line will need to be positioned on the circulatory carriageway.	N/A	N	The Winthorpe Roundabout has been tested within a microsimulation model, including modelling for years 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening) to account for traffic growth as detailed in the Transport Assessment

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Will there be sufficient storage space on the circulatory carriageway?			<p><b>(TR010065/APP/7.4).</b> In a microsimulation model each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The through-about generally works like a conventional roundabout. Signing has been included as part of the design including an overhead gantry within the roundabout to guide southbound traffic down to the A1, Newark-on-Trent or to continue on the A46.</p> <p>Based on the outcome of the microsimulation model, the circulatory lanes have been designed to provide sufficient storage. Further roundabout design information and the sign gantry is illustrated in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The design referred to by the Consultee has been updated as a result of statutory consultation, and an updated design was presented during the targeted consultation. For further information relating to the statutory and targeted consultation, please see Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic forecasts	14. Will the proposed 'through-about' arrangement at the Winthorpe roundabout provide sufficient 'future-proofing' in terms of traffic capacity or will this junction become the new A46 'bottle neck' in a few years' time? Would it be better to provide a grade-separated junction now to avoid the need to revise the junction in the future?	N/A	N	<p>The Winthorpe through-about roundabout design as illustrated in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>, which has been updated since the statutory consultation and included as part of the targeted consultation, has been tested within a microsimulation model and performs well in both 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening), which allows for traffic growth as evidenced in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Winthorpe Roundabout	15. Has the potential future need to upgrade to grade-separation at the Winthorpe roundabout been considered in terms of the proposed at-grade Scheme layout and proposed land take? (i.e., making sure enough land is available to future proof).	N/A	N	<p>The need for future grade separation has not been considered as the roundabout proposed as part of the Scheme's design alleviates traffic until 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening) without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation. As there is no need for grade separation, the Applicant cannot, at this time, acquire additional land to facilitate this in the future.</p> <p>Future proofing could not be justified in terms of cost and potential environmental impact. Any future need for grade separation would follow its own statutory process to allow it to be implemented.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Traffic forecasts; Drove Lane	16. Is there a likelihood of increased 'rat-running' along Drove Lane following introduction of the parallel connector road? For example, drivers travelling from Lincoln towards the A17 eastbound may find it easier to use Drove Lane once they've left the A46 at Winthorpe, rather than use the single carriageway parallel connector road.	N/A	N	<p>Traffic modelling predicts that daily traffic volumes along Drove Lane are predicted to decrease as a result of the Scheme for the 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic) modelling years. Daily traffic is forecast to reduce from around 2,900 vehicles per day in 2028 to around 2,200 vehicles per day in 2028 with the Scheme (-24%). This is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The traffic modelling accounts for journey times on the existing network and accounts for incidences of rat-running based on these parameters (i.e. journey times, queue lengths and turning counts), indicating no likely increase here.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Overall scheme; Southern Link Road	<p>PLANNED GROWTH IN AND AROUND NEWARK</p> <p>Implications for New Planning Proposals and Committed Developments</p> <p>Improvements to both the local and strategic road network in and around Newark are essential to achieve growth ambitions set out in NSDC's Local Development Framework (LDF), which includes the Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013), with interactions between all of the scheduled road improvements having implications for the modelled outcomes.</p> <p>The latest preliminary design for the A46 is, in principle, compliant with the Amended Core Strategy (2019). Spatial Policy 6: Infrastructure for Growth (along with Appendix D) identifies the A46 amongst critical strategic highway network infrastructure and sets out the District Council's commitment to working with partners to secure delivery. Additionally, Policy NAP1: Newark Urban Area (Section B) provides explicit support for the implementation of strategic highway Schemes at the A46 Link Capacity (Newark Bypass); A46 /A617 Cattle Market Roundabout; A46 Roundabout at Farndon; A1/A17/A46 Roundabout; and A1/A46 Brownhills Roundabout. The objectives set out in the Council's Community Plan underline the</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Southern Link Road being delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by Spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road/A46 roundabout junction falls outside the Order Limits of the Scheme. The Order Limits shown on the <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> at the statutory consultation included the area planned for use as the Southern Link Road/A46 Junction as the Southern Link Road may have needed to be altered due to the impact of the Scheme.</p> <p>However, since statutory consultation, the Applicant has confirmed with the Consultee that no further amendments are required to the Southern Link Road roundabout junction with the A46 and therefore it is outside the scope of the Scheme. As this roundabout has not been constructed yet and will not be prior to submission of the development consent application, the Applicant has not included it within the Scheme General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>importance of delivering these infrastructure upgrades.</p> <p>Newark Southern Link Road</p> <p>As discussed previously, the Newark Southern Link Road (SLR) is a critical component in the delivery of the Middlebeck Sustainable Urban Extension (Land South of Newark). This will unlock the development of up to 3,150 new homes and the creation of around 5000 jobs on the employment land component of the Middlebeck development. To date, just under 600 homes have detailed consent and have commenced on-site.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the ongoing positive joint work between National Highways and NSDC on both the extant A46/SLR roundabout and National Highway/Developer (Urban &amp; Civic) designed 'Enhanced' Replacement A46/SLR roundabout.</p> <p>This work is essential in moving the Scheme forward to allow full delivery of the Scheme and its significant associated benefits. Funding for this has now been secured through a combination of sources, including a successful Levelling Up Fund bid. The Council is currently working in partnership with Urban &amp; Civic to let contract packages to construct the SLR Scheme.</p> <p>It is expected that construction will commence in March 2023, allowing completion of the link between the A1 and A46 by February 2025, in advance of a likely start on the A46 Newark Bypass. Once completed, the SLR can provide network resilience during the pending construction of the A46 and its operation. It should offer a needed part of the traffic management solution for the Town and strategic network whilst the A46 Bypass is constructed, aiding traffic flow and congestion and very considerable delays for a prolonged period.</p> <p>As a committed development, the Council is surprised to note that the new roundabout junction of the Southern Link Road (SLR) with the A46 is not shown on the Scheme drawings.</p> <p>The SLR is a committed highway improvement Scheme with full planning permission and funding in place (including for both the extant and enhanced replacement roundabouts).</p> <p>The Council considers that the SLR needs to be included on the drawings to show the A46 Scheme in the context of the SLR Scheme for completeness and accuracy, aiding full understanding for members of the public and interested parties.</p> <p>Account should also be taken of the SLR in the preparation of the DCO application documents including the Environmental Statement and its appendices.</p> <p>Committed Development</p> <p>The following table provides some information on the Schemes the Council has either approved or are pending the outcome of an appeal which would be impacted by the A46 dualling. This will clearly not include any new proposals which may be promoted between this letter and the commencement of the Scheme, notwithstanding National Highways will be informed separately of such instances through the planning application process.</p> <p>TABLE OF ALL COMMITTED DEVELOPMENT IN THE EMAIL ATTACHMENT</p>			<p>The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road scheme into consideration in the development consent application.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road was included in the traffic modelling years 2028 (year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years from Scheme opening). Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasts that in the Do Minimum scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As the Southern Link Road project falls within 2km of the Scheme, it is also considered by the Applicant within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to liaise with the local authority and the developer for the Southern Link Road regarding updates to the Scheme's construction programme and the expected completion date. The Applicant has presented the outline traffic management proposals for the Scheme to the local authority which are included within the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>, this does not include the Southern Link Road as a prescribed diversion route during the construction of the Scheme. This is due to the Southern Link Road being a link road to housing and development along the southern end of Newark-on-Trent, rather than an alternative route for strategic traffic. The Applicant will continue to work with the local authorities during the production of the Traffic Management Plan prior to the commencement of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments and information provided relating to committed developments. Committed transport schemes and land use developments were identified by the Applicant through consultation with relevant authorities, a review of planning portals and a review of policy documents. They were included in the traffic modelling based on their status and following guidance in the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance unit M4 Forecasting and Uncertainty</i>.</p> <p>A Development Uncertainty Log has been produced by the Applicant. This document contains information on future 'certain' or 'more than likely' planned developments in close proximity to the Scheme and how these have been accounted for in the traffic forecasts. This can be viewed in Appendix A: Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Combined and Cumulative Effects Assessment presented in Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> covers potential cumulative effects arising from the Scheme as well as other developments. The first stage of the assessment was to develop a Long List of proposed developments. The Planning Team at Newark and Sherwood District Council and North Kesteven District Council were consulted to review the Long List of proposed developments and to provide any additional developments or further details to aid the assessment. The Long List was discussed, amended, and agreed with the above local planning authorities in March 2023. The email correspondence confirming this consultation and agreement is contained within Appendix 15.1 (Email Correspondence with the Local Planning Authorities) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>During the consultation undertaken with Newark and Sherwood District Council and North Kesteven District Council in March 2023 on the Long List of proposed developments there were 2 proposed developments (20/01452/OUTM and 22/02427/RMAM Tritax Acquisition 39 Limited, and 21/02408/FULM BGO Ark PropCo Limited) requested by Newark and Sherwood District Council to be included in the Long List by Newark and Sherwood District Council that did not feature in the traffic model. However, these developments did not progress to the Short List and so a cumulative effects assessment was not required for these developments.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Taking each planning application reference in turn listed by Newark and Sherwood District Council in their response, the Applicant has set out whether or not the development was included within the cumulative effects assessment:</p> <p>20/01452/OUTM – included in Long List but did not progress to Short List  14/01978/OUTM – included in Long List and progressed to Short List, and therefore assessed within the assessment of cumulative effects  Developments around Fernwood – 18/00526/RMAM and 19/01053/RMAM included in Long List but did not progress to Short List. None of the other developments (19/02125/RMAM, 20/01306/RMAM, 21/00390/S73M and 21/02346/S73M) were considered in the Long List as they did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the Long List. 21/02484/FULM – included in Long List but did not progress to Short List  22/01249/FULM – included in Long List but did not progress to Short List</p> <p>Additional information on developments was also provided as part of the Newark and Sherwood District Council's Scoping Opinion response which aided the assessment and is provided within Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The final Long List and the reasons for determining which developments then progressed to the Short List is included within Table 15-5 of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Construction; Stakeholder engagement; Southern Link Road	<p>Journey times during construction</p> <p>With regard to the construction stage, NSDC continues to be clear on the importance of traffic management, network co-ordination (cognizant of ongoing strategic extensions and projects at Middlebeck, Fernwood, Newark Showground, Newark Gateway (the former Livestock Market and existing Lorry Park), and former NCC Depot), and sequencing throughout the various phases of any approved Newark Bypass. Traffic management and traffic congestion could be assisted through the completion of the Southern Link Road in advance of the commencement of work on the A46, a matter previously discussed.</p> <p>Promotion and communication remain key and the District Council, alongside colleagues from the County Council and all developers active in the Town remain keen to work with National Highways on appropriate messaging and mitigation.</p> <p>It will be necessary to effectively manage publicity to communicate progress on all highway Schemes around Newark to keep local residents and other road users up to date. The Council welcomes the ongoing dialogue with National Highways and seeks commitment on communications and co-ordination, including appropriate use of technology to provide realtime updates and targeting multiple public and business audiences.</p> <p>As has already been highlighted, the District Council would stress the importance of timely delivery of other highways works, including the Southern Link Road and the new A1 overbridge connecting the Newark Urban Area to Fernwood to the southeast. These pieces of infrastructure both have potential to cause delays on the network during their construction close to or within the A46 Bypass construction period. It is noted that once operational all of the highway works will help to address traffic congestion locally and unlock growth, in addition to the clearly identified national benefits. The Southern Link Road is of particular significance insofar as it will provide a southern link between the A46 and the A1, enabling vehicles destined for either route to exit Newark from the south instead of using the existing routes through the centre and accessing the roundabouts at Farndon/Cattle Market/Brownhills.</p> <p>Members and local residents have raised concern about the impact construction work could have on Winthorpe Primary School due to access constraints linking the Winthorpe Road area of Newark via the underpass with the village of Winthorpe. This includes potential for a lower intake of new pupils into the reception year. The Council would like assurances that National Highways can confirm if buses will be used to transport pupils to the school from</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and other key stakeholders relating to traffic management plans and interfaces with third party developments, if necessary, as the Scheme proposals develop. The Applicant has considered other schemes being constructed at the same time so that traffic can be managed during this busy period.</p> <p>The traffic modelling work that has been carried out for the Do Minimum scenario accounted for the development of the Southern Link Road. It demonstrated that without improvements to the A46, even with the development of the Southern Link Road, there would still be significant delays on the A46, especially at the Cattle Market Junction.</p> <p>When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. The Southern Link Road would not be used in the construction phase as a haul route due to its proximity to residential areas, therefore it is not included in the plans.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by Spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and will aim to minimise disruption to the traveling public during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new bridge crossing the A1. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		other areas and set out any other mitigation proposals required. The Council is willing to work with National Highways to explore appropriate solutions.			<p>Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the need for ongoing coordination of all public messaging and publicity of the Scheme and agrees to work collaboratively with the Newark and Sherwood District Council in coordinating public messaging.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage regularly with representatives from Newark and Sherwood District Council to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues, and to support the development of a Statement of Common Ground which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environment Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b> detail the assessment of potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on community receptors, including the area of Winthorpe. The construction of Brownhills Junction and the A46 dual carriageway would be phased such that access along Winthorpe Road including the footpath and cycle way would be maintained. The existing underpass would remain accessible throughout the construction period, therefore the need for additional transport to Winthorpe Primary School has not been identified.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Stakeholder engagement; Land ownership; Overall scheme; Newark Showground	<p>Newark Town Investment Plan</p> <p>National Highways are aware of the Newark Town Investment Plan and the 10 identified priority projects (now 9 following the decision not to relocate Newark Police Station) formulated by the District Council and Newark Towns Board and supported by significant grant funding from the Government. Two of the projects are in close proximity to the A46 Bypass proposals and form part of what is known as the Newark Gateway Development Site and affect the Council as both landowner (and thus existing assets) and developer (with stated aspirations). The Council wishes to engage with National Highways in reaching an agreement to minimise and mitigate, as far as possible, the effect of the exercise of DCO powers.</p> <p>Newark Gateway Development site (the site of the existing Newark Lorry Park and former Cattle Market site)</p> <p>Progress to deliver the Newark Gateway development on the former Cattlemarket site continues at pace. The Air and Space Institute (ASI) has recently commenced development, with completion and student intake expected from January 2024. National Highways are aware that careful consideration is required in understanding and mitigating the impacts of the A46 Bypass on the existing Newark Lorry Park and in facilitating its potential relocation to the preferred site of Newark Showground (also affected by the Bypass preferred route) so that the current site can be redeveloped for the Towns Fund SiSCLog project.</p> <p>The currently published preliminary design would result in permanent landtake of part of the existing operational Newark lorry park, reducing its overall capacity. Any reduction will affect revenue returns and, depending on extent, could lead to an unviable site capacity. Further, the proposed route will likely, based on advice the Council has received from its retained highway consultants (TetraTech), require the current lorry park access to be relocated further south.</p> <p>The Council would like to further understand the impacts of the Bypass proposals in terms of overall land take and any likely requirement to relocate the current Newark Lorry Park access further south.</p> <p>Negotiation on sequencing is also required, in order to ensure an operational lorry park during the Bypass works.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant has undertaken regular meetings with Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and their technical consultants to review and discuss the impact of the Scheme on the Newark Gateway Development. The outcomes of these discussions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of the Scheme Order Limits at the lorry park have been reduced so that it maintains viable site capacity</li> <li>Permanent and temporary land requirements have been outlined, including permanent land required for future maintenance access, details of the land take required can be found within the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b></li> <li>Access to the lorry park would be maintained during construction, details can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b></li> <li>Access to the lorry park has been redesigned to provide a new signalised junction, this can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b></li> </ul> <p>The new access from Great North Road has been designed for use by the lorry park. The Applicant has shared drawings with the Consultee showing the Scheme fence line and a 3m maintenance easement outside of this where permanent infrastructure can't be built, as the Applicant may need access to do maintenance works in the future. The Consultee has been developing a layout for the lorry park that would be used during construction and one following the permanent Order Limits provided. This would allow the lorry park to remain operational once the Scheme is completed.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Equally, the Council would like to understand the extent and timings of any temporary land-take required pre and post construction.</p> <p>Retaining a viable, vibrant and significant lorry park within the town is crucial in terms of meeting the needs of the logistics industry and enhancing and promoting this important trade route. As National Highways will be aware the Council is currently exploring options for the relocation of the lorry park to a preferred identified site at Newark Showground. It welcomes the continued positive input from National Highways to date in seeking facilitate this, and the redevelopment of the vacated site for the Towns Fund SiSCLog proposals.</p> <p>At the time of writing a relocated Newark Lorry Park is not guaranteed, nor are the timings for a relocation notwithstanding it remains the Council's intention to progress this aspiration. The Council must therefore consider the impacts of and for the Bypass Scheme on the existing Newark Lorry Park. The Council has instructed Town Legal and Lambert Smith Hampton to act on its behalf in negotiations in advance of any Development Consent Order to resolve such issues. As is now well-established, the Council and National Highways will continue to meet on a regular basis to ensure the design/technical aspects of all Schemes are coordinated.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Cultural heritage; Landscape and visual effects	<p>HERITAGE</p> <p>There remains some concern about the potential impacts of the A46 improvement Scheme on the historic environment in this location. As per NSDC's original advice on the Options statutory consultation (held between December 2020 and Feb 2021) and the Preferred Route (February 2022), the proposed highway Scheme will have a significant impact on the historic environment. The key areas of impact include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape impact on Winthorpe Conservation Area (CA) and listed buildings therein (notably [redacted]). The new bridge over the A1 and road section down to the Winthorpe junction results in substantial impact on the setting and significance of the Winthorpe CA. Proximity to [redacted] also is likely to lead to adverse visual and noise impacts.</li> <li>Visual interruption of the landscape at the Cattle Market Roundabout, being an important entrance to the town, resulting in impact on key views along Great North Road. Great North Road is an important historic route. The tree lined avenue on approach to Castle Station is an important feature. On approach from Muskham along Smeaton's Arches (Georgian era causeway bridge), the grade separation will present as a significant obstruction to views of the Castle and St Marys Church. Physical impact on the Grade II listed Smeaton's Arches, which may include partial removal/widening of the arches closest to the roundabout, is likely to be harmful in heritage terms.</li> <li>Impacts on known and unknown archaeology- notably the extensive Civil War potential along the A46 corridor.</li> <li>Wider visual impact on the setting and significance of listed buildings and Newark CA.</li> </ul> <p>Inter-visibility of Kelham Hall with Newark heritage assets and Smeaton's arches along road network, experience of traversing local footpath network, views between local landmarks such as the Castle, St Marys and Church of All Saints in Winthorpe etc. We recognise that the proposed design is an improvement on options previously presented insofar as the new A1 bridge and position of roadway adjacent to Winthorpe CA is concerned, but the Scheme will still have a significant adverse impact on the historic environment. Robust mitigation in terms of planting/trees remains a critical aspect of the proposals in the Winthorpe area. The parkland character between [redacted] and the Winthorpe Junction roundabout suggests that medium and larger trees will need to be considered. Extensive work on archaeology is also needed to evaluate and assess and robustly mitigate potential impact.</p> <p>Impacts of the Scheme on Smeaton's arches is also particularly important around the roundabout area. Consideration of emerging policy on Civil War sites and Farndon Fields potentially to be factored in (part of the emerging Amended Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD). Landscape visual assessment of the grade separation in the context of heritage assets, notably high grade, within Newark, Winthorpe and Kelham is also needed, among other things, as:</p>	N/A	N	<p>The setting of Winthorpe Conservation Area is one of rural, agricultural countryside, bounded by modern road networks to the south and west. Views from the conservation area towards the existing road network are well screened by existing mature vegetation.</p> <p>The addition of the A1/A46 Crossing and road section down to the Winthorpe Roundabout is considered to amount to less than substantial harm, in that it would impact only part of the conservation area and part of its setting, and therefore would not amount to substantial harm.</p> <p>The Scheme is expected to yield negligible change in noise at Winthorpe Conservation Area and the property mentioned in the Consultee's response.. In general, this is because the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and the traffic on this road has been predicted to have negligible change. Furthermore, the A46, despite being closer than its current position, is mitigated by a low noise running surface and noise barriers. The new A46 earthworks also block noise from the A1.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, between this particular property and the A1 in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. As a result of this planting, any views of the new bridge should be reduced to glimpse views and the residual effect of permanent construction impacts on the identified property (as a result of the completion of road building) is assessed as permanent slight adverse.</p> <p>Noise bunds along the widened A46 would also mitigate against noise impacts to the south of Winthorpe and additional planting here would soften the visual impact of these bunds. With mitigation in place, it is considered that the impact on Winthorpe Conservation Area would be reduced to moderate or slight. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2). Regarding the property mentioned by the Consultee, no adverse noise impacts are expected. Further information regarding the property and noise is presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).</p> <p>The Cattle Market Roundabout is itself part of the modern road infrastructure, truncating the linear significance of the Great North Road. It is acknowledged that the presence of the grade separation would result in cumulative impact, but it is felt that the roundabout would still serve as an important entrance to the town and would not impact on the sense of arrival when approaching the town from the south side of the roundabout. The tree-lined avenue on the approach to Castle Station would remain unaffected.</p> <p>Long views of Newark-on-Trent are largely screened by trees, both by those along the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that the grade separation will significantly disrupt landscape views, but new views of the townscape will be offered from raised areas. A detailed evaluation of these matters is needed. The new ASI building (planning reference 21/02484/FULM) at the former Cattle Market will present a different visual receptor than solely the current lorry park character of the site affords (this is now under construction).</li> <li>The riverside is an important feature of the Newark CA, and impact on river related heritage assets such as the Grade II* Fidler's Elbow Bridge is relevant. The quality of new development along North Gate is variable however, and it is considered there are no specific concerns of detrimental impact at this point.</li> </ul> <p>Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment (Archaeology)</p> <p>The Environmental Scoping Report for the A46 Newark Bypass sets out the proposed approach regarding Cultural Heritage at Chapter 7. The preferred route runs through areas of high archaeological potential and sensitivity associated with a broad range in activity including sites dating to the late Upper Paleolithic (LUP), pre-historic, Roman, Anglo-Saxon, medieval and post-medieval periods. Of particular note are the LUP site at the Farndon roundabout and the numerous Civil War remains associated with the sieges at Newark in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, of which several sites are Scheduled. Archaeological impacts and subsequent mitigation have the potential for significant impacts, consequently a robust package of evaluation is essential in informing the selection process and in ensuring the subsequent design and work programme is devised with an understanding of the level of archaeological work which may be required before and during the construction phase.</p> <p>We are generally supportive of the programme presented, and the applicant has recognised the potential for significant impact from the Scheme on the historic environment for both designated and non-designated assets. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will require desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation to be undertaken for the full extent of the proposed environmental impacts to be identified and assessed. The results should be used to minimise the impact of the Scheme on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation. The provision of robust baseline information to thoroughly identify and assess the likely significant environmental impacts on known and potential heritage assets is, of course, required by the legal and policy framework pursuant to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Non-intrusive survey and intrusive evaluation trenching results are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling, budget management and design change where necessary. Failing to adequately assess the archaeological potential of the relevant land could lead to unnecessary destruction of or damage to heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided. We are therefore reassured that a full programme of non-intrusive and intrusive evaluation will be undertaken (as outlined in section 7.9.1 of the Preliminary Environmental Information) and the results presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) as part of the DCO application. The details of the non-intrusive site surveys and evaluation will need to be agreed as early as possible and each stage of investigation will inform the nature, location and extent of the next stages. The results will inform a fit for purpose and robust mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains and how these measures will be secured in the DCO. We would request that the Council's Conservation Team continues to be consulted in this respect.</p>			<p>roadside and by those in the distance. Nonetheless, the grade separation would be conspicuous and may well block views of the church on the approach to Newark-on-Trent. The castle is visible once south of the roundabout and therefore views of the castle on the approach into Newark-on-Trent would remain unaffected. Appendix 7.2 (Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides descriptions of the change in view for road users moving south along the Great North Road. The road and roadside vegetation dominate views from the Great North Road. Occasional breaks in roadside vegetation allow brief, oblique views over adjacent pasture and glimpsed views of St Mary Magdalene Church, Newark. Whilst vegetation clearance for the Scheme would open up views to the road, a slight adverse effect is predicated upon this visual receptor.</p> <p>Design of the structure would seek to acknowledge the significance of Smeaton's Arches, without competing with them, through the use of buff facing bricks, with a red brick line to reflect the height of the wall to the arches. It is also acknowledged that in order to accommodate the slip road north of the roundabout, there would be some loss to and impact on Smeaton's Arches in heritage terms. However, it has been acknowledged that this loss would be restricted to the 1922 rebuilt section of the arches, and all due recording, monitoring and appropriate rebuilding would be undertaken, so as to minimise that impact. Further details are contained within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the wider visual impact, given that wider views of the conservation area are screened on the approach to Newark-on-Trent by trees, existing road infrastructure and modern development, it is not felt that there would be a wider visual impact on the setting and significance of listed buildings and Newark-on-Trent Conservation Area, or inter-visibility of Kelham Hall with Newark-on-Trent heritage assets and Smeaton's Arches.</p> <p>Retention of parkland trees and other existing vegetation would be achieved where possible. Proposals to the west and south include woodland between the property and A1 to the west and south-west. This woodland block would extend south and south-eastwards towards the widened A46 prior to opening up to grassland and standard trees to reflect the parkland character. Medium to large tree species would be considered in this location to reflect the current parkland trees in the area. Moving towards Winthorpe Roundabout, the design and construction strategy have been developed to limit land take from the historic parkland landscape. Planting that would be provided includes a hedgerow with standard trees forming a new boundary between the parkland and the widened A46 soft estate beyond. This would include a landscape bund which would aid screening of the widened A46 from Winthorpe and this parkland landscape from Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic), with greater screening value being achieved as tree and shrub planting on the bund matures overtime. The landscape proposals are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and the landscape and Visual impact assessment is set out in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to Smeaton's Arches, consultation has taken place on how to minimise the unavoidable impact on the historic fabric of the structure and how best to reconstruct the impacted section of the arches.</p> <p>Collective value has been considered for all heritage assets including those discovered during geophysical survey as well as the previously known Civil War and Paleolithic sites. Impacts on heritage assets within and including Newark-on-Trent, Winthorpe and Kelham have been considered and assessed, with impacts and mitigation needs accordingly identified in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme was not identified as having significant effects on Newark Castle and St Mary's church in relation to cultural heritage as outlined in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). In relation to views from Newark Castle towards the Scheme, Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides a detailed assessment of the visual impacts.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's comment regarding the new development at Cattle Market, the assessment considers only existing receptors and does not consider the potential impacts to future visual receptors.</p> <p>Unknown archaeology across the Scheme has been considered from the outset and intrusive and non-intrusive investigations have been undertaken in September 2022, January 2023, February 2023, May 2023 and September to November 2023 to better understand the archaeological resource of the area. Survey results are detailed within Appendix 6.1 (Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and an assessment informed by these survey findings is contained within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Geoarchaeological investigations have been undertaken in May 2023 to understand the potential for late Upper Paleolithic features. Further intrusive and non-intrusive surveys have been undertaken to understand the potential for other periods and where possible the construction and Scheme design has been adjusted to avoid significant effects, as detailed within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Further bespoke works commenced in September 2023 to understand the level of work required before and during the construction phase as well as informing detailed design. These works include additional field walking and metal detecting as well as hand test pit excavation, trail trench evaluation and mechanical test pitting. The results will be analysed and used to prepare the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy in accordance with Requirement 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>). It is considered that the impacts of the Scheme on the archaeology of the area is fully understood, and no new significant impacts are anticipated to be discovered by the upcoming works. The presence of potential archaeology has been assumed as definite across the Scheme, as such all potential archaeology has been accounted for and duly assessed and no additional archaeological impacts are possible.</p> <p>A robust baseline has been produced including all information received from the National Heritage Lists for England, Historic Environment Records, and archaeological works which have already been completed. Survey results are detailed within Appendix 6.1 (Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>), and an assessment informed by these survey findings is contained within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed alongside incoming results from archaeological works and several changes to the design have been implemented including the movement of ponds and the removal of certain areas from the construction plan, as detailed within the embedded mitigation measures contained within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been completed in September 2022, January 2023, and February 2023 and all information analysed and added into the baseline as well as informing the follow on proposed intrusive works. Geoarchaeological coring has been undertaken in May 2023 to understand the geoarchaeological potential and inform further works. Survey results are detailed within Appendix 6.1 (Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Stakeholder engagement; Road layout	<p>RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Discussions between NSDC, National Highways, Network Rail, Lincolnshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council have led to the conclusion that the proposed approach in the vicinity of the Newark Flat crossing will not prejudice future rail improvements. However, it remains important to continue dialogue between all parties at key stages of the</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme design does not preclude a future grade separation of the Nottingham to Lincoln Line over the East Coast Main Line and ongoing engagement will take place with Network Rail and the Department for Transport regarding this, where necessary.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Scheme's development, feeding into and shaping the priorities for addressing the flat crossing as a matter of national and regional importance.			
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Walkers cyclists and horse-riders; Speed limit; Brownhills Junction; A17/A46/A1	<p>ROAD SAFETY</p> <p>There is concern about pedestrian and cycle safety at Brownhill's roundabout. What will be the speed limit on the slip road from the A46 to the pedestrian crossing at Brownhill's Roundabout and will this pose a risk to highway safety?</p> <p>Cllr [redacted] has raised concerns about highway safety on the A1/A46/A17 southbound junction. Accidents have occurred when drivers queue on the A1 southbound to access the Friendly Farmer roundabout. Whilst this Scheme will improve junction capacity thus reducing queues this will not be for a number of years. In the interim the Council would like National Highways to explore options for improving safety at this junction, including appropriate signage which could warn drivers of queuing traffic. Whilst this is not directly related to the design of the A46, it is an important issue which needs to be addressed by National Highways.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The speed limit on the A46 exit slip road at the newly proposed Brownhills Junctions would be 50mph and a signalised crossing would be provided for walkers and cyclists. The proposed speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p> <p>The traffic model forecasts that the Scheme reduces traffic and increases capacity at Friendly Farmer Roundabout, due to the A46 through traffic being removed from the junction.</p> <p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions in order to understand how the new flows and turning movements would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts to optimise their operation, such as changes to signing and road markings.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Non-vehicular movements</p> <p>In the last two years Nottinghamshire County Council has been successful in securing over £7m for on-road cycling improvements from the DfT's Active Travel Fund. As a result of this the County Council has invested heavily in cycling infrastructure in Newark. Between 2017 and 2020, the County Council secured over £1m (of its own and external funding) to deliver 2.5km of off-road segregated cycleway, 10.5km of on-road cycleway and cycle signage in Newark. These improvements provide greater connectivity for cyclist within Newark, particularly between the north of the town and the town centre. It is important to ensure that the proposed A46 Scheme supports improved connections across the A46 and, ideally, offers enhancement. NSDC would reiterate the importance of continued dialogue with Nottinghamshire County Council on such matter to ensure both Schemes are coordinated as much as possible.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Since statutory consultation the Applicant has continued to discuss walking, cycling and horse-riding movements across the A46 with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). This includes retaining and improving walking and cycling routes throughout the Scheme, as well as reducing severance between Winthorpe and south of the A46 via a crossing beneath the A46 alongside the A1 and new crossings provided over Winthorpe Roundabout.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Overall scheme	<p>Crime and the fear of crime</p> <p>In response to previous consultations, Nottinghamshire Police highlighted opportunities to address crime through the design of the Scheme. The District Council concurs with the views of the Police and in the ongoing development of this Scheme encourage National Highways to explore opportunities to design-out crime including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced provision of secure HGV parking. Given the continued investigation into the feasibility of relocating the existing Newark lorry park, this would appear to be a timely suggestion. NSDC and no doubt the Police would welcome opportunity to discuss this matter further; and</li> <li>Investment in Automated Number Plate Recognition could be explored. Any additional equipment needs to be coordinated with Nottinghamshire Police to ensure that the</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>During discussion with the Consultee the Applicant has undertaken a review and amendments to the design proposals along the Great North Road and for the slip roads to Cattle Market Roundabout jointly with technical advisers from the Consultee. In doing so the Applicant has agreed with the Consultee appropriate access requirements for the existing lorry park and has also presented proposals of the impact to the lorry park both during construction and in operation of the road, including that the secure HGV parking that the lorry park offers can be continued.</p> <p>The Scheme would not be providing any new automated number plate recognition cameras; however, installation of this equipment could be coordinated during the construction period if Nottinghamshire Police wanted to provide some equipment of this type. All existing police automated number plate recognition cameras would be relocated. The National Technical Information Service cameras would not be re-located.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		systems are compatible.			
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Air quality	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS</p> <p>Contaminated Land, Air Quality, Noise Air Quality:</p> <p>NSDC Environmental Health welcomes the detailed air quality assessment information set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) and also the design to prevent rather than mitigate issues with the construction phase. However, it is disappointing that no continuous monitoring has been carried out, particularly for PM given the lack of background monitoring data for it. We would strongly encourage this going forward.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Scheme specific diffusion tube monitoring survey for NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations was undertaken to support the air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This survey updated the Applicant's monitoring survey that had been undertaken previously in 2016 and supplements the local authority NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring undertaken within the area as there is minimal local authority monitoring along the A46. Monitoring was undertaken at 27 locations along the Scheme alignment and surrounding areas. The monitoring locations are shown in Figure 5.6 (Air Quality Monitoring Locations) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The monitoring survey commenced in May 2022 and was completed in November 2022.</p> <p>PM monitoring was not required as the main pollutant emitted from road traffic is NO<sub>x</sub> (nitric oxides). NO<sub>x</sub> is primarily made up of NO (nitric oxide) and NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), the latter being of most concern due to its impact on human health and as such monitored by local authorities across the UK. NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the study area are well below the annual mean objective and as PM concentrations from road traffic are a magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub>, the assessment has demonstrated based on background PM data available from the Department for Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs shows that concentrations are low and the impact from the Scheme would not have a significant effect on PM. Therefore, no further PM monitoring is considered necessary.</p> <p>This is supported by the latest annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentration recorded by Newark and Sherwood District Council being 21.8µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which is well below the objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This concentration was recorded on Portland Street in 2018, which is the year Newark and Sherwood District Council's PM<sub>10</sub> unit was destroyed in a road traffic collision. Newark and Sherwood District Council has not yet replaced the unit and as such 2018 is the latest year with PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring data available.</p> <p>Further details on the monitoring undertaken can be found in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Geology and soils	<p>Contaminated Land:</p> <p>Given the proposed use, the sensitivity in terms of human health is low, however section 10 of the PEI Report does consider elevated contamination identified in previous site investigation reports which NSDC Environmental Health doesn't have, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Atkins (2021) A46 Newark Northern Bypass Preliminary Sources Study Report.</li> <li>Atkins (2021) A46 Northern Newark Northern Bypass Environmental Assessment Report Volume I Chapter 9 Geology and Soils.</li> <li>Atkins (2021) Technical Note GI: Summary of key Geological/Geotechnical Findings.</li> <li>Atkins (2021) A46 Newark Northern Bypass – Agricultural Land Classification Survey Technical Note.</li> <li>TetraTech (2022) A46 North Newark Bypass Draft Factual Ground Investigation Report.</li> <li>Zetica UXO website (2022) risk mapping105.</li> </ul> <p>We would therefore request that copies of these are provided and submitted with the DCO application. Environmental Health welcomes the ground investigation which is to be carried out as part of the Environmental Statement.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A detailed assessment of effects associated with contaminated land is contained within Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Previous site investigation reports have supported the assessment set out in Section 9.8 (Baseline Conditions) within Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Some of the technical reports referred to by the Consultee also form technical appendices where required to Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Preliminary Sources Study Report (Atkins 2021) is contained in Appendix 9.1 (A46 Newark Northern Bypass Preliminary Sources Study Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Draft Factual Ground Investigation Report (TetraTech, 2022) is contained in Appendix D of Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Some of these technical reports including (<i>Atkins (2021) Technical Note GI: Summary of key Geological/Geotechnical Findings and Zetica UXO mapping</i>) have informed and been referred to in the Applicant's Ground Investigation Report which is contained in Appendix G of Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The <i>Atkins (2021) A46 Newark Northern Bypass – Agricultural Land Classification Survey Technical Note</i> has informed and been referred to in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 9.3 (Agricultural Land Classification Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><i>Atkins (2021) A46 Northern Newark Northern Bypass Environmental Assessment Report Volume 1 Chapter 9 Geology</i> has also informed Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation additional ground investigation surveys have taken place and the results of these surveys have further informed both the assessment in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the supporting assessments. The Factual Reports associated with these investigations are included in Appendix D of Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>The Atkins (2021) documents, apart from the Preliminary Sources Study Report found in Appendix 9.1 (A46 Newark Northern Bypass Preliminary Sources Study Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) have been superseded and therefore will not be included in the application documentation. Whilst these documents will not be included, the application includes all relevant information.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Noise and vibration; Speed limit	<p>Noise:</p> <p>The proposals for assessment contained in the EIA Scoping Report would appear appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted that local residents have raised concern about noise from road surfaces in the Winthorpe area. They are keen to understand the impact of the proposals in this regard and how such surfacing interacts with any speed limits proposed on the route.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Low noise surfacing is generally considered to be an effective mitigation measure for traffic moving at speeds above 75 km/h and is included throughout the Scheme as part of the Scheme design.</p> <p>For many noise sensitive receptors in Winthorpe the A1 is the dominant source of noise and the noise level changes due to traffic changes on the A1 are negligible. While it is understood that the A1 does not currently incorporate low noise surfacing (control of noise emission from this source is outside the scope of the Scheme), cumulative levels from all highways, including the A1, have been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This will vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. The locations of these are also detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Mitigation measures would control noise emission from the Scheme at all sensitive receptors, including in the Winthorpe area, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> guidelines.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Landscape and visual effects	<p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>As indicated in the Heritage section of this response above, consideration should be given to the visual aspect of the proposal due to the elevated position it would afford to the north of Newark. This will change the visual outlook from surrounding vistas and key elevated vantage points such as the Newark Castle. A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment should be produced with key viewpoints agreed with the Council and especially Conservation Officers.</p> <p>As previously highlighted, the area of open countryside that lies between the built-up area of Newark and the village of Winthorpe is identified in local planning policy (Allocations &amp; Development Management Policies DPD: NUA/OB/1) as the Winthorpe Open Break. The A46 proposals on either side of the new A1 overbridge, will impact significantly upon this open break. This should continue to be regarded as a highly relevant matter in National Highways design of the Scheme. However, it is important to emphasise that there are no statutory landscape designations here and indeed the Winthorpe Open Break is not protected for landscape value reasons. The purpose of the Open Break designation is to retain the identity and characteristics of individual settlements.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken and presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). These captured viewpoints were agreed in consultation with the Newark and Sherwood District Council Conservation and Landscape Officers, from a landscape and heritage perspective. The impacts upon views from surrounding vistas, including Newark Castle have been assessed within the Landscape and Visual Assessment, as well as consideration given to impacts upon the Winthorpe Open Break. Further information is presented within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Outcomes of the assessment have also informed the development of landscape proposals, as presented within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Biodiversity	<p>BIODIVERSITY</p> <p>Concern is raised regarding the impact the A46 Scheme would have on biodiversity, in</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the standards for highways document of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle of this document is to avoid</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>particular Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, and Priority Habitats. Section 9 of the PEI Report indicates:</p> <p>During Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Scheme has the potential to cause damage and the loss of habitats within Local Wildlife Sites. Nine Local Wildlife Sites, designated as SINCS, are located within draft Order Limits.</li> <li>There is the potential for priority habitat, non-priority habitat and veteran and notable trees to be damaged or lost as a result of the construction activities and vegetation clearance required for the Scheme. Additional indirect impacts may also impact habitats through airborne pollution, run-off and compaction of root systems.</li> <li>Vegetation clearance to facilitate construction and temporary construction compounds could result in the permanent and temporary loss of habitats for protected and notable species.</li> <li>Night works could directly disturb nocturnal species such as bats, badger, barn owl and terrestrial invertebrates as a result of increased lighting pollution, noise and vibration. This disturbance could potentially contribute to the displacement of a number of species from the area.</li> </ul> <p>During Operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During operation potential impacts from traffic emissions could lead to increased levels of nitrogen deposition at the Local Wildlife Sites and adversely impact sensitive habitats, veteran trees and species.</li> <li>Once operational, the Scheme would result in the permanent fragmentation of habitats of biodiversity value. In the absence of mitigation, the permanent</li> <li>fragmentation of habitat suitable to support protected and notable species has the potential to adversely affect individual species and their conservation status.</li> <li>Any permanent increase in artificial lighting could adversely affect protected species including bats, barn owl and terrestrial invertebrates. Any potential changes in the drainage regime as a result of all options have the potential to damage GCN, otter and water vole habitat. The creation of a new grade separation across a potential bat and barn owl commuting route could result in bat and barn owl mortality from collisions with traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Core Policy 9 of Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the District by working with partners to implement the aims and proposals of the Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan, the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Nature Conservation Strategy. The Council is a member of the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group (NBAG) which includes a range of partnering agencies and local community groups, including Nottinghamshire County Council and Notts Wildlife Trust. NBAG has recently published a detailed Biodiversity Opportunity Map (BOM) of the district which can be viewed on their website:</p> <p><a href="https://nottsbag.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/The-NewarkSherwood-BOM-ProjectReport-FINAL-April2022-.pdf">https://nottsbag.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/The-NewarkSherwood-BOM-ProjectReport-FINAL-April2022-.pdf</a></p> <p>This is a useful tool which should be used to inform future biodiversity enhancement projects in the district.</p>			<p>potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is contained within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Following evolution of the Scheme design applying the mitigation hierarchy principles, a total of seven Local Wildlife Sites are located within the Order Limits, with a further five Local wildlife Sites immediately adjacent to the Order Limits.</p> <p>It is anticipated that there would be permanent unavoidable loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites, including a significant effect upon Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Site. The habitats within these Local Wildlife Sites do not all align with the citations for their designation and several of these habitats are in poor condition. Compensation planting would be provided and contain habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Sites, for which the sites were designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. The compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the permanent loss of Habitats of Principal Importance, priority habitats and non-priority habitat, Local Wildlife Sites and impacts to protected species. Air pollution is only considered for operation of the Scheme. It also details the mitigation and bespoke compensation packages for any loss.</p> <p>The Scheme design has evolved to avoid impacts to veteran trees where possible. The Scheme would result in unavoidable direct partial impact of the root protection area of three Veteran trees. Mitigation measures set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> would be implemented to reduce impacts on veteran trees including: temporary barriers, Cellweb matting and supervision by the Scheme arboriculturist following the installation of protection measures, during construction, and on completion of construction operations</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy principles have been applied throughout the evolution of the Scheme design and this includes consideration of habitats which could be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed works, either permanently or temporarily. Where the loss of habitats is unavoidable, compensation would be provided and mitigation measures adopted during clearance works, to minimise impacts upon habitats and protected and notable species.</p> <p>Habitat compensation has been informed by the biodiversity net gain assessment which is contained in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Night works and impacts to nocturnal wildlife are localised and for short durations (e.g. weekdays over a period of two weeks). Embedded and essential mitigation (which is set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> would reduce impacts of night works. For example, where possible, daytime works would be undertaken, sensitive periods would be avoided (e.g. lamprey migration), use of task and directional lighting with owls. It is possible that night</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>work activities could potentially contribute to temporary displacement of nocturnal species such as bats, badger, barn owl, fish and terrestrial invertebrates as a result of artificial lighting, noise and vibration. However, with mitigation in place, impacts are reduced and no significant effects on these species are anticipated as a result of night works.</p> <p>The increase in nitrogen deposition during operation of the Scheme is not anticipated to affect the integrity of Habitats of Principal Importance or nitrogen sensitive habitats within designated sites and, subsequently, the animal species they support. Habitats identified within 200m of the affected road network are not highly sensitive (for example, woodland designated for lichens or low nutrients communities, such as chalk grassland) and they are still functional despite current (2022 baseline) exposure to nitrogen in exceedance of critical loads.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> details the planting design that has incorporated retained habitat of biodiversity value to improve connectivity for protected and notable species Scheme-wide and would not result in fragmented habitats or isolation of wildlife populations. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> has been informed by desk study data, survey results and biodiversity net gain metric to achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Protected species survey results have influenced the lighting design by recommending that shorter lighting column and lower luminosity are used adjacent to sensitive areas to prevent a deterrent to movement of crepuscular and nocturnal species (e.g. carriageway over the river). The addition of artificial lighting would be for the purpose of road safety and would be located along the existing A46 carriageway, where the baseline is typical of lighting in an urban setting. This mitigation is secured in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. Surveys have shown barn owls and bats foraging in such areas and therefore, following implementation of mitigation to reduce light splay, wildlife is anticipated to habituate to new levels resulting from the widening of the existing A46 carriageway. Furthermore, the planting design would provide a buffer to light splays as vegetation establishes, as detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The biodiversity net gain assessment contained in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> has sought to align with local priorities set out in the Biodiversity Opportunity Map produced by Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group, where possible. The map produced for Newark and Sherwood District Council is available on their website and sets out a number of opportunities to align with their local priorities. When considering compensatory grassland creation for losses around Cattle Market Roundabout this has been located as close as possible to habitats affected. This aligns with Opportunity 374 to link grasslands in the Kelham/British Sugar area.</p> <p>Other habitat creation would contribute to opportunities 346 (wetland creation on the floodplain) and 347 (wetland creation linked to dualling of the A46 at Newark-on-Trent) by involving new wetland creation in the Trent floodplain and along the road corridor. This would include new grazing marsh, ponds and reedbed as well as the drainage network, which has been designed to maximise its ecological value. The Scheme would also involve new woodland creation along the Scheme route to complement Opportunity 525 (relating to urban tree planting in Newark-on-Trent).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> includes trading rules for woodland, specifically the need to compensate for loss of lowland mixed deciduous woodland in order to achieve a net gain. Some of this would be achieved through woodland creation on site but there is insufficient space to fully compensate within the Scheme Order Limits and therefore it has been necessary to consider other options. The requirement could be met by new woodland planting but this would need land use change in excess of 20ha and take a relatively long time to establish whereas meeting it through woodland enhancement requires only 8ha with no change of land use and would provide the required habitat more quickly. It is intended to carry this out at Doddington Hall within an area that has a sufficient area of woodland of a type and quality suitable to deliver the required enhancement. This is outside the district but within the same National Character Area.</p> <p>The benefits of this include that the woodlands to be enhanced sit within an extensive network of woodland habitat and their enhancement would contribute to improved habitat quality and connectivity. It would also support aspirations of the Greater Lincolnshire Local Nature Partnership to undertake habitat restoration in the area between Doddington Hall Estate and Whisby Nature Park. Local landowners have been consulted but the Applicant is not aware of any others able to help achieve this requirement.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Biodiversity	<p>The Council is aware that Nottinghamshire County Council's Conservation Team has also raised concern about the adverse impact on biodiversity arising from the Scheme proposals. NSDC supports NCC's recommendations with regard to robustly applying the mitigation hierarchy in the delivery of the Scheme (i.e., by avoiding impacts in the first instance), and seeking opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the design of the flood alleviation Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will inevitably lead to the loss of Local Wildlife Site habitat contained within the Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Sites 2/778 at the Cattle Market junction. Unfortunately, these losses are compounded by the location of attenuation basins within two parts of this Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>Given that there appear to be other places within the Scheme boundary in the immediate vicinity of the junction which are not covered by Local Wildlife Sites designation, the attenuation basis should be moved to minimise impacts on designated sites caused by the Scheme and correctly apply the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. by avoiding impacts in the first instance).</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the standards for highways document <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i> and within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The first principle is to avoid potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed the partial permanent loss of Local Wildlife Site habitat, including the Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Site at Cattle Market Junction, with the County Ecologist and Natural England. Re-locating the basins outside of the Local Wildlife Site would require direct run-off against the natural fall of the land as well as the highway, which in turn would lead to piped runs at unrealistic depths or swales having to be raised higher to allow flows to be conveyed towards the basin. The basins are therefore still proposed within the Local Wildlife Site, developed to ensure nature-based solutions are maximised wherever practicable. A compensation package has been designed to provide a greater area of the equivalent habitat type to that lost within each Local Wildlife Site as detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) and Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Biodiversity	<p>The borrow pit and floodplain compensation areas provide an opportunity to create new floodplain habitat on at least some of the land identified. With careful design, wet grassland (to include ditches, pools and scrapes) can be created, providing habitat for things like breeding waders and wintering wildfowl, whilst allowing ongoing farming practices through grazing. Marsh and swamp, reedbed and ponds should also be considered. As part of the design, public access should be provided, where possible, in such a way that does not impinge on farming activities or that would lead to disturbance of wildlife.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Farndon East and Farndon West are proposed as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The main habitats within Farndon West floodplain compensation area include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East floodplain compensation area would also be provided. For these areas in particular, public access is not provided in order to maximise the biodiversity value of the areas (reducing stresses presented by public use, such as dog walking) and also to reduce health and safety risks posed by ponds (former borrow pits which would hold standing water).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Biodiversity	<p>In accordance with the Environment Act 2021, the District Council would support a minimum 10% net gain for biodiversity for the Scheme and would welcome discussions and proposals as to how this would be delivered.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme would result in a predicted overall net gain in biodiversity. However, 10% net gain is not expected to be a requirement for development consent applications until 2025 and is therefore not a legal requirement for this Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Scheme environmental design has sought to create a range of habitats similar to those already present on site and affected by the proposals. This would include habitats of higher biodiversity where possible, for example a species rich grassland is proposed where much of the existing grassland is species poor. The highway drainage has also been designed to provide swales and ponds of value to nature.</p> <p>Further details can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Road drainage and the water environment; Stakeholder engagement	<p><b>FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE</b></p> <p>As National Highways is aware, there is a high level of flood risk associated with large swathes of the land surrounding the A46 corridor between Farndon and the A1. Therefore, the incorporation of a flood mitigation Scheme in this location is welcomed; the detail of this Scheme will be critical. It will be important to continue dialogue with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority (Notts CC), and NSDC as the Scheme progresses to ensure flood risk is fully considered and robustly mitigated. With regard to biodiversity enhancement, it would also be helpful to involve Nottinghamshire County Council's Conservation Team in the design process.</p> <p>One of the main areas of flood risk and concern along the A46 Newark Bypass is the travelling community situated on Tolney Lane. The District Council considers the design and development stages of the A46 upgrade to offer significant potential to collaboratively explore the feasibility of different options to improve conditions on Tolney Lane, specifically during times of heightened flood risk. NSDC are continuing to work with the Environment Agency to explore solutions and are liaising with National Highways in this process.</p> <p>Further to the north of the project area, flood risk mapping indicates a much lower level of risk. This matter is regarded as significant in the process of considering potential design solutions that might mitigate against or lessen the impacts of development on the village of Winthorpe. Local residents are particularly concerned about flooding at the Fleet at Winthorpe and around the showground roundabout. Questions have been raised regarding the capacity of the attenuation ponds. The Council would encourage National Highways to directly liaise with Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board in this respect.</p> <p>These issues should continue to form part of the ongoing discussions between NSDC and National Highways and other relevant stakeholders as the Scheme progresses.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The floodplain compensation area adjacent to Brownhills Junction proposed at statutory consultation has been removed from the Scheme. The Brownhills floodplain compensation area was proposed to cater for mitigating floodplain lost between 8-10m above ordnance datum ground elevations. This mitigation would now be provided by access track drainage ditches and the Farndon East floodplain compensation area, which is a more suitable site due to its hydraulic connectivity to local watercourses.</p> <p>Meetings have been held with Newark and Sherwood District Council to ensure that their works to reduce flood risk to the local community in Tolney Lane are not impacted by the Scheme. Through collaboration between all parties, it is being explored that a copy of the Scheme fluvial hydraulic model be shared with Newark and Sherwood District Council (when the opportunity arises) to coordinate their design work with the Scheme more efficiently and effectively. These matters are set out in a Statement of Common Ground with the Consultee, which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination, further information on the ongoing engagement can be found within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>. The attenuation basins have been sized to discharge to the watercourses at a restricted rate agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) and have been calculated using the upper limit (conservative estimate) of MicroDrainage's Quick storage Estimate. Detailed volume attenuation calculations would be undertaken at the detailed design stage of the Scheme. Engagement with stakeholders, including the Environment Agency, Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Nottinghamshire County Council are ongoing. Regular engagement includes the Flood and Drainage Steering groups, detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment which forms Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Climate	<p><b>CLIMATE</b></p> <p>A climate emergency was declared by the Council on 16 July 2019. NSDC is continuing to develop a district-wide greening programme along with measures to try and reduce our carbon footprint as a Council and a community. This involves working with other stakeholders, such as National Highways.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the A46 upgrade on climate change are largely covered under air quality, flood risk and ecology. During the construction period efforts should be made to maximise re-use of materials excavated within the Scheme and to use locally sourced materials and contractors so as to reduce travel-related emissions.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as the climate emergency declared by Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information and assessment of the Scheme on climate. This mitigation includes measures which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Through the design to date, workshops and engagement between the Consultee and Applicant have occurred focusing on resource efficiency and low carbon opportunities. A number of opportunities raised included further investigation of reusing material from other construction sites or industry in the area. Furthermore, the earthworks have been optimised to reduce the volume of material to be imported. Further information on the reuse of materials can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<b>(TR010065/APP/6.1).</b>
BHLF-559H-RWDM-5	Stakeholder engagement; Land ownership; Overall scheme; Southern Link Road	<p><b>PROCESS</b></p> <p>We note that National Highways intend to apply to the Secretary of State for a DCO in Summer/Autumn 2023. The Council both as local planning authority and as a significant landowner is keen to utilise the period between the close of the statutory consultation and the making of the application to resolve as many issues as possible so that it can publicly state its wholehearted support for the Scheme once the DCO is made.</p> <p>To that end, we would like to be provided with drafts of the order itself and relevant application documents (including the Environmental Statement) as they are produced so that we can work collaboratively with National Highways to agree the requirements to be included in the Order and to inform the local impact report. We would also wish to progress any necessary agreements between National Highways and the Council in its capacities both as local planning authority and as landowner in advance of the application being made.</p> <p>We suggest that it would be helpful for us to meet as soon as possible in the New Year to discuss how the Council and National Highways can most effectively progress discussions.</p> <p><b>CONCLUDING COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Council welcomes the continued progress on the A46 Newark Bypass Scheme. Subject to consideration of matters raised in this consultation response and any necessary mitigation to address these concerns, the Council remains of the opinion that the successful delivery of the Bypass is essential nationally, regionally, and locally in order to maintain and enhance growth aspirations for the majority of residents and businesses.</p> <p>Prior to and during the construction stage, traffic management engagement and communication will need to be extensive and in consultation with local organisations and communities. Additionally, there remains the potential to utilise new infrastructure, such as a completed SLR, to be part of this solution. Failure to deliver the SLR allowing a connection between the A46 and the A1 poses a significant risk to greater congestion in the area. On this basis, NSDC welcome the opportunity for more specific and detailed discussions with National Highways at the ongoing regular meetings.</p> <p>It is hoped that you find these comments helpful. Newark and Sherwood District Council look forward to working collaboratively with the community and National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council as the Local Transport Authorities in determining the final detailed design and delivery of the A46.</p>	N/A	N	<p>During the pre-application process, the Applicant has engaged with the Consultee. If necessary, the Applicant will re-engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues, and to support the development of a Statement of Common Ground which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> will be available for viewing by the Consultee at submission. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee regarding the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXK-Q	Consultation - general; Overall scheme	<p>Thank you for consulting North Kesteven District Council on the proposals to improve the A46 Newark Bypass, noting the consultation period runs from Wednesday 26 October to Monday 12 December 2022.</p> <p>North Kesteven DC is a neighbouring local authority and not a host authority.</p> <p>The Council has previously raised the question as to why there is no socio-economic chapter setting out the costs versus benefits of the proposed Scheme and articulating how its delivery might benefit the wider sub-regional economy through improved connectivity and reduced congestion. The A17 and A46 are key entry points into North Kesteven and are therefore regarded as important economic assets for this Council individually and as part of Central Lincolnshire (we share a plan-making role with City of Lincoln and West Lindsey for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan). Whilst no specific chapter is referenced within the suite of documents the Council has concluded, that nonetheless the Scheme offers potential benefits for the economy of North Kesteven through improved and more reliable accessibility to Sleaford and the south of the district and for wider Central Lincolnshire via A46 to Lincoln and beyond to the A15 corridor towards the Humber. The Council therefore supports the proposals.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on the social economic baseline of the local area, which includes employment and deprivation statistics. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes that the operation of the Scheme would have a beneficial impact on local businesses due to the reduced congestion and improved journey times that the Scheme would deliver. Further information regarding the Scheme can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWD1-9	Consultation - general	<p>Thank you for giving North Lincolnshire Council the opportunity to comment on the A46 Newark Bypass Project.</p> <p>I can confirm that North Lincolnshire Council has not comments to make in respect of the proposed development. It is unlikely that NLC will wish to register as an Interested party or take an active role in the examination of this DCO application when it is submitted.</p>	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Introductory text	<p>A46 Newark Bypass – Statutory Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 21st October 2022 and the opportunity to respond to this statutory consultation. Nottinghamshire County Council welcomes the ongoing involvement with this nationally significant infrastructure project it is noted that there are several areas where further detail of the final Scheme design is required. The Council therefore looks forward to continued close working with National Highways to ensure that any remaining concerns are addressed in the final design and mitigation strategy for this Scheme.</p> <p>To provide a coordinated Council response to this consultation, detailed comments have been sought from relevant teams across the authority. These are summarised within the body of this letter/ but have been appended in full. Please note that colleagues from the Council's Rights of Way and Countryside Access team will be responding separately to this consultation.</p> <p>The A46 around Newark-on-Trent is the only remaining single carriageway section of this key strategic trunk road and this part of the network suffers from severe congestion, has a poor safety record, and inhibits growth in the local area. The County Council has consistently campaigned for improvements to the A46 Newark Bypass and strongly supports these proposals which are expected to bring significant transport and economic benefits to the area, unlocking future housing and employment growth.</p>	N/A	N	The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Walkers cyclists and horse-riders; A1; Congestion	<p>The reduced congestion and delays will significantly improve journey time reliability and network resilience, also improving local air quality. Separating the A46 through traffic from the local traffic network will improve the safety of road users, pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. The proposals will reduce pressure on the A1 junctions and reduce traffic conflicts as the majority of the A46 traffic will be able to bypass the complicated A1/A17 junction. However, accidents on/ around the A1 could still result in potential delays.</p> <p>The County Council would like to see additional measures put in place to address the problem of stationary vehicles queuing on the A1 southbound approach to the A17 junction. Whilst the A46 Scheme should help to alleviate this in the long term, there have been many accidents here and it poses a significant ongoing safety risk. It is suggested that National Highways consider more immediate additional warning measures such as using the interactive overhead gantry signs to warn drivers of potential queuing traffic.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions in order to understand how the new flows and turning movements would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts to optimise their operation, such as changes to signing and road markings.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Biodiversity; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The Council welcomes the revisions which have been made to the proposed route in response to previous consultation which will reduce the visual impact on the village of Winthorpe and reduce noise and vibration impacts on Winthorpe Conservation Area. However, the proposed grade separation as part of Cattle Market junction will increase visual impact for residents on the northern edge of Newark. The smaller footprint of the Scheme should reduce the overall impacts on biodiversity and flood risk although these will still need to be addressed as set out in the accompanying detailed comments.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The design has been developed to meet the Scheme objectives and adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the standards for highways document of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle is to avoid potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts.</p> <p>At Cattle Market Junction, mitigation planting to reduce the impacts of the junction upon properties at Sandhills Park would be provided in order to soften the visual prominence of the structure and screen where possible. Details of the environmental design can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and further explained within Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Stakeholder engagement	<p>At this stage there are several detailed areas of the Scheme design which cannot be finalised until the current consultation has been completed and further mitigation measures agreed. These include detailed traffic modelling and Schemes of mitigation to address flood, heritage, ecology, landscape, rights of way, minerals safeguarding and construction waste management. The Council is therefore unable to comment in detail on these aspects until the final design is available and wishes to remain a key statutory consultee and interested party throughout this process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these outstanding matters to be agreed, the Council wishes to make several specific comments at this stage which have been appended to this letter. The Council remains appreciative of the ongoing engagement with National Highways and looks forward to further detailed working on this project.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me in the meantime if have any queries about the Council's response or require any further information.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from the Consultee to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues if necessary. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>Additional information regarding to traffic modelling and rights of way is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) and Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the impact of the Scheme on mineral safeguarding areas and construction waste. The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), details measures to reduce the use of materials and the amount of waste generated which would be implemented during works.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Consultation - general; Traffic forecasts; Stakeholder engagement; Newark Showground	<p>Detailed transport comments</p> <p>The proposed works and consultation do not appear to be supported by any form of Transport Assessment or formal modelling documentation. Without this we are unable to ascertain what potential impacts on the wider highway network across Nottinghamshire will be or indeed whether the proposed junctions which intersect with County Road network are of sufficient capacity to cater for the anticipated levels of traffic. We would welcome the chance to review this when it has been completed.</p> <p>Any works on the County Road network will be need be subject to some form of cross boundary agreement under the relevant sections (4 or 8) of Highways Act 1980 and as such will be subject to technical design checks and safety audits at this time. As part of this process there will be a need to agree future maintenance boundaries, responsibilities, and costs. This will also need to consider appropriate tie-ins to the county highway network where relevant and how construction will take place. As part of the detailed design, we are also keen to make sure that every opportunity is taken to future proof access arrangements to Newark Showground.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Traffic modelling has been carried out to support the development of the Scheme. The results of this traffic modelling are described in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage regularly with representatives from Nottinghamshire County Council to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant design issues, and to support the development of a Statement of Common Ground which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the examination.</p> <p>The approach relating to Newark Showground continues to be discussed as part of ongoing regular meetings with the Consultee. A 'left-in' junction has been provided to the Newark Showground site from the Friendly Farmer Link Road and a 'left-out' junction onto Drove Lane to allow traffic to be better managed during show days. This is presented in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Material assets and waste; Stakeholder engagement; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Planning Policy comments</p> <p>As the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, it is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council to form policies and determine applications relating to minerals and waste. Any development proposal within the County, including for the proposed A46 Newark bypass Scheme therefore should consider both the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021) and Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002) and the Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2013), forming part of the statutory Development Plan. These plan documents are considered to be important and relevant to the ultimate decision to be reached under the 2008 Planning Act.</p> <p>The County Council have the following minerals and waste comments to make on the latest consultation documents for the proposed A46 bypass Scheme. The Council would also highlight that no consultation specific to material assets and waste has been undertaken to date including with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The Council would welcome engagement with National Highways on these issues prior to the DCO application being made.</p> <p>Minerals</p> <p>As identified in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report, whilst the exact quantities of minerals required for the development is currently unknown, considering the number of active quarries nearby and the landbank for sand and gravel and Sherwood</p>	N/A	N	<p>The availability of Mineral Safeguarding Area and/or peat resources has been reviewed and summarised within Section 10.8 (Baseline Conditions) of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). There is one Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel within 500m of the Order Limits, but no peat resources.</p> <p>The Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021), the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002) and the Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2013) have been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects for material assets and waste generation and management within Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The potential impact on Mineral Safeguarding Areas has been considered within Section 10.9 (Potential Impacts) of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Paragraph 10.9.9 the chapter states "As indicated in the baseline study, sand and gravel have high reserves and landbank within Nottinghamshire (paragraph 10.8.10 and Table 10-6), which have been confirmed by Nottinghamshire County Council. The size of this MSA is significantly greater than the size of the Scheme. The total area of the Scheme within the MSA represents approximately 0.48 percent of the MSA area (paragraph 10.8.21)". Therefore, the Scheme is considered unlikely to have an impact on sterilisation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Additionally, the Scheme is not likely to represent a risk to the Mineral Safeguarding Areas, as outlined in paragraph 10.8.22. The assessment for sterilisation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas has been undertaken in Table 10-18 of</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Sandstone, as detailed in the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA, Published 2021 containing 2020 sales data for minerals), there should be sufficient availability of mineral to support the project and not place undue pressure on resource availability. It is also noted that any crushed rock required will need to be imported from neighbouring areas as there is no hard rock quarries in operation in Nottinghamshire currently. The Council would highlight that an updated LAA, containing 2021 sales data, will soon be published, and should be used in future assessments for this proposal.</p> <p>Whilst the PEI report states that the proposed development is not in a Mineral Safeguarded Area (paragraph 11.11.5), this is incorrect as the Scheme does fall within the Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Area for Sand and Gravel. As per Policy SP7 of the adopted Minerals Local Plan, any non-mineral development within the minerals safeguarding area will need to demonstrate it will not needlessly sterilise the minerals resource. Where this cannot be demonstrated, and there is a clear need for non-mineral development, prior extraction will be sought where practical. In some cases, large scale prior extraction might not be practical, however consideration should also be given to the potential use of minerals extracted as a result of on-site ground works rather than simply treating them as a waste material.</p> <p>Large areas of land are denoted for possible flood attenuation areas and/or borrow pits. The lack of refined detail on these aspects is disappointing given their potential size and local environmental impact, including during construction. Impacts of these aspects upon the local communities of Kelham, Averham, Farndon and Winthorpe are unclear. Regard should be had to policies DM13 (Incidental Mineral Extraction) and DM15 (Borrow Pits) for these aspects.</p> <p>Part of the flood attenuation area near Kelham within the Scheme is part of a proposed site for a sand and gravel quarry that was put forward during the Call for sites consultation in the Minerals Local Plan process. This site was not taken forward as an allocation within the now adopted Minerals Plan, but the submission of the site indicates that this is a potentially viable area for extraction.</p> <p>In order to promote the sustainable use of natural resources the use of recycled and secondary materials should be maximised as far as practically possible where this meets the required construction specification. For example, Pulverised and Incinerator Fuel Ash is locally available.</p> <p>Waste</p> <p>In relation to waste, the PEI report follows local and national policy in the drive to avoid and minimise waste and apply the waste hierarchy in handling waste. The report notes that there will be waste generated from the site that will need to be handled at different levels of the hierarchy and so considers the availability of local waste management sites, including landfill. However, the list of sites included does not consider the planning position of the sites and so further assessment is required of whether there is sufficient capacity to handle the waste.</p> <p>In terms of landfill, the nearest non-hazardous landfill site at Staple quarry now has no remaining capacity and is now closed other than for restoration materials and soils. However, there is a real need for restoration materials and topsoils in order to complete its restoration and so this may still be a viable option to the Scheme. There is one remaining landfill site still accepting non-hazardous within the County at Daneshill, north of Retford, which is not identified in table 11.15. This site also requires significant volumes of restoration/capping materials and soils. It should be noted that Serlby quarry landfill no longer has planning permission for tipping and is subject to restoration without any further imported waste materials. The ash lagoons at Cottam, Ratcliffe on Soar and Bole Ings are also not open tipping sites and can only accept power station residues under the terms of their respective planning permissions. Similarly, the British Sugar Borrow Pits is a restricted user site and only has permission to accept soils from beet washings at the factory. A significant proportion of the assumed landfill capacity therefore does not exist, either because the sites are no longer available or have limited capacity or because there are planning restrictions preventing</p>			<p>Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, it is considered that the Scheme is unlikely to sterilise Mineral Safeguarding Area and/or peat resources.</p> <p>The updated Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Local Aggregates Assessment (2021 sales data) was used to inform the assessment in Table 10-6 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will ensure that engagement with host local authorities continues. These matters will be detailed in the Statement of Common Ground, which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. A previously proposed the floodplain compensation area adjacent to Brownhills Junction has been removed from the Scheme.</p> <p>Regard has been given to policies <i>DM13 (Incidental Mineral Extraction)</i> and <i>DM15 (Borrow Pits)</i> for these aspects. These are documented in Table 10-1 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to population and human health during construction and operation (including construction of the borrow pits) are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health and communities from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The Scheme would use recycled and secondary materials wherever technically appropriate and financially feasible. This is in line with guidance from the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 110 - Material assets and waste</i>, which presents the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects on material assets and waste from the delivery of motorway and all-purpose trunk road projects. This has been stated as part of mitigation measures in Table 10-17 and Table 10-18 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Further details of these mitigation measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The landfill capacities available at the end of 2021 (latest available figures from Waste Data Interrogator) are stated in Table 10-11, Table 10-12 and Table 10-14 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Section 10.8 (Baseline Conditions) of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> states that the latest available information on the remaining landfill capacity (2021) was checked for the Nottinghamshire area and East Midlands region, including the permit status (i.e. if the landfills are still active and have remaining capacity) of the landfills where publicly available. The information aims to indicate the regional landfill capacity and possibility to accept waste from the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 10-11, Table 10-12 and Table 10-14 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> do not include Staple Quarry into the remaining landfill capacity void due to it currently being closed. Serlby Quarry Landfill, Cottam Ash Disposal Site, Ratcliffe on Soar, Bole Ings Ash Disposal Site and British Sugar Borrow</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>importation of waste. Further planning approvals and/or variations would need to be sought from the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority to either add capacity of change the planning conditions/terms.</p> <p>There are a number of smaller waste transfer facilities in the local area as listed in table 11.16. Again, the planning status of these sites has not been considered as several sites listed do not operate and do not have permission.</p> <p>The Veolia Waste Transfer Station may have limited commercial capacity as most of its capacity is needed to service the public waste and recycling collection services under contract through the County Council.</p> <p>The wider need for waste management capacity within the County is currently being studied as part of the development of a new Waste Local Plan. Further information will become available throughout the progression of the plan.</p> <p>It is not clear to what extent the project will be able to manage waste on-site (including compound sites) and within the terms of a DCO permission, or whether off-site temporary facilities would be required for a temporary period. Previous infrastructure projects locally have required off-site locations that have gone through the local planning process with NCC as the waste planning authority.</p>			<p>Pits have been included and listed in these tables because these are listed by the Environment Agency as permitted and active sites with remaining landfill capacity. These sites are within Nottinghamshire. Table 10-12 and Table 10-14 indicates the landfills that have been confirmed by Nottingham County Council as not suitable to receive waste generated by the Scheme and has not been included for impact assessment for waste generated.</p> <p>Table 10-11 outlines the inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity (in 2021) in the East Midlands region. Table 10-14 includes permitted and active inert and non-hazardous landfills within 50 km of the Scheme, including landfills outside of Nottinghamshire but within the East Midlands region. Therefore, there is likely sufficient landfill capacity in proximity to the Scheme.</p> <p>Not all landfill may be suitable for accepting waste generated by the Scheme, and the Principal Contractor should verify the landfill is permitted to accept the waste generated by the Scheme. This includes the excavated materials generated by the Scheme, which may be suitable for restoration and capping purposes at Staple Quarry, Daneshill Landfill or any other facility.</p> <p>An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been developed. This can be found within Appendix B.1 (Outline Site Waste Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), which outlines how waste would be managed during construction. An Outline Soil Management Plan has been developed. This can be found within Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which outlines how soils would be managed during construction. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, which will include a Site Waste Management Plan, a Materials Management Plan, a Soils Management Plan and additional mitigation measures, to be implemented during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The waste hierarchy would be followed for waste management and waste would be reused on site wherever technically appropriate and economically feasible. Where required, waste would be sent to off-site permitted waste management facilities for recovery and recycling. Table 10-13 of Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) outlines permitted waste management facilities within 10 km from the Scheme. Not all treatment facilities may be suitable for accepting waste generated by the Scheme, and further facilities may be required, following the proximity principle when possible.</p> <p>The Site Waste Management Plan aims to ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy and relevant legislation, the Materials Management Plan aims to provide suitable ways to reuse site-won material within the Scheme and in accordance with the Contaminated Land: Application in Real Environments Code of Practice. The Soil Management Plan ensures that soils would be managed in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance and aims to also ensure the quality of soil won from the Scheme so it would maintain suitable quality to be reused within the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Cultural heritage; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Archaeology comments</p> <p>National Highways has already discussed potential impacts and started on a program of investigations to understand the archaeological resource and devise an appropriate program of mitigation. This will need to be agreed with Council officers as part of the DCO application process.</p> <p>Built heritage conservation comments</p> <p>Consultation with Newark and Sherwood DC conservation and Historic England built heritage officers did not include NCC's building conservation officer who will be making a primary consultation input into any planning submission. With regards to the commitment provided in 7.8.4 of the ESR, 'in depth analysis of the design of the Scheme to understand the potential</p>	N/A	N	<p>The initial archaeological investigations have been completed and provide sufficient information to inform the Scheme design and the assessment contained within Chapter (6 Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Ongoing works will be used to finalise a programme of archaeological recording prior to construction which will be included in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy in accordance with Requirement 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council's Senior Practitioner Historic Buildings has been invited to review the impact assessments on built heritage within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and give their opinion. A stakeholder meeting was held on 3 May 2023 to which Nottinghamshire County Council were invited but unable to attend. Minutes and the presentation from the meeting were subsequently emailed to Nottinghamshire County Council's Senior Practitioner Historic Buildings for review and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>impacts on listed buildings, conservation areas and unknown archaeological remains' that it is indicated will include consulting the ZTV, this should include the use of photomontage and wireframe imagery from key heritage set as receptors in the LVIA. Consultation with NCC, NSDC and HE to determine which receptors to include should take place and must include consideration of noise and light impacts.</p> <p>It is worth emphasising that there will be impacts from the works on the 'setting' of designated and non-designated heritage assets, especially as a result of the Cattle Market Junction design and the new alignment at Brownhills. The Cattle Market design will also directly impact on two grade II listed sections of Smeaton's Arches (National References: 1045946 and 1297727). Harm or loss of a designated heritage asset is covered in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 200 as follows:</p> <p><i>200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.</i></p>			<p>comment. A reply was emailed on 22 June 2023, stating that no additional input was proposed by Nottinghamshire County Council following that offered by Newark and Sherwood District Council in the meeting. Further engagement will be sought with the Nottinghamshire County Council Senior Practitioner Historic Buildings as appropriate during Examination. Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>In line with Requirement 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) the Applicant will be developing its Archaeological Mitigation Strategy in consultation and agreement with Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>To inform the assessment, visual receptors have been identified with support from a digital Zone of Theoretical Visibility. This uses geographic information system software to identify the theoretical areas from which the Scheme may be visible. Visual receptor locations have been agreed with Newark and Sherwood District Council. Four photomontages have been produced from a select number of key visual receptors which were locations that the Applicant felt would most clearly explain the Scheme and its main elements. Further information is contained within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the photomontages can be viewed in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Setting impacts as a result of the Cattle Market Junction have been identified and assessed within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The need for appropriate mitigation has been incorporated into the design and has informed the assessment of likely significant effects. Embedded mitigation measures are detailed within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), and the environmental design is presented on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Further details of mitigation, such as open area archaeological excavation, are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) and will be implemented prior to and during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Paragraph 200 (as it was at the time) of the National Planning Policy Framework has been taken into consideration during the assessment. There is not considered to be a loss of significance to the majority of built heritage assets, and where there is impact on setting it is less than substantial. Partial loss of fabric from the 1922 section of one element of Smeaton's Arches minimises the impact on historic fabric of greater significance and amounts to less than substantial harm. Further reference to National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks can be found in Section 2 of Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Biodiversity	<p>Ecology comments</p> <p>The Scheme will inevitably lead to the loss of Local Wildlife Site habitat contained within the Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Sites 2/778 at the Cattle Market junction. Unfortunately, these losses are compounded by the location of attenuation basins within two parts of this Local Wildlife Sites. Given that there appear to be other places within the DOL boundary in the immediate vicinity of the junction which are not covered by Local Wildlife Sites designation, the attenuation basin should be moved to minimise impacts on designated sites caused by the Scheme and correctly apply the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. by avoiding impacts in the first instance).</p> <p>Regarding specific sections of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para. 9.5.9: NVC surveys should also be undertaken of affected Local Wildlife Sites grasslands (recognising that some may have decline in quality and therefore no longer be</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>Re-locating the basins outside of the Local Wildlife Site would require direct run-off against the natural fall of the land as well as the highway, which in turn would lead to piped runs at unrealistic depths or swales having to be raised higher to allow flows to be conveyed towards the basin. The basins are therefore still proposed within the Local Wildlife Site but have been developed to ensure nature-based solutions are maximised wherever practicable. A compensation package has been designed to provide the equivalent habitat type to that lost within each Local Wildlife Site, details of which can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Habitats within the Scheme study area were initially identified, classified and mapped in accordance with the Joint Nature Conservation Committee's <i>Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey</i>. The habitats identified are detailed within Appendix E (Phase 1 Habitat survey maps) of Appendix 8.1 (Extended Phase 1 Habitat Technical Report), of the Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>'good quality semi-improved grassland', but it will be important that this can be evidenced).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para. 9.5.11: It would be advisable for wintering bird surveys to be carried out during November and December this year, as well as March next year, to cover the whole winter period.</li> <li>• Para. 9.5.13: There is no reference to breeding bird surveys here, this is presumably an accidental omission given Appendix C indicates that breeding bird surveys have been completed.</li> <li>• Para. 9.5.13: Consideration should also be given to common toad and common frog breeding in ponds and borrow pits adjacent to the A46, given these are Section 41 species.</li> </ul> <p>The following should also be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocation of balancing ponds at the Cattle Market junction to reduce impacts on the Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Sites 2/778</li> <li>• Para 9.10.4 states that National Highways have 'a target of Biodiversity Net Gain by 2040', then stating that the Scheme 'aims to achieve a biodiversity net gain... to include the creation of an equal or greater area of similar habitat to that lost'; note that this in itself will not necessarily achieve the statutory minimum of 10% net gain, and that as per para 9.10.5, 'no net loss' is not the same as 'net gain'; development of the Scheme to achieve 10% net gain will therefore be needed, as indicated.</li> </ul>			<p>Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Habitats identified during the Phase 1 habitat survey as potential Priority Habitats and any Local Wildlife Site habitats (including grasslands) were subsequently subject to a National Vegetation Classification survey to confirm the habitat classification against the Local Wildlife Site citation (Appendix 8.2 (National Vegetation Classification) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>)). The following communities were found to be present within the survey area; MG1, MG4, MG5, OV26, W8 and W10. Where appropriate, all accessible habitats were subject to habitat condition assessments with reference to the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Technical Supplement (Panks et al., 2022)</i>.</p> <p>A precautionary approach has been taken to assigning condition for baseline habitats where condition was not assessed as part of the Phase 1 Habitat survey/where no National Vegetation Classification surveys were undertaken, due to access constraints. In these cases, the baseline condition was precautionarily assessed as good This is also applicable to habitats located within all Local Wildlife Sites potentially impacted by the Scheme.</p> <p>Wintering bird surveys were carried out across four visits in January to February 2022 and November to December 2022. This is in line with the core survey months for wintering birds (with reference to the Bird Survey Guidelines, birdsurveyguidelines.org and <i>Bibby et al., 2000, Bird Census Techniques</i>). Transect routes were devised to survey a representative sample of the habitats within a 1km buffer of the Order Limits and were surveyed once per survey visit. Further details are available in Appendix 8.6 (Wintering Bird Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Field surveys and subsequent mapping of species richness and abundance for breeding birds were undertaken across eleven transects, once a month during the 2022 breeding season (between April to September inclusive). Breeding bird surveys were carried out across six visits between April to August 2022, inclusive. Further details are available in Appendix 8.5 (Breeding Bird Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The common frog and common toad are widespread in the county and protection of sites are not considered to have any meaningful impacts on their conservation status. These species have been scoped out of targeted surveys with no concerns being raised by the Planning Inspectorate to this approach in their Scoping Opinion (<b>TR010065/APP/6.10</b>). Despite being scoped out of targeted surveys, the impacts and mitigation provided for protected species would benefit local populations of common frog and common toad. A desk study of biological records returned three records of common frog and one record of common toad within the Order Limits (data from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre).</p> <p>No ponds would be directly impacted (lost) or indirectly impacted (e.g. degradation of habitat from pollution) during construction, as there are no viable hydrological pathways between ponds identified and the Order Limits. In the poor semi-improved grassland adjacent, west of the A46 the borrow pits comprise predominantly of arable land and frogs have been recorded during other protected species surveys, Old Trent Dyke east of the A46 is scrubbed over and dry for the most part, reducing its suitability for amphibians.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to be implemented during construction (detailed in Section 8.10 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>)) include a pre-works search by the Ecological Clerk of Works prior to vegetation clearance/brush removal to check for notable faunal species such as hedgehog and toad resting places. Landscape planting, creation of refugia for reptiles and creation of Farndon Borrow Pit wetland areas comprising of a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland are considered to have a beneficial effect on the local population of common frog and common toad by providing suitable habitat and improvement of existing. The environmental design for these areas can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>This mitigation is also secured through the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be further developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan prior to construction. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. However, 10% net gain is not expected to be a requirement for development consent applications until 2025 and is therefore not a legal requirement for this Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme's environmental design has sought to create a range of habitats similar to those already present on site and affected by the proposals. This would include habitats of higher biodiversity where possible, for example a species rich grassland is proposed where much of the existing grassland is species poor. The highway drainage has also been designed to provide swales and ponds of value to nature. Further details can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Biodiversity	The borrowpit and floodplain compensation areas provide an opportunity to create new floodplain habitat on at least some of the land identified. With careful design, wet grassland (to include ditches, pools and scrapes) can be created, providing habitat for things like breeding waders and wintering wildfowl, whilst allowing ongoing farming practices through grazing. Marsh and swamp, reedbed and ponds should also be considered. As part of the design, public access should be provided, where possible, in such a way that does not impinge on farming activities or that would lead to disturbance of wildlife.	N/A	N	<p>Farndon East and Farndon West would be provided as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. For these areas in particular, public access is not provided in order to maximise the biodiversity value of the areas (reducing stresses presented by public use, such as dog walking) and also to reduce health and safety risks posed by ponds (former borrow pits which would hold standing water).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Flood risk comments</p> <p>As Lead Local Flood Authority we are liaising with the design team to ensure the final proposals do not put the development at risk of flooding nor does it increase the risk of flooding to the surrounding areas. We expect our involvement to continue through the lifetime of the design process to ensure our Flood Risk considerations are met.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with host local authorities including Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council, and statutory environment bodies, including the Environment Agency, as part of a Flood and Drainage Steering Group. This group provided the means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of stakeholders on relevant design issues, and to support the development of Statements of Common Ground with those relevant parties, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been produced, which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Local transport comments</p> <p>Our interest mainly lies in promoting opportunities to encourage cycling and walking. The county council is currently developing a joint Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan along with other D2N2 authorities at Derby City, Derbyshire County Council and Nottingham City Council. Public engagement on the proposed document and its accompanying strategic cycle network is due to begin shortly. As part of this work, we are proposing to develop or improve a network of routes in and around Newark (see attachment). This is a long-term and</p>	N/A	N	<p>Since statutory consultation the Applicant has continued to discuss walking, cycling and horse-riding movements across the Scheme with relevant stakeholders such as local host authorities including Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan with the Consultee. The Scheme is not assisting with any of the short-term aspirations of this plan as the locations are outside of the Scheme Order Limits, however, all new walking and cycling</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		ambitious programme. It has yet to be formally approved by the County Council, but we intend to seek approval once our public engagement exercise has been completed and the results analysed. Several routes intersect with the A46 project and we would be keen to ensure that LTN 1/20-compliant cycle routes and crossing facilities are provided at the appropriate points in order to ensure that our proposals are not severed or unnecessarily compromised by the Trunk Road Scheme.			<p>infrastructure within the Scheme would be 3m wide. This would assist with the long-term plans from Winthorpe to Farndon through the town and for a route that passes through Cattle Market.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>. This includes retaining and improving walking, cycling and horse-riding routes throughout the Scheme, as well as reducing severance between Winthorpe and south of the A46 via a crossing beneath the A46 alongside the A1 and new crossings provided over Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to <i>be Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) will be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Rights of Way comments</p> <p>The Rights of Way team are working with the applicant and will be responding separately following approval by Chair of Planning and Rights of Way Committee.</p>	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWDR-A	Stakeholder engagement	<p>Property comments</p> <p>The Council's property team are aware of the proposals and have expressed their STRONG concerns about the temporary sterilisation of this land (which has been identified as a site with development potential). We would welcome more detailed discussions on this proposal as a matter of urgency, to include the potential for compensation for the delay in the Council being able to dispose of this site.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee with regards to the former highway depot site, which they are referring to in their comments. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee relating to the use of this site as a temporary construction compound as part of the Scheme. Further details regarding the location of these compounds can be found with the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Introductory text; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Thank you for consulting with NCC's Countryside Access Team. These notes are the Team's initial response to the consultation. As National Highways are aware there is continuing dialogue with the Countryside Access Team, the Newark Active Travel Group and Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum.</p> <p>There are a number of public rights of way (Row) recorded on the County's Definitive Map and Statement which are within the red line boundary of the Scheme as well as a number of paths which are affected just outside of this red line boundary. NCC will work with National Highways and its partners to ensure that the correct alignments and status are duly noted. Any inaccuracies or misalignments of the rights of way on future legal Orders may result in legal anomalies generating further issues and problems.</p> <p>The generic term 'Non-Motorised User Route' (NMU) is used throughout the proposal. This covers Row, unrecorded paths of unclear status, adopted paths which are not footways, cycleways and other paths of differing status. Once again, this will be picked up as the dialogue between NCC and NH continues.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with representatives from Nottinghamshire County Council Countryside Access Team as part of A46 Active Travel Working Group meetings. This has enabled the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise of the Consultee on relevant active travel design issues.</p> <p>Engagement with the A46 Active Travel Partnership has influenced the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes developed as part of the Scheme, including a signalised walking and cycling route across Winthorpe Roundabout between the A1133 and Drove Lane. Engagement has also resulted in a change being made to a walking and cycling route at Brownhills Junction. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Where temporary diversions are required as part of the Scheme, advanced detail will be required so that any temporary diversions are assessed and checked for safety and suitability. For example, when temporarily diverting a public bridleway, alternatives will need to be suitable for walkers, equestrians and cyclists. Ideally, TTROs will be kept as brief as possible to ensure minimum disruption to users of the paths.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The diversion proposals for walking, cycling and horse-riding routes have been presented and discussed with representatives of the A46 Active Travel Partnership and members of Nottinghamshire County Council. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are included in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The Applicant will continue to work closely with interested parties to ensure that the diversion routes are safe and appropriately signed. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Farndon A46 roundabout:</p> <p>The land which is set out for the works compound adjacent to Crees Lane has a number of unrecorded desire lines through it. It would be advantageous to see these formally recorded and set out following completion of the Scheme. Currently these paths are used to link the existing underpass with Farndon Footpath No.5 and Bridleway No.2. As per the comment above regarding temporary traffic regulation orders, the temporary closure of Bridleway No.2 will have a substantial impact of NMUs using this bridleway. Therefore, there needs to be a suitable alternative.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The unrecorded desire lines are on a piece of land that has been identified for temporary use as part of Scheme, any activity to formally record these desire lines as Public Rights of Way would need to be undertaken by stakeholders, including the Consultee, outside of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Following feedback received as part of the statutory consultation, the temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 was changed, and an alternative route was presented as part of the targeted consultation on the Scheme. Following further feedback received as part of the targeted consultation the route for equestrians is now different than that for walkers and cyclists. The temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 would only be for use by equestrians. Pedestrians and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Cattle Market Roundabout:</p> <p>Newark Footpath No.14 is currently severed by the existing A46. The proposal to extinguish this must be mitigated by the provision of suitable shared use paths between the Old Kelham Road and the A617 / Rugby Club. For example, segregated paths, suitably signed, marked out, widened where required along with the provision of light controlled crossings.</p> <p>Newark Bridleway No.6, Newark Footpath No.66 and Newark Footpath No.48 will be affected by the works. NCC will require further detail on how these paths will be managed during the works including access across the Trent via Fiddlers Elbow Bridge. There also appears to be an anomaly on Bridleway No.6 regarding alignment of the legal definitive line. This can be picked up as part of the ongoing discussions.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Users of Newark Footpath FP14 would use the existing walking route to the Cattle Market Junction, where suitable shared use provision is provided around the junction. Signalised crossings are provided, allowing access between the A617 and Great North Road.</p> <p>Newark Footpath FP66 would remain operational during the works as would Newark Bridleway BW5, which crosses Fiddler's Elbow Bridge.</p> <p>Newark Bridleway BW6 would require temporary closures for the installation of the temporary access bridge as well as during the lifting operations associated with the new bridge construction over the bridleway. Closures would be minimised where practicable with the use of marshals to maintain access.</p> <p>A diversion would be in place for Newark Footpath FP48#1 for 24 months. This would follow</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Newark Footpath No.48 follows Quibell's Lane to the north and then west to cross the railway line at-grade adjacent to the Seven Trent Water Treatment site. There is a desire line which goes north and then under the railway via a cattle-creep to join Newark Bridleway No.6. A formalised and recorded link here would improve safe access for all and provide a much-needed link in the public rights of way network.			<p>south on Quibell's Lane to join Newark Bridleway BW10 across the Lincoln Road Railway Bridge, joining the Trent Valley Way before rejoining Newark Bridleway BW5. The unrecorded desire line would not be impacted by the Scheme and isn't on land identified for use as part of Scheme, any activity to formally record this desire line as a Public Right of Way would need to be undertaken by stakeholders, including the Consultee, outside of the Scheme. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) considers the impact of the scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on users of walkers, cyclists and horse riders during construction and operation. There are significant construction impacts on Newark Footpath FP48#1. This identifies that there will be significant adverse impacts on users of the route due to the length of the diversion (2km) and the duration of the diversion (24 months)</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are included in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Brownhills roundabout</p> <p>An important and well used link for the National Cycle Network and both the promoted Trent Vale Trail and Trent Valley Way. The proposal requires that NMUs use the proposed occupation slip road, an addition of another underpass and a longer route than existing. Detail is required on lighting, surfacing, signing width and general layout to ensure improvements are achieved above the current facilities. As part of the mitigation for the loss of the current arrangements it would be advantageous to see the extension of Newark Bridleway No.6 from the A1 bridge to Holme Lane, Winthorpe via the locally named 'Winthorpe Rack.</p>	N/A	N	<p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided at the new Brownhills Junction, which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road.</p> <p>The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and provide a route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The walking and cycling route would be a shared use 3m wide walking and cycling route, with lighting provided. The proposed lighting is described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). An asphalt type surface would be used in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> standards. Signing details would be finalised at a later stage of the Scheme design process in correspondence with the local authority.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>Holme Lane is outside of the Scheme Order Limits, however the opportunity to link Newark Bridleway BW6 with Holme Lane is currently being investigated, however is not a requirement as a result of the Scheme and is reliant on planning policy and consent that falls outside of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDZ-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Brownhills and Winthorpe Roundabouts</p> <p>The area round here is very busy and is difficult for NMUs to pass and repass safely and logically. Further discussion is required to enable improved and suitable provision for NMUs including links to the existing definitive footpaths Winthorpe No.2 and No.3.</p> <p>These 2 paths are currently severed by the existing A46 and the crossing of the road is via a very difficult and dangerous uncontrolled crossing to the south.</p> <p>Further details are required to look at how links between these paths will be improved. The provision of the service road for NMUs on the western side of the road is welcomed albeit suitable surfacing, width, lighting etc. is required.</p> <p>Also the provision of a shared use path on the eastern side from Drove Lane (Newark</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group, including Nottinghamshire County Council's Countryside Access Team, on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision.</p> <p>This group will continue to be engaged by the Applicant as the Scheme progresses, including discussions relating to claimed paths and the legal status/recording of routes if necessary.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council will be responsible for the future maintenance of the walking and cycling routes provided as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Winthorpe Footpath FP2 (Winthorpe No.2), was historically a direct route from Winthorpe to the Newark Showground. Due to historic severance of Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 (Winthorpe No.3) caused by the existing A46, Winthorpe Footpath FP2 would now be</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Showground) is welcomed.</p> <p>There is currently a claim for a public bridleway off Drove Lane therefore future proofing to link with this path at this location would be required.</p> <p>Further afield to the Scheme but clearly a link is an occupation underpass under the A1, south-west of the Curry's PC World warehousing. There is currently a claim for a public right of way linking existing recorded definitive paths.</p> <p>The underpass along with the claimed paths would provide very beneficial links to employment sites and residential parts of Newark. The County Council would like to discuss this with National Highways as part of the ongoing consultation.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council look forward to the continuous collaboration and consultation on the Scheme. Discussions also need to be had regarding legal status / recording of all routes including being clear about responsibilities and future maintenance. It's imperative that the legal status and alignment of routes are clear and agreed before any legal Orders are made.</p>			<p>connected and form part of a new 'circular' route, connecting Winthorpe Roundabout, Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3, Hargon Lane, and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. New signalised crossings would be provided at locations where the new route crosses a carriageway.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>Walking and cycling routes and crossings would be designed to be <i>Local Traffic Note 1/20</i> compliant where practicable. Where this is not achievable, other design standards would be referred to including those from the local authority, Sustrans and the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i>. Appropriate design processes would be followed to ensure they are safe and accessible for all road users, including carrying out a Road Safety Audit which is summarised in Chapter 4 (Road Safety) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a 3m wide combined walking and cycling route from the Friendly Farmer Link Road to the first entrance of the Showground along Drove Lane. If required, this could be converted into a bridleway and extended by others in the future.</p> <p>The underpass beneath the A1 to the south-west of Currys PC World distribution centre will not be considered as part of the Scheme but the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review detailed in Appendix C of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> does highlight this as a potential route to develop at a later opportunity.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Introductory text	<p>A46 Newark Bypass Statutory Consultation 26 October to 12 December 2022</p> <p>This letter constitutes formal advice from Nottinghamshire LAF. As a body listed under Section 94(4), National Highways is required, in accordance with Section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to have regard to advice from this forum in carrying out its functions.</p> <p>Thank you for your presentation at our recent Local Access Forum (LAF) Meeting, we found it both interesting and informative.</p> <p>We have now held a further meeting to look in more depth at the potential issues and potential benefits which the Scheme can bring to the non-motorised user attempting to negotiate the greater Newark area for business and pleasure.</p>	N/A	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>We do feel that the Scheme is focused on the needs of the motorised user and would like more emphasis to be placed on making the project work for all users, making safe routes for non-motorised users reduces vehicle journeys, therefore reduces pollution, improves traffic flow, and improves health and wellbeing, all of which are important.</p> <p>Working our way from the southern end of the Scheme at Farndon to the northern extremity of the Scheme at Winthorpe we would like to make the following points:</p>	N/A	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exists have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes have been provided. The improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 will be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 will be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route will continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing will be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Farndon Roundabout:</p> <p>The plans indicate that the Farndon Underpass will remain open throughout the works which is good. As you are aware the land adjacent to Crees Lane is currently used by members of the public as a walking route, we are also aware that National Highways are planning to use this as a compound. We would support the opportunity to create a public footpath at this location to link the underpass with Footpath No.5 and Bridleway No.2.</p> <p>Newark Bridleway No.2: We would like more information about the proposed routing of the temporary alternative bridleway while works on Windmill Viaduct take place, and also on the likely duration of the temporary diversion. The LAF consider this route to be very important and that a good multi-user path must be maintained throughout.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Comments noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>Following feedback received as part of the statutory consultation, the temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 was changed, and an alternative route was presented as part of the targeted consultation on the Scheme. Following further feedback received as part of the targeted consultation the temporary diversion of the bridleway would be only for use by equestrians. Pedestrians and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane shown within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 is being used to avoid temporary severance of the existing Public Right of Way route during the construction of the new bridge over the River Trent. The diversion would only be in place for the duration of the construction works in this area. After completion of the construction works, the existing bridleway alignment would be restored.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse riding routes during construction and operation. The assessment finds that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 during the construction period due to the length of the diversion (700m) and the duration of the diversions (24 months).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The unrecorded desire lines on the piece of land adjacent to Crees Lane are on a piece of land that has been identified for temporary use as part of Scheme, any activity to formally record these desire lines as Public Rights of Way would need to be undertaken by stakeholders, including the Consultee, outside of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are included in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Cattle Market Junction:</p> <p>The LAF have no problem with the extinguishment of Newark Footpath No.14 between the A617 and the old Kelham Road – this path has been unsafe and largely unused for many years. The proposal to divert any public use onto the roadside footway of the A617 to the Cattle Market Junction is acceptable provided the footway is widened to provide safe shared use. The proposed route for non-motorised users over the Cattle Market Roundabout should be segregated as far as possible from the carriageway and made safe, with user friendly, clearly signed, light controlled and marked out junctions (as do all junctions).</p>	N/A	N	<p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are included in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>All new walking and cycling routes would be designed to be <i>Local Traffic Note 1/20</i> compliant, which sets out guidance for cycle infrastructure design, unless environmental or physical constraints prevent this.</p> <p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road. The routes are segregated as a minimum.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>. This includes retaining and improving walking and cycling routes throughout the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Construction	<p>Cattle Market to Brownhills Roundabout:</p> <p>The LAF are concerned as to how Newark Bridleway 6 will be temporarily diverted during the works to widen the A46 over the Trent, this is an important and well used path which has been unavailable on its definitive line at the old Red Bridge for some time, with users taking the cattle pass as a diversion. We understand that the contractors are going to use the cattle pass to move machinery through. The LAF would like to know how access will be maintained during the construction and propose that on completion the cattle pass become the permanent diverted route of Bridleway 6.</p> <p>More detail is also required on how National Highways plan to manage the temporary closure of Newark Footpath No.48 where it passes under the A46.</p> <p>We would like to be further consulted on these issues which although temporary in nature are likely to be in place for some time. There appear to be no permanent changes to the public path network affecting this section of the route.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Newark Bridleway BW6 would need to be marshal controlled to allow escorted movements along it during the construction period due to construction work that would be taking place to build the new viaduct structure at Nether Lock. Access would be affected for approximately 10 weeks approximately 12 months after construction commencement, during construction working hours only. The route would be fully open for use outside of these hours.</p> <p>The cattle pass would not become the permanent diverted route of the Newark Bridleway BW6.</p> <p>A diversion would be in place for Newark Footpath FP48#1 for approximately 24 months. This is to allow construction of the widened underpass to the sewage works and the associated embankment earthworks. This would follow south on Quibell's Lane to join Newark Bridleway BW10 across the Lincoln Road Railway Bridge, joining the Trent Valley Way before rejoining Newark Bridleway BW5.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes during construction and operation. The assessment finds that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of Newark Footpath FP48#1 due to the length of the diversion (2km) and the duration of the diversions (24 months).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Brownhills Roundabout:</p> <p>The Trent Valley Way, Trent Vale Trail and National Cycle Route 64 currently cross the A46 by an underpass to the west of Brownhills Roundabout, before continuing through a second underpass under the A1 and into Winthorpe. The proposed alternative route is much less convenient to the NM User, as it will involve a detour, an additional third underpass and the crossing of a slip road at grade, making use of the route unsafe for a lot of users. Improvements to width, security and lighting are needed to the existing underpass under the A1. The LAF considers that careful thought and planning will be needed to make this junction</p>	N/A	N	<p>The new shared use route alignment would provide a segregated route for walkers and cyclists in place of the stopped up Winthorpe Road. This route would be a walking and cycling route, with lighting provided and a signalised crossing at the northbound exit slip road to the Brownhills Junction. This option has been developed from the preferred route announcement layout to remove two additional underpasses and make it more attractive to users.</p> <p>Holme Lane is outside of the Scheme Order Limits, however the opportunity to link Newark Bridleway BW6 with Holme Lane is currently being investigated, however is not a requirement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>acceptable.</p> <p>Newark Bridleway No.6 currently ends at the A1 where it is blocked off, if this path were to be opened up along Winthorpe Rack to Holme Lane, it would provide an alternative safe route and go some way to compensate for loss of amenity.</p>			as a result of the Scheme and is reliant on planning policy and consent that falls outside of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Brownhills to Winthorpe Roundabout:</p> <p>This is a very complex junction and will become even more so with the proposed works. New routes and diversions should be an improvement, safe to use, not substantially longer, and not inconvenient to users. The proposed changes do not appear to have been well thought through and need to be revisited.</p> <p>The track running along the north-western side of the A46 from the Brownhills Roundabout to the Winthorpe roundabout and labelled on the plan as shared access and NMU will form a very useful Multiuser route and is a reasonable distance away from the carriageway. It will need to be constructed to a LT1/20 standard with lighting, and sufficient width to accommodate all legitimate users.</p> <p>Winthorpe Footpath No.2 and Winthorpe Footpath No.3 will both be affected by the project, Footpath No.2 will terminate on the new multiuser track referred to above, and for some destinations the diversion required here will be very long. For walkers wishing to continue their walk along Footpath No.3 there will be multiple road crossings to make, a new underpass to negotiate, and a considerable length of footway to walk, and there is no indication on the plans of how access to the remains of Footpath No.3 can be made.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout doesn't show any crossing points for non-motorised users although paths appear to exist at Drove Lane and along the southern edge of the new link road beside the A46. Safe multiuser crossings will be necessary at this location.</p> <p>The Footpath provided along the southern side of the link Road (A46) from Winthorpe Roundabout towards the Friendly Farmer Roundabout is stated to be "to maintain existing NMU access" therefore if this is intended to be a multiuser route then it will need to be of a suitable width and be safely accommodated away from the main traffic flow and constructed to LT1/20 standards.</p> <p>The LAF considers that careful thought and planning will be needed to make this junction acceptable.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The proposals to remove the existing severance of Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 is detailed in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winthorpe Footpath FP2 would tie into a new walking and cycling route This would cross the widened A46 beneath the new structure that passes over the A1</li> <li>A signalised pedestrian crossing would be provided over the existing A46 between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts</li> <li>The signalised pedestrian crossing would link to Winthorpe Footpath FP3 via a new section of walking and cycling route north of Friendly Farmer Roundabout by the existing pedestrian bridge over the A1 slip roads and the existing pedestrian crossing over the A17</li> <li>A new walking and cycling route would only be provided between Hargon Lane to provide a walking and cycling route to the new crossings over Winthorpe Roundabout. This would be designed in accordance with <i>Local Traffic Note 1/20</i></li> </ul> <p>Whilst there is an increase in distance, Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and Winthorpe Footpath FP3 at the existing A46 had already been formally stopped prior to the Scheme starting due to safety concerns.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDD-V	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Flood Relief Areas:</p> <p>The LAF would like some reassurance that you are aware of the need to protect public rights of way in the flood relief areas. Specifically, the Trent Valley Way, Kelham Footpath No.4 and Averham Footpath No.6.</p> <p>The Local Access look forward to continuing to work with National Highways and their consultants looking at the detail of the Scheme and its effect on non-motorised vehicle users. Representatives of the LAF will be attending the workshop next week to continue this dialogue.</p>	N/A	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. A previously proposed floodplain compensation area adjacent to Brownhills Junction has been removed from the Scheme. As such, there are no Public Rights of Way present within floodplain compensation areas, meaning that none would be impacted by their construction.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXV-2	Consultation - general	Whilst RMBC appreciates the courtesy consultation, the impacts on our authority are likely to be imperceptible and it was deemed inappropriate to offer a detailed commentary on the Scheme.  The opinions and local knowledge of those more directly affected by the Scheme should be given greatest weight	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

N.2.I: Rushcliffe Borough Council

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW8E-H	Consultation - general	No comments to make	2B/2C	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZT-2	Consultation - general	South Kesteven District Council has no specific comments on the proposed Scheme. However, we wish to confirm that appropriate consultation is undertaken with Lincolnshire County Council (as local highway authority) to ensure any traffic impacts, temporary or permanent, that could effect South Kesteven are fully understood. Likewise, we would suggest direct consultation with Claypole Parish Council, Long Bennington Parish Council and Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish Councils.	N/A	N	<p>The Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) has considered the impact of the Scheme in this region and the Applicant has engaged with Lincolnshire County Council on the Scheme and its impacts on the Lincolnshire Road network.</p> <p>Stakeholders were identified for engagement and consultation based on their proximity to the Scheme Order Limits. Claypole Parish Council, Long Bennington Parish Council and Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish Councils have not been consulted as statutory consultees, as part of the statutory consultation, due to their parish areas being outside of the Order Limits and also outside of the distribution areas identified for the section 47 consultation, as outlined in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXQ-W	Consultation - general	I accept that the consultation period has closed, however, please note that for the sake of completeness please note West Lindsey has no objections or observations to make.	N/A	N	Comment noted by the Applicant.

### N.3 – Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an Interest in Land

#### N.3.A: Environment

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Air quality	<p>Pollution</p> <p>A big concern is the dramatic increase in pollution levels from such a large number of vehicles (approx. 3800 a day based on Technical Note Traffic Modelling Data), many of which are heavy goods vehicles and lorries, decelerating along the slip road and onto the roundabout and accelerating off the roundabout in such close proximity to the house and garden as well as the emissions from the continuous stream of traffic along the raised A46 now substantially closer to the property. This concern is not only for the residents of [redacted] own health but for that of their dogs and their staff.</p> <p>182 receptors were assessed within 200m of the affected road network and 12 of those receptors deemed most impacted upon by the Scheme were listed on p.82 A46 Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1. Why were there no recordings taken outside [redacted] as it will be the greatest impacted by the slip road and large roundabout which will involve many vehicles decelerating and accelerating, all within 200m of the house as well as the largest section of raised A46 creating increased pollutants within the airspace? Readings taken from receptor R151, [redacted], Gainsborough Road, Winthorpe cannot be suitably representative as they are separated by the raised A1 and are on the opposite side to the proposed roundabout and slip road so would be far less impacted than [redacted]</p>	2C	N	<p>The air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses receptors which are located within 200m of the Scheme's affected road network and focuses on receptors where the effects of changes in traffic are greatest on air quality. The assessment has included the property referred to in Consultee's response in the operational phase modelling. Pollutant concentrations at the receptor have been predicted using modelling of Do Minimum (without the Scheme) and Do Something (with the Scheme) scenarios. The modelling demonstrated that annual mean pollutant concentrations at this location are predicted to be 19.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) in the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) which is well below the air quality objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Air quality	<p>Little to no information is given around the mitigation measures for the increase in air pollution. When looking at the consultation materials the number of road users predicting to be using the A46 will increase significantly over the next decade. There are no mitigation measures laid out for air pollution in the materials. Given the recent press coverage surrounding the death of [redacted] from air pollution exposure it is VERY concerning given that we have two young children who play outside in our garden and attend Winthorpe Primary school. Both of these areas will be compromised by the Scheme.</p>	2C	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> which is the standard used to assess all highway projects and their effects on air quality in England. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. This includes the proposed mitigation measures which are further detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation. The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>An assessment has been undertaken to assess the air quality impact during the operation of the Scheme at receptors, using an atmospheric dispersion model, which is utilised to simulate how pollutants disperse in the atmosphere. Winthorpe Primary School was not included in the assessment as it is located outside of the air quality operational phase study area (more than 200m from the affected road network) and therefore no impacts as a result of the Scheme would be expected at this location.</p> <p>This approach of only including receptors within 200m of the affected road network aligns with recognised best practice, as outlined in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. As such, any receptors located greater than 200m from the affected road network are not recommended to be considered for further assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Air quality	<p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the mitigation measures during construction – such as damping down the dust – seem rudimentary. Residents will experience this build for three whole years – surely National Highways has something better to offer than this.</li> <li>It is gravely concerning that National Highways is not mapping the smallest particulates in relation to the Scheme (PM 2.5). These are the worst aggravators to human health.</li> <li>Furthermore, air pollution data has not been fully made available.</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> which is the standard used to assess all highway projects and their effects on air quality in England. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. This includes the proposed mitigation measures which are further detailed in the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Air quality	3. Can National Highways give a more robust and reassuring process to manage construction dust and air pollutants? 4. Will National Highways be mapping PM 2.5. particulates? If not, why not?	2C		Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Air quality	9. Will you map the PM 2.5 particulates? If not, can you justify why not, using up-to-date science and not outdated methods or approaches.	2B		<p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation.</p> <p>The construction mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>• Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>• Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or screen, cover, seed, or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>• Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>• Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washers</li> <li>• Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>• Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>• Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>• All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>• High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The proposed mitigations for the construction phase align with best practical means and are considered suitable and robust for the type of construction activities that will take place.</p> <p>The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> guidance states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds and modelling of PM<sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. This is considered an appropriate approach and method of assessment, given that PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future and PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, which means that vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Effects are not predicted to be significant.</p> <p>Human health receptors in the operational phase assessment have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the Scheme and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. These receptors are likely to experience the highest pollutant concentrations or highest level of change in pollutant concentrations within the vicinity of Winthorpe village and primary school.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Air quality	3. The proximity of 10 lanes of traffic which will form a continual infrastructure of road from our property to the borders of Newark. We are one of the properties at the edge of Winthorpe village and look to suffer the most from the intensification of road infrastructure in the existing open break between Winthorpe and Newark. A key concern relates to air pollution – at construction due to dust deposits, and at Scheme completion due to traffic being closer to our property, and an increase in traffic because the Scheme is built on anticipated increased capacity. Our property is in the line of fire for these pollutants. It is negligent of National Highways to not be mapping the smallest particulates (PM 2.5) – these are the ones that are proven to cause most damage to people's health.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO <sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), PM <sub>10</sub> or PM <sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant.
ANON-559H-RWBG-W	Air quality; Biodiversity	I have my doubts that you will be able to mitigate the effects of increased traffic on air pollution as outlined on page 36. You admit to the loss of habitats for wildlife etc. I think this is unacceptable.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. This includes construction mitigation measures to be implemented, which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation.</p> <p>The construction mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>• Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>• Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or screen, cover, seed, or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>• Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>• Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washers</li> <li>• Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>• Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>• Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>• All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>• High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Air quality; Consultation – negative feedback/ experience	Air Quality – Details ongoing research, with current findings being too difficult to understand for consultees. Most will not comprehend the NO <sub>x</sub> data presented and the health impacts are unclear to the average reader. The data presented is not personalised to the reader, it does not enable local consultees to easily work out the direct impact on their lived experience.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment relating to the explanation of air quality information in the consultation materials. Information about air quality was included within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> as well as within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> as part of the statutory consultation. These materials included different levels of technical detail on this aspect of the Scheme. The Applicant aimed to make the language used in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> as easy to understand as possible. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme. The Applicant also included contact details so that the consultees could contact the Applicant with questions about the Scheme or for clarification of any technical detail, including a Customer Contact Centre telephone number and direct project email address.</p> <p>Table 5-1 in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the air quality objectives and limit values relevant to the Scheme for human health receptors, whilst Table 5-3 provides details of where the respective air quality objectives do and do not apply and therefore the types of receptors that are relevant to the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>assessment of air quality, which are based on guidance from the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs <i>Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG22)</i>.</p> <p>Human health receptors included in the assessment have been selected at locations that are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change, in line with the details set out in Table 5-3. The assessment of likely significant effects on the modelled human health is provided in Chapters 5-11 of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. The Consultee's address is located in Winthorpe village, which is over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. Concentrations of up to 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> have been predicted at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives and likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience the highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction equipment, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7B-D	Noise and vibration; Air quality	Concerned for my children. 2 under 5's living at the side of the A46 near the showground [redacted] unsure of how this will effect our daily routines. For example. Noise disruption, unknown particles which can create illnesses. No-one spoken to us regarding this massive change.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised by the Consultee. The assessments presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operation effects in relation to noise and vibration and air quality.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided to the west of Winthorpe Roundabout including barriers, bunds and low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. With regard to the property referred to in the Consultee response, no noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary construction traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the air quality objectives within the study area (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). This includes human health receptors located along the A46 close to the property referred to in the Consultee response, which represent the worst-case locations affected by</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the Scheme in. The changes in air quality during operation of the Scheme are therefore concluded to be not significant and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Further detail can be found within the individual topic chapters of the Environmental Statement as outlined above. Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Further information regarding construction traffic can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) a Traffic Management Plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network. The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) submitted with the application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD8-G	Noise and vibration; Air quality; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>We are very concerned as to the effects of not only the ongoing work, but also the fact that Farndon borrow pits are directly opposite our home with only the river between us.</p> <p>When we asked at the consultation for some information as to what measures could be put in place for us, no one seemed able to provide us with any.</p> <p>We seriously need to know what measures will be available to us to reduce noise and dust pollution for our home.</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>With regards to the concerns around noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>This includes but is not limited to dust management (such as locating stockpiles out of the wind, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and switching off vehicle engines when not in use), daily inspections to ensure dust management is effective, noise management (including temporary acoustic barriers where necessary), and general best practice construction practices. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW9H-N	A1/A46 Crossing; Air quality; Noise and vibration; Landscape	I worry particularly about the A1 flyover which will provide more pollution, more noise and more vibrations nearer to the church and houses at the south end. With the extra height of the flyover it is also an eyesore to that end.	2C	N	The Applicant has submitted several documents that address the Consultee's primary concerns, including Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	and visual effects				<p>Several locations in proximity to the A1/A46 Crossing location were selected for detailed assessment and can be seen on Figure 5.1 (Air Quality Receptors) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The assessment results at these locations demonstrate that predicted concentrations of monitored pollutants remain below the air quality objective thresholds for human health and in many cases show an improvement in pollutant concentrations due to the beneficial impacts of the Scheme in relieving local traffic congestion.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to noise and vibration changes around the Scheme, during construction and operation. This includes potentially sensitive receptors in proximity to the location of A1/A46 Crossing. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, these measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> presents further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme. The embankments either side of the A1/A46 Crossing would be planted with trees and shrubs, aiding landscape integration of the above grade structure, and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors over time.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7B-D	Air quality	No one has measured the amount of small particles being left out in my area. These particles are the most harmful, especially to children and animals. We have lots of wildlife around us, and my children are both under 5	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development. An Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results, including those of NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) monitoring undertaken between May and November 2022, are presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application.</p> <p>The monitoring locations are shown in Figure 5.6 (Air Quality Monitoring Locations) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Further detail on the monitoring survey is presented in Appendix 5.3 (Air Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The results from the monitoring study show that NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations along the Scheme alignment and surrounding areas are well below the annual mean objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>, with the highest concentration recorded overall being 33.0µg/m<sup>3</sup>, at a receptor located on the A1133 adjacent to Winthorpe Roundabout. This indicates that PM concentrations are also well below the annual mean objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>, given that PM emissions from road traffic are an order of magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen), which is primarily made up of NO (nitric oxide) and NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide). Background NO<sub>2</sub> and PM concentrations available from the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs are also low. As such the impact from the Scheme would not have a significant effect on NO<sub>2</sub> or PM.</p> <p>This is supported by the latest annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentration recorded by Newark and Sherwood District Council being 21.8µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which is well below the objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a fraction of PM<sub>10</sub> and so concentrations would be lower.</p> <p>This PM<sub>10</sub> concentration was recorded on Portland Street in 2018, which is the last year Newark and Sherwood District Council's PM<sub>10</sub> unit recorded concentrations, as it was</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					destroyed in a road traffic collision. Newark and Sherwood District Council has not yet replaced the unit and as such 2018 is the latest year with PM <sub>10</sub> monitoring data available.
ANON-559H-RW7B-D	Air quality	Small particles have not been measured as stated in the previous email	2D	N	<p>Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides detail on why PM<sub>2.5</sub> has not been considered further within the local air quality assessment.</p> <p>In summary, <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds and modelling of PM<sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. For this assessment, when the maximum modelled road contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> of 4.5µg/m<sup>3</sup> from existing traffic in the base year at modelled receptors is combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded. Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>.</p> <p>Further to this, the greatest change in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations at modelled receptors in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 3.9µg/m<sup>3</sup> between the Do Something (with the Scheme) and the Do Minimum (without the Scheme) scenarios. Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> as a result of the Scheme would therefore be even lower in the opening year of the Scheme, as PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are an order of magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen) emissions. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that the current and future PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are lower than the current threshold of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> and the Scheme would not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold at any of the human health receptors considered and no further assessment is required.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Biodiversity	Having so much open agricultural land, hedgerow and trees around encourages wildlife, regularly seen in the fields such as deer, rabbits, pheasants, stoats, voles, foxes, and hedgehogs. Birdlife includes garden birds such as sparrows, tits, blackbirds, robins, and finches but also kestrel, buzzards, red kites, barn owls and bats. How can you mitigate the loss of habitat for this wildlife in this area and prevent numerous animal deaths by creating such large-scale infrastructure in their commuting corridors?	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design.</p> <p>If a potential significant effect is identified in relation to an ecological receptor, mitigation has been applied in line with the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts where possible.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Biodiversity	The impact on wildlife habitat requires more work, deer movements require study and suitable provision including signage indicating the risk.	2C		<p>This hierarchical approach dictates that the following system is applied in identifying and applying mitigation, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoidance and prevention of the effect: alternative design option or avoidance entirely</li> <li>• Reduction of the effect: application of specific mitigation to lessen the magnitude or significance of an effect</li> <li>• Remediation of the effect: application of measures to offset the effect</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Biodiversity	Make sure that animals can cross the carriageways which they will want to do at night.	2D		<p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) as they are not a protected species by law. However, as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species, however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter, and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Existing commuting or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole. Any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water voles. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population. The retention of existing commuting or foraging routes will ensure safe movement of these species in proximity to the Scheme, where possible, minimising any long-term impacts upon these species. Full details of mitigation measures, how they will be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, which would minimise long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>The mainline has a boundary fence that is 1m high and a 0.8m continuous central reserve concrete barrier. This would hinder but not prevent deer crossing the road. They could go through Cattle Market Junction and through the railway line bridge to cross over the Scheme.</p> <p>Existing safe passage under Windmill Viaduct, Nether Lock, and access tracks under the Scheme carriageway (between Windmill Viaduct and the railway line to the north, and access to Severn Trent Water Ltd. Sewage Treatment Works) would be maintained during operation and construction. Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do.</p> <p>At present, there is no existing safe access around the habitat adjacent to the Cattle Market Roundabout, other than under the arches of the Great North Road. The culverts around Cattle Market Roundabout do not offer passage for otter, with the dense habitat between the River Trent and British Sugar being the only habitat around the Cattle Market Roundabout with connectivity for otter to utilise. Otters would still have this available to them during construction and operation. Badgers and deer can continue to cross Kelham Road and would be able to continue to do so during construction and operation of the Scheme. The disturbance from the A46 carriageway and directional planting, once established during operation are considered to deter and direct deer and badger from crossing the A46 carriageway. Furthermore, though the highways boundary fence would not be an impermeable barrier to wildlife movement, it would act as a deterrent to deer crossing the A46 if on the far side/away from the carriageway.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. To summarise, the following general measures or principles would be adhered to during construction:</p> <p>The following general measures or principles would be adhered to for biodiversity during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Ecological Clerk of Works would be employed to provide advice and monitor the works adherence to the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and construction mitigation measures</li> <li>• A pre-works search by the Ecological Clerk of Works prior to vegetation clearance/brush removal to check for notable fauna such as hedgehog and toad resting places</li> <li>• Toolbox talks on protected species and control of Invasive Non Native Species to be delivered prior to construction activities</li> <li>• Staged grass cutting and directional clearance</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Pollution Prevention Plan and Erosion Prevention and Sediment Management Plan will be prepared as detailed in commitments RDWE2 and RDWE3 of this First Iteration Environmental Management Plan. Techniques could include the use of oil booms on the River Trent during construction of the new outfall</li> <li>• Site drainage (including site compounds and material storage areas) will be designed to connect to existing road/mains drainage network, and not directly discharged to the environment</li> <li>• Best practice methodology for the correct storage and disposal of wastewater and pollutants, the establishment of dedicated plant and wheel washing areas at least 10m from any watercourse or surface water drain, collection of run-off water in sumps, and the recycle and reuse of water where possible</li> <li>• Outfall construction (integrated into an existing headwall) on the River Trent (adjacent to Nether Weir) to be undertaken between mid-June and October. This would allow higher winter flows to wash silt through the system before the next coarse fish spawning season (March to mid-June)</li> <li>• Use of best practice measures set out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (to be produced as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan) to minimise impacts on mammals such as covering excavations overnight, or securing mammals ladders within excavations</li> <li>• Restriction of night working where possible along the majority of the working width to minimise the requirement for artificial lighting to be used</li> <li>• Use of task and directional lighting with cowls to minimise light splay to the River Trent and its banks outside of the works area</li> <li>• Use of suitable piling equipment to minimise noise and vibration and a slow start-up, where possible, for all night works and sheet piling adjacent to the River Trent</li> <li>• Use of screening, dust suppression measures, vegetating or covering of spoil heaps to minimise dust exposure and dispersal, with focus on areas in the vicinity of Local Wildlife Sites</li> <li>• The Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan will detail the working methodology for protected and notable species during construction. Where necessary, protected species licences would be applied for and a Method Statement would be provided in the licence package which will need to be adhered to</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Biodiversity	<p>Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Habitat will be lost as a direct result of the Scheme</li> <li>• Trees will be removed – in particular it will eradicate the current habitat of the rooks which live in the trees at the Winthorpe/showground roundabout.</li> <li>• The Environment Report lists a whole slew of protected species that could be adversely affected, including otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers and bats.</li> <li>• Not considered here is the impact on the locally important muntjac deer population. Will impact on the deer herds be mapped?</li> <li>• Effect on bat migratory paths</li> <li>• New road height could result in species being killed/injured due to traffic collisions.</li> <li>• Various kinds of habitat, including deciduous woodland, wood pasture marsh, meadow and fen will be lost. Given attempts to preserve and build on such rich landscapes, is it acceptable for any of this habitat to be compromised?</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme specific to those upon trees, habitats and protected and notable species, such as bats.</p> <p>Consideration is given to any trees to be affected as a result of the Scheme, including those trees present in the centre of Winthorpe Roundabout, as assessed in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Felling is recommended for trees in direct conflict with the proposed works. However, to minimise the potential number of trees which would require felling, tree loss can be mitigated using protection measures such as ground protection, barrier protection, and arboricultural supervision, would be recommended for retainment.</p> <p>The impacts on rooks have been assessed as part of the assessment for breeding birds found within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. With reference to the mitigation hierarchy, the latest roundabout design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery at Winthorpe and much of this habitat would now be retained.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Scheme would result in the unavoidable loss of the rookery located north-west of Friendly Farmer Roundabout only. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the implementation of mitigation measures detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>This includes but is not limited to, removal of suitable habitat outside of the core breeding season. Removal of the rookery specifically would be between September and February inclusive, outside of the core nesting period. It is anticipated that birds disturbed from the rookery during woodland clearance would be displaced into existing woodland across the Scheme, for which there is adequate alternative nesting provision. The planting of new woodland would support the rookery once established as evidenced in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the bat surveys undertaken for the Scheme. To summarise, there is anticipated to be some permanent loss of foraging and commuting habitat during construction. However, once the mitigation planting and landscaping matures and establishes, there are not anticipated to be any operational effects on bats, as reported in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, has assessed the potential for the Scheme to affect bat and barn owl commuting where there is potential for bat and barn owl mortality from collisions with traffic. As such, mitigation has been identified to reduce the potential for collisions occurring in the form of targeted planting of large trees and shrubs as a continuous hedge at a height either side of the carriageway, detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. This is intended to encourage bats and barn owl to fly over the hedging at a safe height or discourage them from crossing entirely by acting as a natural screen from the road.</p> <p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> as they are not a protected species by law. However, as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and has been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter, and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Existing commuting or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures including how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects identified (following application of mitigation).</p> <p>Some habitat loss as a result of the Scheme is unavoidable, however, the Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process. This hierarchical approach dictates that the following system is applied in identifying and applying mitigation, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoidance and prevention of the effect: alternative design option or avoidance entirely</li> <li>• Reduction of the effect: application of specific mitigation to lessen the magnitude or significance of an effect</li> <li>• Remediation of the effect: application of measures to offset the effect</li> </ul> <p>The Scheme has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures would be provided to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. Should steps 1 or 2 in the hierarchy not be applicable or suitable, measures to compensate adverse effects would also be provided, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these impacts cannot be avoided.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Biodiversity	We have had numerous surveys planned and cancelled for our property which will be in VERY close proximity to the road - Barn Owls, Bats etc. This is incredibly disappointing that this is not feeding into Statutory consultation materials.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Appendices 8.1 to 8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>), summarise the results of the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and assessment. Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), details any assumptions and limitations associated with the surveys undertaken, such as restrictions due to land access, adverse weather conditions during the survey itself, restricted access on site due to flooding or health and safety concerns which prevented the survey from being undertaken or completed. Where certain ecology surveys couldn't be undertaken in full, appropriate measures were taken to ensure sufficient data was assessed and informed the overall assessment of effects i.e. surveys repeated in subsequent months, or a reasonable worst-case scenario applied.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The statutory consultation responses and subsequent surveys have informed the iterative design process. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides the required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The surveys referred to by the Consultee were required to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment referred to above. Bat and Barn Owl surveys have now been completed across the Scheme and in the area of this Consultee's concern. Full survey results of the bat surveys can be found in Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report). Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Biodiversity	<p>6. What assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the proposed route will compromise the viability of Winthorpe's status as a conservation area? It is important to note that National Highways Schemes has brought into question the future viability of World Heritage Status (e.g. Stonehenge A303 project). Therefore it is reasonable to ask whether this road Scheme will damage Winthorpe's conservation status.</p> <p>7. What mitigation will be offered for the rooks whose habitat will be obliterated on the Winthorpe/showground roundabout? Have you been able to identify any similar trees that could form an alternative habitat in the vicinity?</p> <p>8. Will you map the muntjac (and other) deer population and impact of the road on them? They are significant part of Winthorpe wildlife yet no reference is made to them anywhere.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). This assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies and agreed with key heritage stakeholders. A temporary significant effect is predicted on Winthorpe Conservation Area during construction; however, this would reduce to a slight adverse non-significant effect in operation with the provision of landscape planting. Therefore, this would not affect the status of Winthorpe Conservation Area as a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Consideration is given to any trees that would be affected as a result of the Scheme, this includes those trees present in the centre of Winthorpe Roundabout, as assessed in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Felling is recommended for trees in direct conflict with the proposed works. However, to minimise the potential number of trees which would require felling, tree loss can be mitigated using protection measures such as ground protection, barrier protection, and arboricultural supervision, would be recommended for retainment.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity during operation and construction. With reference to the mitigation hierarchy, the latest Winthorpe Roundabout design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery at Winthorpe and much of this habitat would now be retained. The Scheme would result in the unavoidable loss of the rookery located north-west of Friendly Farmer Roundabout only. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the implementation of mitigation measures detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). This includes, but is not limited to, removal of suitable habitat outside of the core breeding season. It is anticipated that birds disturbed from the rookery during woodland clearance would be displaced into existing woodland across the Scheme, for which there is an adequate alternative nesting provision. The planting of new woodland would support the rookery, once established. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Existing commuting or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, including how they would be implemented and managed, are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) as they are not a protected species by law. However as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter, and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole. Any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water voles. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population. The retention of existing commuting or foraging routes will ensure safe movement of these species in proximity to the Scheme, where possible, minimising any long-term impacts upon these species. Full details of mitigation measures, how they will be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), which would minimise long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Biodiversity	Biodiversity – the surveys are ongoing, no specific information provided.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. Since statutory consultation, the assessments within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) have been completed.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and Appendices 8.1 to 8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ), summarise the results of the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and assessment. This details any assumptions and limitations associated with the surveys undertaken. Sufficient surveys have been undertaken to inform the assessment and mitigation requirements where necessary. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Biodiversity	habitat provision and reducing the amount of tree demolition ie the copse at the side of the A46 northbound just after the ESSO garage.	2D	Y	<p>Consideration is given to any trees that would be affected as a result of the Scheme. This includes those trees present in the centre of Winthorpe Roundabout, as assessed in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Felling is recommended for trees in direct conflict with the proposed works. However, to minimise the potential number of trees which would require felling, tree loss can be mitigated using protection measures such as ground protection, barrier protection, and arboricultural supervision, would be recommended for retention.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, the design has been amended including the location of the combined access track/footway/cycleway and landscape bunds located to the south of Winthorpe. The extent of tree loss has been reduced to avoid trees likely to be used by nesting birds and commuting bats. The copse past the Esso Service Station would now be retained as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Climate; Construction; Route corridor	<p>Climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction emissions alone are 254,536 tCo2e. These emissions seem out of line for a scheme of this size. Comparable schemes of a similar length have far lower carbon outputs. This therefore suggests that the construction emissions are out of kilter with what would be deemed acceptable. The complexity of the project – as it has to cross existing rivers and dualled roads – means that the carbon output for construction is disproportionate. This complexity again begs the question regarding whether the right Scheme corridor has been chosen and whether another corridor option would have been less impactful in terms of carbon.</li> <li>In the year of opening, the carbon emissions are 10, 411 tCo2e</li> <li>Carbon emission figures are absent for the operation of the road other than opening year. But the Scheme is built on anticipated increased capacity so it is imperative that the long term carbon impact of the Scheme is assessed. Why are these figures not made available?</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) the need for the Scheme and how it complies with the relevant planning policy such as the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The specific policy and legislation relevant to the Scheme can be found in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound. The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080</i> best practice, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the Scheme, for example, the use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Climate; Construction	Climate – the quarter of a million tonnes of equivalent carbon dioxide generated by the Scheme construction is a significant amount and grossly higher than other Schemes of a comparable length (almost 3 times that quoted for improvements to the A47 North Tuddenham), due to the complex structures and embankments required for this Scheme. This is a significant amount and will impact on the carbon targets of National climate policy.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Climate; Construction	<p>20. What is the projected carbon increase in the years following Scheme completion? How does this comply with the Government's net zero targets?</p> <p>21. Why is the carbon output so high at construction phase?</p> <p>22. What is the carbon output at construction stage for a road built in corridor E compared with a road being built in corridor C?</p>	2C		<p>A detailed breakdown of the carbon attributed to the construction phase is provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The largest contributor of emissions during construction is the Scheme earthworks (up to 51,404 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). Whilst this is a significant quantity attributed to one item, the earthworks play a wider beneficial role across the Scheme, not only for the overarching design, but also as part of the acoustic mitigation and visual screening.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>A construction Carbon Management Plan would be produced to form part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and will include the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement</li> <li>• Materials and resource management on site</li> <li>• Change process for low/zero carbon solutions</li> <li>• Low/zero carbon plant and management</li> <li>• Construction techniques and competency</li> <li>• Training matrix</li> </ul> <p>Operational emissions are provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, for both the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after Scheme opening (2043).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is undertaken by comparing the emissions from the Scheme against the relevant UK Government carbon budget for that period. The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO<sub>2e</sub> and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.</p> <p>As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes no likely significant effect, as the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> document states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'. The assessment has identified that the emissions arising from the Scheme represent less than 0.007% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. And so, the assessment concludes that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>Carbon has been assessed on the preferred route option and the result of this assessment can be found in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This includes the predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2e</sub>) during construction and operation of the option that was selected as the preferred route.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Cultural heritage	Cultural Heritage – No mention of Grade II listed property [redacted] when analysing the impact of the Scheme. This is the closest listed property to significant new infrastructure in the Conservation Area of Winthorpe, being immediately adjacent to the A46/ A1 overbridge. The elevated section of the A46 in this area is likely to have a significant deleterious impact on this important historic property both in construction and operation.	2C	N	Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings, and historic landscapes). This assessment was carried out in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 106 - Cultural heritage assessment</i> and agreed with key heritage stakeholders such as Nottinghamshire County Council archaeology and heritage officers, Newark and Sherwood District Council heritage and conservation officers and Historic England.
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Cultural heritage; Land ownership	<p>In the consultation materials you highlight Heritage Assets in Newark Winthorpe, but completely fail to mention our house [redacted].</p> <p>This is deeply worrying and a major oversight, when [redacted] is a Grade II listed building within the Winthorpe Conservation Area. Here is its entry on the Historic England website.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>[Redacted] will be VERY impacted by the new proposed route. There will be visual impact to the curtilage of the property as well as noise and vibrational impacts.</p> <p>The house is a significant building within the historic core of the village. The house dates to 1787 as evidenced by the plaque above the front door.</p> <p>Any changes to [redacted] and to its surrounding area, have to be passed by Planning Authorities, who are required to be mindful of other material planning considerations in determining such matters i.e. Sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and</p>	2H		<p>The property referred to in the Consultee's response was introduced into the cultural heritage assessment after the consultation materials were prepared, following site visits and discussions with the Newark and Sherwood District Council conservation officer. Impacts on this receptor have been considered in full as part of Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment does identify a temporary significant effect on the listed building during the Scheme construction and a permanent non-significant, slight adverse effect during the Scheme operation, due to the potential presence of construction machinery, increased noise, dust and light pollution which may affect the setting of this asset. The property has also been assessed as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment detailed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and take into account the following other material considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Adopted March 2012</li> <li>Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) published April 2014</li> <li>Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 2 and 3 – Managing Significance in Decision</li> <li>Taking in the Historic Environment and The Setting of Heritage Assets</li> <li>Historic England Advice Note 2 – Making Changes to Heritage Assets</li> </ul>			<p>Mitigation measures specific to this asset are identified in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of landscape bunds, barriers and low noise road surfacing to mitigate noise impacts resulting from the Scheme</li> <li>Provision of additional planting to minimise visual impacts resulting from the Scheme</li> <li>Ongoing monitoring to ensure the successful establishment of mitigation planting</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 5.1.31 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and paragraph 206 of the National Policy Planning Framework outline the Government's approach to impact assessment, decision-making and recording for the historic environment and provide guidance for proposals affecting cultural heritage assets. Further details of all relevant legislation and policy that has been applied in the assessment can be found in Section 6.3 (Legislative Policy Framework) of Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which includes those publications listed by the Consultee.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking consent for the Scheme via a development consent application. As such the determining authority is the Secretary of State for Transport, not the local planning authority. The local planning authority has been consulted during the Scheme development and their views incorporated into the design where appropriate.</p> <p>Further consideration of the potential for the Scheme to impact Winthorpe Conservation Area is provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment concludes that a small area of the conservation area is within the Order Limits of the Scheme, however it is not anticipated to be directly impacted during construction or operation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Winthorpe Roundabout; Brownhills Junction; Route corridor; Road layout; Cultural heritage	<p>More broadly, the grade separation at the Cattle Market roundabout will create intrusive infrastructure for Newark, leading to significant detriment of a market town which such historic connections.</p> <p>The design of the roundabout at the showground is also a cause for concern in terms of its size and the vast numbers of lanes involved in its design. This is another example of infrastructure that is disproportionate to a small market town. This – along with the building around Brownhills Junction and the Cattle Market flyover – all point to the kinds of infrastructure built near and through city centres 50 years ago, such as the Gravelly Interchange in Birmingham (more commonly dubbed “Spaghetti Junction”). These kinds of Schemes are now deemed out of touch and inappropriate. Residents in Glasgow – where the M8 motorway carved up two communities in the 1960s – are now campaigning for its removal, such is the harm that it has caused. They want the M8 to be replaced with routes promoting walking and cycling. Why is National Highways seeking to impose similarly damaging proposals to a market town where the route will have a similar effect? This is short-sighted and further evidence that the wrong route corridor has been chosen.</p>	2B	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment, including consideration of the works at the Cattle Market Roundabout and its potential impact upon archaeological remains, historic buildings, and historic landscapes. Mitigation measures specific to the setting of heritage assets and historic character of relevance to the Cattle Market Roundabout are identified in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitive landscape design and planting to provide visual screening where possible</li> <li>New and replacement planting to reflect the character of the local area</li> <li>Physical protection measures such as fencing to protect known heritage assets in proximity to the Scheduled Monument at Cattle Market Roundabout</li> </ul> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Details of the landscape proposals can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme forms part of the strategic Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor between the M5 in the south-west and the Humber Ports in the north-east. The improvements forming the Scheme are detailed within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country. The Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> makes a commitment to create a continuous dual carriageway from Lincoln to Warwick. The Scheme would meet the commitment set out in Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> and is considered to be commensurate with the Applicant's objectives for the Scheme.</p> <p>The junction options were assessed prior to preferred route announcement and those selected fulfilled the needs of current and future traffic growth including the year of the Scheme's opening (2028) and 15 years after the Scheme is open (2043). Grade separation at Cattle Market was required as there is high demand from all routes to the junction and a conventional at grade roundabout at existing ground level would not have dealt with the conflicting demands and very large queues would form, as occurs on the existing roundabout.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Winthorpe Roundabout has been fully assessed for safety and the risks are all deemed low. The new Brownhills Junction was introduced to provide direct access to the residents and business at Brownhills but also remove the sub-standard northbound exit slip road to Brownhills Roundabout. This also allowed Brownhills Underbridge to be moved very close to the A1/A46 Crossing which significantly reduced the length and height of the raised embankment therefore reducing the visual impact of the Scheme for the Winthorpe estate to the south.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Environment – general; Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When will key environment data become available?</li> <li>2. Will another statutory consultation take place when this information becomes available?</li> </ol>	2C	N	<p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022, allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation, which is 28 days.</p> <p>The Applicant does not intend to hold further statutory consultation at this stage. If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received. There would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p> <p>Supporting environmental data is summarised in the Baseline Conditions of Chapters 5 to 15 of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and included in supporting appendices in the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) submitted with the development consent application. The application will be supported further by the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) as well as the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW3G-E	Landscape and visual effects	Plant tree species suitable for waterlogged areas.	2C	N	Plant species would be selected on the basis of the receiving soil properties and conditions, including being mindful of waterlogged or regularly flooded areas. Indicative plant species are presented on Sheet 1 of Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ) submitted with the development consent application and would be refined during detailed design.
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Landscape and visual effects	<p>We need it, but you must help us bear the consequences through good mitigation measures please.</p> <p>Young trees are not the short term answer to noise and light pollution. The village of Winthorpe has a high proportion of retired people who can't wait for trees to grow 40 feet tall.</p>	2H	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the Scheme are provided in <b>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects)</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment accounts for mitigation planting, considering visual impacts for the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after Scheme opening (2043), during both winter and summer. Viewpoint photography and digital photomontages are utilised in this assessment, to fully consider the effects of mitigation planting both in the short and longer-term (once planting has established). Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. These are shown in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Planting is not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise. Instead where needed, landscape bunds and acoustic barriers would be provided, including a series of landscape bunds, fencing and screening planting (offering visual screening only) running alongside the A46 south of Winthorpe. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Further detail on the specific measures that would be provided to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Measures such as landscaping bunds do not need to establish and are</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>anticipated to be effective in minimising impacts on sensitive receptors from the point at which the Scheme is operational. These landscape bunds would also be planted to soften the visual appearance of built features, contribute to habitat creation and align with the local landscape character.</p> <p>Regarding light pollution, mitigation measures would be in place to minimise potential light spill and disturbance to receptors during construction. Such measures are anticipated to include directional lighting away from receptors, lighting motion sensors to minimise unnecessary usage, low luminosity lighting and limitations to the hours at which lighting can be on. Further details of all mitigation measures can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Landscape and visual effects	<p>Environmental repair and enhancement is a critical part of any scheme of this magnitude.</p> <p>Variations in woodland planting to provide 12 months of the year sound screening is a vital part but only one part of the environmental impact of such a project.</p>	2E/F	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. This has identified measures to be implemented across all environmental disciplines to minimise adverse environmental effects in the first instance, and to mitigate any unavoidable impacts of the Scheme during both construction and operation.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact upon the Scheme. Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Landscape and visual effects	<p>9. Will intensive tree planting start ahead of the scheme? 10. Will residents be protected from the site lines of the trees – e.g. will any proposed bunds be built first?</p>	2C	N	<p>Opportunities would be sought for advanced tree planting, however in the vast majority of cases this would not be possible as the planting would sit within the construction footprint of the Scheme. Planting would however be introduced in the first possible planting season following completion of construction. Landscape bunds are likely to be constructed during the earlier stages of construction. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Landscape and visual effects	<p>Although mitigation measures are detailed around the east border of Winthorpe village, these are the only landscaping bunds featured around the scheme. The other areas of the scheme rely on initial tree planting along new embankments that will take many years to establish. Many areas of the Scheme do not have any such features shown.</p> <p>For example the A1 /A46 boundary on the south curtilage of the Winthorpe conservation area where most intrusion of the elevated A46 and associated A1 overbridge will occur does not show any distinct features. This area would benefit from increased tree cover and earthwork bunding.</p> <p>All earthwork bunding and initial planting should be completed early in the project to allow for maximum protection of local communities during the construction phase, and early establishment of trees and other planting.</p>	2D	N	<p>Landscape bunds would be provided wherever feasible outside of the floodplain. Much of the Scheme sits within floodplain which is the reason for the bunds being limited to around Winthorpe. The landscape design has evolved since statutory consultation and now includes a greater amount of tree and shrub planting, including an area of woodland to the east of the A1 to aid screening of views to the road from Winthorpe Conservation Area and the listed building. Bunds are not achievable in this area. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Landscape bunds are likely to be constructed during the earlier phases of construction. Opportunities would be sought for advanced tree planting, however in the vast majority of cases this would not be possible as the planting would sit within the construction footprint of the Scheme. Where planting would sit outside the construction footprint and therefore not be at risk of damage, early planting works would be sought. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> and can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW9Q-X	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	The environment is so important especially with the problem of climate change. You need to put back more than taken away i.e. trees, hedges and shrubs. There is a mixture of birds, deer, foxes, ponies and there must be smaller creatures as well, so some protection and observation needs to be applied during construction and the future.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors (such as birds) but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. Should potential impacts be anticipated to an ecological receptor, mitigation measures would be implemented. Mitigation measures for both construction and operation can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, for example employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to provide specialist advice and monitor adherence to construction mitigation measures.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme, including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity	The route beyond the A1 towards Winthorpe requires the removal of many well established trees which are a live habitat. Additionally and more importantly these trees shield the south side of Winthorpe from current A1 and A46 noise and light pollution. Their removal will expose many residents to the open views of Currys' warehouse and it's night time operations and light pollution.	2B	N	<p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. This includes the retention of areas of existing intervening vegetation which is located between Winthorpe and the Currys Distribution Centre. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme which would also reinstate screening value of views towards the distribution centre. There are several lines of vegetation that would be provided between the village and the centre. For instance, between the southern edge of Winthorpe and the A1, a new area of woodland would be provided to create a visual screen. To the south-east, a series of planted landscape bunds would also offer screening and continue the green corridor that would be provided along the route of the Scheme. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will be prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation. The Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be prepared prior to construction starting and will be based on and incorporate the requirements of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> submitted as part of the development consent application. It will ensure that control measures are in place to limit environmental effects before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ2-Z	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	Trees need to be kept for noise limitation	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. Planting is not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise. Instead where needed,</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>landscape bunds and acoustic barriers would be provided. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Further detail on the specific measures proposed to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Measures such as landscape bunds do not need to establish and are anticipated to be effective in minimising impacts on sensitive receptors from the point at which the Scheme is operational. These landscape bunds would also be planted to soften the visual appearance of built features, contribute to habitat creation and align with the local landscape character.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Details of the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided proposed beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN6-R	Landscape and visual effects	We need more medium and large trees planting to provide more visual barriers especially by the A1133 which will be nearer to the north end of the village as it only shows plans for Grassland and not Tree and shrub planting which is planned for the Langford side just off the Roundabout.	2C	N	The environmental design has evolved since the statutory consultation and now includes the provision of tree and shrub planting on the southern side of the A1133 as well as a native hedgerow with trees. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> shows further detail of the landscape planting and respective locations.
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects; A1/A46 Crossing	<p>Landscape and visual effects – the significant elevated section of the new A46 will have a lasting impact on the nature of the Winthorpe Conservation Area. The scheme also obliterates the Open Break area between Newark and Winthorpe with the potential of merging of the town and village in the future as no distinct character or space between the two settlements will exist.</p> <p>On a personal level, the new elevated section of the A46 will dominate over the existing A1. The new road will be visible from my garden and the new overbridge for the A1 a dominant feature in the landscape.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's concerns with regards to the impacts on the Winthorpe Conservation Area as a result of the Scheme. The Applicant has assessed the landscape and visual effects as part of its Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment of effects upon the Winthorpe Conservation Area is addressed within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) whilst the impacts on the open break are addressed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>From a cultural heritage perspective, the impacts upon Winthorpe Conservation Area during construction have been assessed as temporary moderate adverse. Upon completion of construction of the Scheme, the impacts have been assessed as permanent slight adverse once planting mitigation is established. Operational effects on the Winthorpe Conservation Area have not therefore been assessed as significant.</p> <p>From a landscape and visual impact perspective, the impacts upon Winthorpe Conservation Area and the open break are assessed as part of the broader impacts upon landscape character. The Winthorpe village and Farmlands Landscape Character Area (which the open break falls within) would experience a large adverse effect during construction and in Year 1 (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic), reducing to moderate adverse by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) upon the establishment of proposed mitigation planting. Further information is provided within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Planting would be provided to limit the visual effects upon local receptors, using woodland planting, trees and shrubs to aid screening of sensitive areas.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVX-2	Landscape and visual effects; Land ownership	<p>The current proposal (as shown on General Arrangement drawings and page 25 of the Statutory Consultation Brochure) shows new tree and shrub planting on the north side of the A1133 from the new Winthorpe junction for a distance of c. 250m. We note this and assume it is included for environmental mitigation and (possibly) wildlife benefits, however we make no formal comment as it is on land not owned by the charity.</p> <p>Trustees are therefore very surprised to see nothing similar for the south side of the A1133 (apart from the first 75m or so), especially as the new section of the A1133 from the new roundabout will be positioned even closer to the village than it is now. Whilst trustees recognise that a tree / shrub planting Scheme on the south side that effectively mirrors that proposed on the north side would take more of the charity's land, we REQUEST that such a Scheme be included in the detailed design to come post-consultation.</p> <p>We would expect any land required to accommodate this to be included in any compulsory</p>	2D	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Details of the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The environmental design has evolved since statutory consultation and now includes a provision of planting on the southern side of the A1133. Land required for essential environmental mitigation as part of the Scheme (such as planting) would be acquired permanently and managed by the Applicant unless otherwise agreed with the landowner.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		purchase order and the ownership of any such land is transferred permanently from the charity to National Highways or another third party of NH's choosing. The charity would have no responsibility for the planting and ongoing maintenance of any trees and shrubs.			
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Landscape and visual effects	Will you put landscape screening around the Esso service area which is likely to become busier?	2H	N	Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . The majority of existing planting around the Esso Service Station would remain. In addition to retention of existing vegetation, planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including to the rear and side of the Esso Service Station which would aid screening of the fuel station as well as the widened A46 beyond. The introduction of a landscape bund between Winthorpe and the Esso Service Station would aid screening of the lower sections of the Esso Service Station with immediate effect, whilst screening of upper parts of the area would increase over time as vegetation matures.
ANON-559H-RWN8-T	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	The elevation, depth and density of tree planting is not clear from the visualisations. There must be a temptation to reduce or merely maintain what exists in order to the additional carriageway. Clearly, higher levels of traffic will create more noise, etc and this will need to be mitigated by more rather than less screening	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has produced Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065APP/6.2)</b> which provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, including the planting densities and height of trees that would be provided. With regard to the depth of trees, this will be finalised during the detailed design stage. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting including trees, shrubs and hedgerows would also be provided beyond earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. Where necessary, mitigation planting would be provided within the Order Limits of the Scheme to ensure mitigation is delivered on-site and embedded within the Scheme design.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. The noise mitigation measures would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing along the length of the Scheme, these measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Material assets and waste	Material assets and waste <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where will your material come from? Is it feasible for the borrowpit material to be used to construct the highway? If material is sourced from elsewhere, what will be the carbon mileage?</li> </ul>	2C	N	Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> , outlines the broad sources of materials to be used by the Scheme, such as soil (site won material and imported fill), aggregates (sand, gravel and crushed rock) and manufactured products (precast concrete). Further details of the main types and estimated quantities of construction materials required for the delivery of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Waste would be managed in adherence with the <i>Waste Framework Directive</i> hierarchy, which requires that waste is dealt with in the following order of priority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention</li> <li>Preparing for reuse</li> <li>Recycling</li> <li>Other recovery (energy recovery)</li> <li>Disposal</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Material assets and waste	Material assets and waste – are materials excavated from local borrowpit areas likely to give the benefits outlined in the PEI. Local soils, sands and gravels may not provide materials suitable for embankment building.	2C		<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, assesses greenhouse gas emissions relating to the transport of materials to site. The transport of materials during construction is estimated to contribute 62,079 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, which equates to approximately 24% of the total construction carbon emissions. This follows guidance from the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and assumptions on the transport of materials to site, where actual supplier information may not be known.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the use of borrow pits to source construction material, it would be necessary to import some engineering earthworks materials, for example imported backfill material behind structures and, where required, imported materials in a starter layer or drainage layer under embankments.</p> <p>Where possible, materials would be recycled and used in the works. This includes materials such as road planings from resurfacing works or redundant sections of carriageway. It is</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>planned that unsuitable materials generated from earthworks operations would be used within the works and placed as landscape bunds..</p> <p>A Ground Investigation was undertaken by the Applicant, targeting floodplain compensation areas and borrow pit sites and one area of localised contamination. Details of the Ground Investigation undertaken are contained in Appendix 9.2 (Contaminated Land Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The Ground Investigation was undertaken in accordance with regulatory standards and current best practice to confirm the materials present at the Scheme, including their thickness and properties, specifically with regard to geo-environmental aspects. The Ground Investigation was undertaken in accordance with the following British Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS 10175:2011+A2:2017 "Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites": Code of Practice (BSI, 2017)</li> <li>• BS 5930:2015 + A1:2020 "Code of Practice for Site Investigations": (BSI, 2020)</li> </ul> <p>The three borrow pits to be provided would support the creation of embankments required for the Scheme, as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3G-E	Noise and vibration	I would like to see sound reducing fences to be put up on the a46 southbound lane at the Cattlemarket roundabout near the truck stop as my property has a north-eastly front where I can hear the a46 at present from my property. The sound reducing measures for this stretch currently only benefit sandhills close.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment concludes that mitigation measures are required as outlined in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers would be provided along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout. Locations of the noise barriers can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. These measures are also detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Noise and vibration; Brownhills Junction	<p>The information provided already shows that the noise and pollution levels at Brownhills junction are at sensitive levels so the addition of 4 lanes of fast flowing traffic, a slip road with decelerating vehicles and a roundabout and connecting road with accelerating vehicles can only increase these levels to an intolerable and unacceptable level.</p> <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.2 shows that [redacted] already lies in a noise important area due to the A1. Long term noise level monitors placed at locations LT6 and LT7 showed similar daytime and night-time noise level results, well above the recommended limits. These monitors were placed on the opposite side of the raised A1 from [redacted] and there was no monitoring taken place close to the location of the proposed new Brownhills junction where the noise levels are likely to increase significantly from not only the traffic on the raised A46 but from the decelerating and accelerating vehicles on the slip road and roundabout to the side and in front of the property</li> <li>• What further increase in this level should be expected by bringing the proximity of the A46 significantly closer to the property and by creating a slip road and a roundabout where the vehicles will be continuously decelerating and accelerating creating additional road and vehicle noise? Referring to the proposed A46 development the second inspector for the secretary of state [redacted] stated, "I have no doubt that the potential exists for a greater adverse impact because of the closer proximity of a dual carriageway." (Appeal Decision, 13.06.22)</li> <li>• Noise levels from the existing A1 already exceed guidelines in BS8233:2014 which relates to noise levels in and around buildings as was found by a noise survey conducted on behalf of inspector [redacted] for the secretary of state when the land adjacent to the property was subject to a refusal of planning permission on 2 occasions. It recommends</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided in the form of barriers, a bund, a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, and low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area.</p> <p>Receptors at LT6, LT7, and the property referred to in the Consultee's response, are all expected to have negligible noise impacts with the Scheme. Despite the Scheme moving the A46 closer to these receptors, the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and therefore a slight increase in the noise contribution from the A46 would not be perceivable.</p> <p>In response to the quote shared by the Consultee, the potential exists, however there are a number of other factors that contribute to the noise levels changing that are not just associated with road proximity, such as flow changes, speed changes, topography, and screening such as noise barriers and bunds where required.</p> <p>The assessment of this Scheme has been carried out in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> rather than <i>BS8233:2014</i>, as it sets out the requirements for noise and vibration assessments from road projects, applying a proportionate and consistent approach using best practice and ensuring compliance with relevant legislation.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		that external areas used for amenity space should not exceed 50dB, with an upper guideline of 55 dB for noisier environments. Noise levels were found to average 63.5 dB during the daytime and 60dB at night. 2.4M high acoustic fencing was deemed inadequate to reduce the levels enough. (Appeal Decision 26.02.19)			<p>Existing noise levels in isolation must be considered within the context of the resultant noise impact of the Scheme, and therefore cannot be the only factor from which the resultant significance of effects is drawn. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and Vibration</i> considers not only the absolute noise levels but also the contribution of noise impacts that arise from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme only considers the development of the A46. Therefore, mitigation of noise from the A1 is not within the remit of the Scheme.</p> <p>Where possible noise would be mitigated such that noise levels in noise important areas would decrease and for all other noise important areas there would be a negligible change.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction phase of the Scheme, including the use of borrow pits.</p> <p>There are no statutory legal noise limits that are applicable to the Scheme. The methodology for assigning significant adverse noise effects is set out in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). By employing mitigation, it has been possible to eradicate the possibility of significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Changes in speed at the Cattle Market Roundabout are noted to be present. Exact values for speed changes have been assessed as part of the traffic model. This traffic model has formed the basis of the noise model which has been used to assess the likely noise impact of the Scheme. It was noted that there would be potential for noise sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Cattle Market Roundabout to be adversely affected by the Scheme and therefore mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers has been included in the design, details of which can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWBQ-7	Noise and vibration	<p>You say in your brochure...</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>Deliver better environmental outcomes by achieving a net gain in biodiversity, and improve noise levels at Noise Important Areas along the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts.</p> <p>Our noise levels will get far worse and are already close to legal limits. The 'borrow pits' are unacceptable so close to houses along the riverbank. We should not be expected to live opposite a building site.</p>	2C		
ANON-559H-RWE5-E	Noise and vibration	At present the average speed of vehicles travelling across this junction is about 25 mph – when the road is raised and average speed is 60mph the noise levels in Kelham Road and the surrounding area will increase very dramatically as the designers well know.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWBQ-7	Noise and vibration	<p>Recognition that current noise levels (sampled by you) makes where we live a 'noise important area'</p> <p>Information and consultation about 'quarrying' by the river and a rethink of doing that on opposite people's homes.</p> <p>Proper and transparent 'noise impact analysis' and clear, specific mitigation measures built into the project (e.g. noise barriers, tree planting, noise insulation for affected homes).</p>	2D	N	
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Noise and vibration	noise reduction mitigations ie bund, road surface, mature tree planting	2D		
ANON-559H-RWGU-G	Noise and vibration	Noise: What steps are being put in place to reduce road noise? There needs to be low nose tarmac or sound barriers.	2B		

Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (**TR010065/APP/6.1**) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.

'Noise important area' is a Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs term that refers to areas where the 1% of the population affected by the highest noise levels from major roads is located. Noise important areas that are relevant to the Scheme are shown within Figure 11.3 (Noise Important Areas NIAs) of the Environmental Statement Figures (**TR010065/APP/6.2**). It is noted the current assessment is not limited to noise important areas, and considers all relevant sensitive receptors, including addresses in the vicinity of Farndon.

Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, these would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (**TR010065/APP/6.2**). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (**TR010065/APP/3.1**) secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.

Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be provided north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening, these measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes in the short term (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and the long term (2043, 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration	The height of the new A46 carriageway in the vicinity of the open break between Winthorpe and Newark. This is projected to be 7.8 metres high with a width of 70 metres. This makes it higher than the A1. This means that the noise will travel over the A1, thereby creating more noise for the south end of Winthorpe, including our house. This is very concerning as we already live in a noise important area.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment concludes that mitigation measures are required as outlined in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, these would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be provided north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area, including the location referred by the Consultee. Further information can be seen in Figure 11.3 (Noise Important Areas NIAs) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. There are no significant adverse effects predicted at any locations with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Despite the Scheme moving the A46 closer to these receptors, the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and therefore a slight increase in the noise contribution from the A46 would not be perceivable. Where possible, noise has been mitigated such that noise levels in noise important areas would decrease and for all other noise important areas there would be a negligible change. The Scheme only considers the development of the existing A46, therefore mitigation of noise from the A1 is not within the remit of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise mitigation measures are also detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNB-4	Noise and vibration	The working groups were useless, we should of had people to the houses. These houses we live it are right by the a46 and any works or extensions will make are house a place that is unbearable. The noise is a lot now, not alone when it goes to x4 lanes or more!!	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment relating to the working groups and assumes the Consultee is referring to resident events that took place from August and October 2022 on the Scheme.</p> <p>The five events took place at locations along the route to provide residents with the opportunity to meet the project team, get an update on the Scheme and ask questions about the Scheme ahead of the statutory consultation taking place.</p> <p>Letters inviting residents to the events were sent to over 300 addresses and included an option for residents to arrange for a home visit to take place if preferred. Several residents took up this option and members of the project team visited resident's homes as part of this engagement activity.</p> <p><b>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided including low noise road surfacing along the Scheme. Noise mitigation measures would be introduced in the form of noise barriers from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Noise and vibration	<p>Serious consideration needs to be given to how noise reduction Schemes will work.</p> <p>Multiple properties to the South end of Winthorpe are already deemed to be in Noise Important Areas, including our house [redacted].</p> <p>At present, the listed nature of [redacted] limits the improvements that we can do to our house to reduce noise. We would ask for support from National Highways for the cost and planning permission needed for Triple acoustic secondary glazing.</p> <p>The use of bunding along the A46 extension is going to be crucial in noise abatement. We would like to know more about what plans are going to be put in place and what expected noise levels at our property will be.</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to the noise mitigation measures provided for the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to the concerns of properties in proximity, or within a noise important area, the noise assessment presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concluded operational noise impacts would result in a negligible impact at noise important area 7838, detailed in Figure 11.3 (Noise Important Areas NIAs) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Despite the Scheme moving the A46 closer to the receptors referred by the Consultee, the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and therefore a slight increase in the noise contribution from the A46 would not be perceivable.</p> <p>Where possible, noise would be mitigated such that noise levels in noise important areas would decrease and for all other noise important areas there would be a negligible change. Noise mitigation measures would be provided in the form of barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route. Low noise road surfacing would be provided along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>With regards to the concerns around glazing of windows, the noise assessment presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) includes consideration for noise insulation measures. No receptors eligible for noise insulation under the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (amended 1988) have been identified.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures highlighted in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) would be provided at the northern side of the A46 at Winthorpe including low noise running surface, barriers and bunds. This would yield negligible or beneficial changes in noise at the southern point of Winthorpe. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN6-R	Noise and vibration	<p>I am very worried about the increase of noise both from traffic and construction machines that this project brings. There is much noise from the A1 as the prevailing wind (from the Sugar Beet factory area (SW) already is unacceptable when windows are open in the summer. With the A46 coming nearer that will just add to the existing levels.</p> <p>I worry about vibrations being raised as well to buildings at the South end of the village.</p>	2H	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Baseline noise monitoring was undertaken at several locations chosen to represent a spread along the length of the Scheme along with specific locations made by stakeholder request. These locations can be found within Figure 11.4 (Noise Monitoring Locations) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects from noise and/or vibration during construction provided the proposed mitigation measures as set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) are adhered to. Such measures include, but are not limited, to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary acoustic barriers to be erected at several locations,</li> <li>• Limitations on the timing of construction machinery known to generate significant noise to minimise potential disruption</li> <li>• Construction plant to be fitted with noise reduction equipment where possible</li> <li>• Use of acoustic dampened sheet piles to minimise noise generation during piling activities</li> </ul> <p>This would ensure that any adverse effects are no worse than set out in the assessment as per Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and are compliant with any subsequent agreements with the local authority associated with temporary noise and/or vibration effects.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The assessment concludes that during operation of the Scheme there is potential for changes to traffic flows and road alignment which may result in noise sensitive receptors, many of which would be beneficial due to the addition of temporary acoustic screening, permanent landscaping bunds and changes in the carriageway surface material to reduce operational noise. The assessment concluded that no noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Operational vibration has been scoped out of the assessment for the reasons provided in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) which states that "Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out."</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration; Stakeholder engagement; Land ownership	<p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What mitigation will be offered for properties in the south of Winthorpe, above and beyond low noise tarmac?</li> <li>2. National Highways are building more road infrastructure in an existing NIA. What will National Highways do to ensure that noise does not increase in the NIA at Winthorpe?</li> <li>3. What complex noise mapping will be undertaken to understand how the noise dynamics of the new A46, the Brownhills Junction and the A1 will interact?</li> <li>4. What noise mapping will be undertaken to account for the noise impact of the A46 carriageway being higher than the existing A1?</li> <li>5. What specific expertise will be utilised to ensure that there is a full understanding of the complexities of noise in this NIA? It is concerning that thus far, National Highways has failed to provide us with a specialist with the required skills set to answer our questions on this matter. It would imply that the current team do not have the required expertise to undertake this complex task, or be able to convey this information to impacted residents in a helpful and informed manner.</li> <li>6. Are we one of the houses that is predicated to experience an increase in noise (page 42, Consultation Brochure)? If we are, may I remind National Highways that they have a duty to not make noise worse in an NIA.</li> </ol>	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. In consideration of Winthorpe, a temporary acoustic barrier would be in place as well as restrictions to plant machinery operating hours and use of muffling and noise reduction machines to minimise potential disruption to sensitive receptors. Once operational, permanent noise barriers and landscaping bunds north of the A46 between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout would provide noise screening for receptors. These are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Figure 11.3 (Noise Important Areas NIAs) has been produced to illustrate the location of noise important areas in proximity to the Scheme, which can be found within the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). There are two small noise important areas present within proximity to Winthorpe. Both are attributed to areas of the A1/existing A46 south of Winthorpe and relate to a very limited number of residential properties. Assessment of these noise important areas has been undertaken as part of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and concludes that the operational effects of the Scheme on both noise important areas would either negligible or showing a minor beneficial effect.</p> <p>Detailed operational noise modelling was undertaken to inform Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), supported by the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) which show predicted noise levels across the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after Scheme opening (2043) (<i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and Vibration</i> convention). This model presents the contribution of noise levels from the existing A46, the widened A46, the A1, a number of other local roads, and the general changes in traffic. During operation, there is potential for changes to traffic flows and road alignment to result in noise changes. This is attributed to increased road traffic. This model has been used to inform the noise mitigation strategy for the Scheme. As a result, no significant adverse effects are expected to arise in Winthorpe as a result of the changes in noise contribution from the A46 or its interaction with the A1.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Table 11-35 in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) lists all receptors where a potentially significant operational noise effect as a result of the Scheme has been identified. As detailed in Section 11.2 (Competent Expert Evidence) of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the noise specialist who prepared the chapter has a BA (Hons) in Engineering Science from the University of Oxford and is a Chartered Engineer and Fellow of the Institute of Acoustics. They have over 30 years' of experience in noise and vibration including preparation of Environmental Statement chapters. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) has been written so that the reader can understand the noise impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant has also produced an Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (<b>TR010065/APP/6.4</b>) which explains the Environmental Statement (including Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)) in an easily digestible way.</p> <p>Permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration; Population and human health	<p>Noise and vibration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As emphasised in a previous section, new road will be built in an existing Noise Important Area (NIA). How can this be acceptable when National Highways has an obligation to not increase noise levels at NIAs?</li> <li>Why is National Highways dismissing World Health Organisation measures when considering noise?</li> <li>The elevated level of the road in the vicinity of Cattle Market and A1 will propagate noise over a larger area than the current A46.</li> <li>Analysis provided in the scheme indicates that some communities around Newark already experience noise that exceeds World Health Organisation guidelines. This includes our property. The new road will exacerbate noise for two reasons – firstly, road is being built in new areas (e.g. a brand new roundabout as part of the scheme; new elevated sections which will generate greater levels of noise), and secondly, because expanded capacity of the road network will increase traffic levels.</li> <li>National Highways themselves acknowledge that “There is extensive evidence linking noise to changes in health and wellbeing, for example, exposure to noise can cause high blood pressure, heart disease, sleep disturbances and stress”.</li> <li>The key remedy offered by National Highways is low noise tarmac. However, this will require regular maintenance causing additional maintenance construction noise and vibration during operation. There is no justification for scoping out vibration during operation. The assumption is that the tarmac laid will be smooth and free of defect but this will only last for a while. Over time, vibration will become an issue. It is important that vibration mapping is therefore properly analysed.</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p><i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments with regards to World Health Organization measures when considering noise impacts. The World Health Organization's <i>Environmental Noise Guidelines</i> have been considered within <b>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). It is noted however that these guidelines do not account for sustainability which is a key element of the <i>Noise Policy Statement</i> for England (and UK Government policy). The effect of noise from a road does not only consider the proximity of residences from that road but also the traffic flow, composition of traffic, speed, road surface type, road gradient, local topography, and any additional screening such as buildings, fences, or noise barriers. Therefore, it may be possible and therefore appropriate, to position a road in new areas without adverse noise effects provided the acoustic context was also appropriate. In the context of this Scheme, no residual operational adverse effects would arise due to changes in road alignment. Noise levels with and without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes both short-term (2028, the year the Scheme is open) and long-term (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) are presented for all areas relevant to the Scheme within <b>Figures 11.5 to 11.10</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Figure 11.3 (Noise Important Areas NIAs) has been produced to illustrate the location of noise important areas in proximity to the Scheme, which can be found within the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). There are two primary noise important areas present within the Order Limits of the Scheme. Both are attributed to areas of the A1/existing A46 south of Winthorpe and relate to a very limited number of residential properties. Assessment of these noise important areas has been undertaken as part of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and concludes that the operational effects of the Scheme on both noise important areas are either negligible or as showing a minor beneficial effect. As such, there would be no operational increase in noise within these noise important areas. The Applicant notes the concern regarding regular surface maintenance, surfacing would be replaced on average every 10 years.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments with regards to noise related health impacts. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the Scheme on local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>The elevated level of the road in the vicinity of Cattle Market and the A1, and the expanded capacity, have all been accounted for in the noise modelling of the Scheme. Where necessary, mitigation would be provided, such as low noise road surfacing, barriers at Cattle Market and barriers and bunds at Winthorpe. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. Mitigation measures are further detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Operational vibration has been scoped out of the assessment for the reasons provided in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which states that "Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out."</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration	<p>14. Why is National Highways dismissing World Health Organisation measures when considering noise?</p> <p>15. What mitigation for noise will be offered over and above low noise tarmac? As outlined by the UK Health Security Agency, "Priority should be given to reducing noise at source, and noise insulation Schemes should be considered as a last resort" (TR010065-000046-A46N – Scoping Opinion)</p> <p>16. Why has vibration been scoped out?</p>	2C	N	<p>In many instances, noise levels already exceed World Health Organization guidelines. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>, as required for highway schemes and to avoid significant effects. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, these would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures continue the approach of reducing noise as close to source as is feasible, and are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Operational vibration has been scoped out of the assessment for the reasons provided in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which states that <i>"Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out."</i></p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration; Consultation – general	<p>Decibel readings are given. But these numbers are meaningless without a proper understanding of what the numbers mean, and what an increase in decibels will mean.</p> <p>The UK Health Security Agency recommends that consultation is undertaken with those who will experience changes or increases in noise through immersive technology, so that a full and honest consultation process is enacted.</p> <p>Nothing of this sort has been offered by National Highways, and our concerns about noise have been met with incredulity from National Highways staff and associated representatives.</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments relating to the decibel readings provided as part of the statutory consultation and appreciates that a level of technical understanding is required for a subject of this nature. Interpretation of decibel readings is subjective and therefore can be difficult to accurately describe. However, the noise assessment is presented on the basis of comparing noise levels both with and without the Scheme, in line with the guidelines presented in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> which describes the noise and vibration assessment methodology including how effect significance is judged.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments regarding the use of immersive technology, and how this can assist with the understanding of potential noise impacts. The noise assessment information the Applicant has provided as part of the statutory consultation and within the development consent application presents the information that is necessary to demonstrate that no noise and vibration related significant effects would occur as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place, as outlined in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMG-8	Noise and vibration	Soundproof screen. Is the construction of noise barriers envisaged? If so, what level stage of work? Please provide more information regarding of noise reduction in the area next to ringroad?	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The final design of the permanent noise barriers would continue to be developed at the locations specified in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNB-4	Noise and vibration	Noise cancellation from the bridge that runs by the end of our riverside garden	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. Details of this (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RWVQ-U	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	Fencing to help eliminate noise very much required as is the planting of evergreen trees & hedging.	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, including noise barrier/bund locations, are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Incorporation of the permanent noise barriers is included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifying actions and commitments demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNB-4	Noise and vibration	The noise is going to be horrific, when being worked on and when open.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. Measure would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Noise and vibration; Land ownership	<p>10. NOISE</p> <p>We note from Figure 12.1 Preliminary Environmental Information Report – Noise Important Areas that our client's property, known as [redacted], is marked as a 'noise important area'. However, we also note that this location has not been included as a noise monitoring location. The impact of noise on this property and [redacted] would be significant during construction and post construction if appropriate attenuation measures of the correct standard/specification are not installed; which are also of a sympathetic design taking into consideration the heritage nature of these properties. Our client's request further details in this respect and how, in the absence of noise monitoring at this location, how the full impact will be assessed by NH.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant is aware of the listed status of the building and as such, it has been assessed in detail in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Consideration of impacts on noise important areas relevant to the Scheme is given in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and it is noted that short-term noise impacts during operation would either be negligible or slightly better in all noise important areas within the study area. With regard to the Consultee's concerns of the operational noise impacts on the property, the residual short-term impact here is minor beneficial and the long-term impact is negligible. Therefore, there are no residual significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Noise monitoring was undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment. The noise assessment is nonetheless predominantly based on forecast traffic flows and simulated noise levels for all address base data points. All relevant locations have been included in the assessment. No additional noise monitoring is required to facilitate the assessment.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ). This includes the use of temporary acoustic barriers during construction. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme, adherence to which is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Land ownership; Landscape and visual effects; construction; Noise and vibration	<p>11. RESIDENTIAL &amp; COMMERCIAL PROPERTY IMPACTS</p> <p>The proposed Scheme will have significant impacts on the quiet enjoyment of our client's properties particularly in relation to the visual and operational impacts of the Scheme and its construction. The operational impacts will result in a loss of letting income; particularly in the case of our client's existing Airbnb lettings. Our client requests that all accommodation works in respect of the proposed new access drive are constructed prior to the main works being carried out in order to minimise the impact of the project works</p>	N/A	N	<p>Following statutory consultation, there has been ongoing engagement with the Consultee. The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Applicant understands the concerns regarding operational impacts associated with the loss of an existing access to this property. To mitigate this impact, the Applicant would construct the replacement access in advance of the existing access being closed. All accesses are shown on the Works Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Land ownership; Landscape and visual effects	The outlook will be adversely affected in a major way. The property currently overlooks open farmland on 3 sides surrounded by mature trees and all this land will be used in the construction of the new road network, creating a view of raised concrete construction instead. Even if some of this could be mitigated using planting, the trees planted would need to be mature at the time of planting to be of necessary size to mitigate any noise, pollution, and visual impact. Sapling growth would take very many years. How will it be possible to screen the 10m high roadway seen from the entire frontage of the property?	2B	N	<p>The Scheme design has been developed in order to reduce adverse visual effects where possible. Existing vegetation would be retained wherever possible, including along the property boundaries so as to retain existing screening value. The land parcels to the west would be returned to existing land use upon completion of construction. The land parcel to the south-west between the property and the A46 would be planted as a woodland, providing notable screening over time. To the east and south-east, planting of trees and shrubs, hedgerows and standard trees would be provided to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme over time, providing secondary intervening vegetation to that already provided by planting on Winthorpe Road and the property boundary.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. With regards to the Consultee's suggestion to plant mature trees, some mature tree planting would be considered; however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>The existing A46 is a constraint on the vertical geometry design, as the new proposal is designed to incorporate and maintain the existing A46 where possible. The existing A46, where retained, is the primary design influence for the proposed vertical alignment of the new carriageway adjacent. Additionally, there are bridge clearance requirements which must be maintained over existing infrastructure, and which will be a factor in designing the geometric approaches to structures, as well as the overall vertical alignment. The vertical gradients have to be designed to ensure that visibility criteria for safety requirements is achieved in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 109 – Highway link design</i>. Lastly, there are design requirements to safeguard drainage and flooding events (<i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 – Design of highway drainage systems</i>), such that they do not have an adverse effect on the proposed highway. Where the design is in the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					floodplain zone, the vertical geometry has to account for storm events and the aftermath of such events.
ANON-559H-RWVA-B	Noise and vibration; Land ownership	<p>I am particularly worried about the noise levels which are already quite bad and would be much worse for the residents of the [redacted] It would have less impact both in the building of and day to day usage of the road if the route was taken further away and on the showground side of the current road. I am also concerned about the noise reduction options as trees take a long time to grow to an appreciable size and would have to be planted now to have any impact at all.</p> <p>And of course I am worried about the loss of value to my property should we wish to sell as we are only a few houses away from the Mint Leaf building.</p>	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme, including potential noise impacts at the property referred to in the Consultee's response. The assessment concludes that there are no residual significant effects anticipated at the property during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation in the form of permanent noise barriers would be provided along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station and also from the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund. Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects. Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with and without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes both short-term (the year the Scheme is open to traffic, 2028) and long-term (15 years after Scheme opening, 2043) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE5-E	Noise and vibration	I think the Designers and the Engineer who presented this scheme to the residence of Kelham Road should have been more honest about the increase in noise level that this Scheme will inevitably bring to the area	2I	N	<p>A noise and vibration assessment which considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme has been undertaken in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>, which sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration and the standard to which all applications must adhere to. The results are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>No significant noise or vibration effects are anticipated along Kelham Road during construction or operation following application of the mitigation presented in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>). During construction several measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise and vibration, these include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary noise barriers to be erected at several locations, including the Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• Limitations on the timing of construction machinery known to generate significant noise to minimise potential disruption</li> <li>• Construction plant to be fitted with noise reduction equipment where possible</li> <li>• Use of acoustic dampened sheet piles to minimise noise generation during piling activities</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Once operational, permanent noise barriers would be in place at several locations, as well as along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout. This would help to contain road traffic noise and minimise potential effects on noise sensitive receptors, details of which are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . These measures at Cattle Market Roundabout would ensure that no receptors on Kelham Road would be subject to significant adverse effects.
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Noise and vibration	Increased traffic noise. Current noise levels (already sampled) make it an area of "noise importance".	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at all address base points (including noise important areas) that are relevant to the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	Increased risk of flooding to residential properties from the river Trent. Quarrying borrow pits opposite residential properties across the Trent on existing farm land which floods annually.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, and a mitigation scheme has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, including from the River Trent. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	There must be clear plans to stop flooding to residential properties both when the works are undertaken and long term afterwards.	2G		<p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With respect to flooding of excavated borrow pits, as indicated in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, dewatering is expected to be required at excavated borrow pit locations. Environmental permits for groundwater abstraction and water discharge would be sought from the Environment Agency before this work commences.</p> <p>Dewatering discharge would be directed to silt lagoons for settlement and attenuation prior to discharge to a local watercourse. After the completion of material extraction, the excavations would be backfilled and re-soiled. The borrow pit sites that are with floodplain compensation areas would be topsoiled to form the permanent floodplain compensation area levels. These measures would prevent an increase in flooding in the borrow pits during construction.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Noise and vibration	No clear plans to manage & mitigate increased noise levels.	2C	N	The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, details of which (excluding the low noise surfacing) can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>This appears to have been an afterthought within the plans</p> <p>Newark is a high flood risk area and it is critical that a compressive design is developed and signed off prior to the submission of the Development Consent Order</p>	2G	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) setting out a mitigation scheme to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Noise and vibration	<p>Recognition that current noise levels are unacceptable to local residents. Noise impact analysis is required, and clear specific mitigation plans built into the project – such as noise barriers from Fardon roundabout to Cattle Market roundabout, noise insulation to homes and enhanced tree planting, including evergreens.</p>	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Noise and vibration	Raised A46 at Cattle Market needs noise cancelling fences on the southbound side near the current Truck Stop. Properties 1 to 11 on Kelham Road are north facing. Greatest disturbance will come from that direction. I can currently see the Cattle Market roundabout from my property, with the A46 being elevated, I will be able to see and hear it more.	2B		<p>due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, details of which (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. These measures include the use of temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction.</p> <p>The noise assessment presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes consideration for noise insulation measures. No receptors eligible for noise insulation under the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (amended 1988) have been identified.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	No clear details of the impact of quarrying borrow pits opposite residential properties across the Trent.	2C	N	<p>The design of the Scheme includes the formation and use of borrow pits which are described in Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The purpose of the borrow pits would be to extract suitable earthworks materials for use during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Potentially three borrow pits would be formed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon West, to the north of the River Trent</li> <li>• Farndon East, to the north of the River Trent</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction</li> </ul> <p>With regards to the borrow pits, these locations have been selected in proximity to where material would be needed during the construction phase therefore minimising the distance over which material would need to be transported. Further information on the consideration of</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	Clear impact analysis of the quarrying of borrow pits – night working, more noise, dust and flood impact whilst doing so and afterwards.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Road drainage and the water environment	Indicated areas N and P could become a 'wet land' and a habitat for wildlife – therefore concerns over flood areas would be minimised.	2G		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>locations can be found in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The average depth of the borrow pits would be 1-3m. The topsoil excavated from the borrow pit areas would be stockpiled adjacent to the areas such that it can be resoiled after completion of the works as outlined within Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) and Outline Materials Management Plan of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Settlement and recharge lagoons would be constructed adjacent to the borrow pit areas to allow dewatering operations to take place. The excavated material would be cleaned and graded to a specified material classification on site. This would be loaded on to wagons to be taken to the required fill locations.</p> <p>These borrow pits may be utilised to provide retrospective surface water attenuation for a section of the existing highway and have the potential to be turned into wetland areas, providing water quality improvements and biodiversity potential. The potential use of borrow pits within the drainage strategy can be found in Section 6 (Construction and Environmental Management Plan) of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The potential impact of the borrow pits on the water environment is assessed within Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed which is detailed in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the material excavated from the Farndon East site, it is likely to be sands and gravels and would be processed into a Class 6i/j material for use in the reinforced earth soil embankment between the River Trent and the Nottingham to Lincoln Railway Line. Material excavated from the Brownhills site is likely to be a Class 2 clay. Class 6 granular material is a type of fill material used in earthworks, defined as a selected granular material that is used for gabion filling and as fill to reinforced soil and anchored earth structures and are specified in the <i>Specification for Highway Works</i>.</p> <p>Class 2 materials are used as general fill that can't contain chalk and are specified in the <i>Specification for Highway Works</i>. This would be used to construct the new embankment at Brownhills Junction. After completion of the extraction of the material, the excavations would be backfilled and resoiled. The borrow pits sites that are within the floodplain compensation areas (such as Farndon) would become areas of permanent water bodies such as lakes and ponds, or reedbeds, wet marsh and grassland with tree planting.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. As set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, with regards to working hours, they would be restricted to the following core hours, (subject to some exceptions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 07:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday</li> <li>• 07:00 to 13:00 Saturday</li> <li>• No Sunday working</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Some overnight work is anticipated however, this is limited to the exceptions set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan or would require consent from the local authority.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Population and human health; Air quality; road drainage and the water environment; Construction	Clear recognition of problems that will impact local residents both during the project and afterwards – night working, dust, noise & flood risk and what analysis and mitigation plans will be clearly communicated.	21	N	<p>The assessments presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> consider both construction and operation effects upon local residents in relation to night working, dust, noise and flood risk, with consideration of mitigation as part of this.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains in outline how the impact of construction activities on the environment and local residents would be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP 6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction, including on access to services health and social care; and access to green space and recreation.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> provides details on the construction working hours, lighting, and mitigation measures for the Scheme. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours with core construction working hours being from 07:00 to 18:00 on weekdays and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Exceptions to these hours may be required to accommodate activities such as installation and removal of traffic management, installation of bridge beams, abnormal load deliveries, such as bridge beams or large items of plant. Outside the core hours and days specified above, the Applicant will consult with the local planning authority prior to carrying out certain operations such as earthworks which are season and weather dependent. Any other work required to be undertaken outside of core hours (not and the exceptions listed above including repairs or maintenance) would be agreed with the relevant local authority prior to undertaking the works.</p> <p>The Applicant would provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and also identify ways to generate benefits and further mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides details of the Flood Risk Assessment undertaken by the Applicant. The borrow pits would be below existing ground level and therefore would not cause flood risk impacts to other receptors outside of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Noise and vibration; Population and human health; Consultation – general	<p>Noise and Vibration – I believe the current and changing noise affecting local populations is severely downplayed by the analysis presented. The information is presented in terms of global change and the number of receptors affected. It does not allow individual consultees to identify whether they are in the affected areas, a map of the positive and negatively affected areas would allow this without personalised reporting. Where is can be demonstrated that local receptors already experience noise levels in excess of LOAEL and even SOAEL noise levels including those generated by existing Trunk roads this should be more greatly acknowledged and the Scheme should provide the opportunity for improvement in the noise levels experienced by all. ANY increase in noise where levels already exceed health related thresholds is UNACCEPTABLE, especially those in already identified NIAs. The Environment Act states that improvement should be sought in NIAs affected by planned Schemes. It should also be noted the current LOAEL and SOAEL's are deemed lenient compared to some health related noise thresholds and significant health effects may be experienced at much lower levels [UKHSA response to Scoping Opinion].</p> <p>Will this information be made available to local residents to better understand the noise impact of the scheme?</p> <p>I think it is incorrect to remove vibration from the in operation analysis of the proposals, the surfacing suggested to provide low noise has a lifespan of around 10 years before maintenance is likely to be required. This maintenance will be in close proximity to historic properties which may be at risk of vibration due to foundations not being to modern standards. Vibration is likely to gradually increase on the deteriorating surface due to potholes and fretting leading up to the maintenance to replace it.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been completed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>, which sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration and the standard to which all applications must adhere to. This assessment presents the impacts at sensitive receptors across the Scheme. Noise contour figures have been prepared which show short-term (the year the Scheme is open to traffic, 2028) and long-term (15 years after Scheme opening, 2043) changes in noise, as outlined in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and are also presented in the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. This information is of a resolution which is anticipated to enable residents to identify if their property is within a specific noise level band as assessed.</p> <p><i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> provides the most robust means for assessing a development of this size and nature, and therefore has been implemented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Lowest observed adverse effect level and significant observed adverse effect level are considered within the context of the impact that the Scheme would have on noise sensitive receptors, and therefore they are not the only factors in the designation of significant effects.</p> <p>Operational vibration has been scoped out of the assessment for the reasons provided in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which states that '<i>Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out.</i>' The Applicant understands the concerns regarding low noise road surfacing which would be provided throughout the Scheme. The life of low noise surfacing is typically between 8-12 years depending upon many factors, suggesting continual repairs would not be required.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on noise important areas around the Scheme is given in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the short-term noise impacts in operation would result in either a negligible change or be slightly better in all noise important areas within the study area.</p> <p>Assessment of potential impacts to listed buildings and heritage assets has been undertaken in the context of construction vibration, with appropriate mitigation measures such as structural monitoring to be provided before, during and after the construction phase. Further information can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Potential operational impacts resulting from vibration on listed buildings has been scoped out as it is not anticipated to result in a significant impact.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects; Land ownership; Air quality; Brownhills Junction; Biodiversity	<p>There has been 22 years of heavy investment to create a retirement home, which will be significantly devalued by the creation of an additional 5 lanes of traffic (4 lanes A46, and slip road) plus a substantial roundabout encasing the property on 2 sides, in addition to the existing 4 lanes of A1 running along one other side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All these additional roads are raised considerably above ground level and to a height of 10m at the closest point to the property meaning it will not be possible to escape the sight, sound and vibration of traffic day and night from all 4 sides of the property.</li> <li>A height of 10m (33 feet) above ground level for the Brownhills underbridge and the A1 overbridge make it a huge construction encasing the property, even with a planted embankment the outlook and skyline will be non-existent. – It would no longer be possible to enjoy sitting in the front garden or conservatory due to the continuous traffic sight, sound, vibration, and emissions.</li> </ul>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee regarding the points raised. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme. The embankments either side of the A1/A46 Crossing would be planted with trees and shrubs, aiding landscape integration of the above grade structure, and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors over time.</p> <p>A sensitive lighting design would be embedded into the construction and operational phases, and would take bats, otters and other nocturnal wildlife into account. All lighting would be directional to minimise light spill onto retained habitat. Habitat creation adjacent to the</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would no longer be possible to open any windows in the property during warmer months due to excessive noise and pollution levels, especially at night.</li> <li>Currently [redacted] is situated at the end of an unlit lane adjacent to the unlit A1 and surrounded by agricultural land. At night the level of light pollution is extremely low with the nearest lights being barely seen from the streetlights of the existing Brownhills roundabout. The proposed Brownhills scheme will introduce a great deal of light pollution close to the property from the new slip road, roundabout and the headlights of traffic travelling on the raised and significantly closer A46. This will have a detrimental impact from lighting up the property and from interfering with the nocturnal wildlife.</li> </ul>			<p>Scheme and subsequent habitat manipulation during operation would also be incorporated to reduce the effects of artificial lighting and divert species away from lit areas and potential collision points. Further details of the assessment can be found in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Mitigation measures would be put in place to protect wildlife and such details are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> <li>Winthorpe Roundabout</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations would be determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. Adherence to the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be secured by Requirement 3 in the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the potential impacts associated with both the construction phase and the operational phase on sensitive human health receptors and was undertaken in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p> <p>For the operational phase, dispersion modelling was undertaken to predict changes in air quality associated with the Scheme. Dispersion modelling accounts for all roads within the study area that meet the criteria for assessment and are presented in Figure 5.4 (Air Quality Affected Road Network) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Where relevant the dispersion modelling undertaken considered the elevation of roads. Results from the air quality dispersion modelling demonstrated that there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme. Changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant, so no mitigation measures are proposed during operation.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Land ownership; Noise and vibration;	[Redacted] has NOT been listed as a residential property situated within the local impact area according to Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.2 Fig 13.3. How can this be the case? Is this why it has not been chosen as a location for receptors for noise, light and pollution impact testing? How can this be justified when such a large infrastructure such as the	2B	N	From a landscape assessment perspective, the property referred to in Consultee's response has been captured within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and assessed as a residential dwelling as well as a business with workers and visitors. As detailed in Appendix 7.2 (Visual Baseline and

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Landscape and visual effects; Air quality	proposed Brownhills junction and the 10-meter high, 4 lane A46 road is within a few meters of it? No baseline for environmental factors has been established at the location of the proposed Brownhills junction.			<p>Impact Schedules) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, the Scheme would have a large adverse effect on this visual receptor during construction and the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028), reducing to a non-significant slight adverse effect by 15 years after Scheme opening (2043) once mitigation vegetation has had time to mature.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential construction and operational noise and vibration impacts at relevant noise sensitive receptors and the property mentioned is no exception to this assessment.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The assessment did consider impacts at receptors near to Brownhills Junction and noise barriers would be located along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station, and from the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3K-J	Population and human health	<p>There seems to be high care given to the effect on nature and the environment. Which is important. However the effects of living with the disruption, increased traffic noise and pollution affecting residents alongside the new road, appears to take somewhat of a back seat.</p> <p>More care needs to be taken to also protect the health, welfare and future of those residents in close proximity of the new road</p>	2C	N	<p>Consideration of impacts on Population Human Health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and vibration	<p>Population and human health – this section is conveniently divorced from those on air quality, noise and vibration. I think this gives a false impression that these are separate issues. It is clear from recent research and legal cases that there is a direct link between these factors. How many consultees would change their opinion on the scheme if they knew that air quality has been quoted as being linked to increased levels of dementia for example?</p>	2C	N	<p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration amenity effects which includes the coexistence of environmental effects such as air quality, noise and vibration, and landscape and visual amenity. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>This includes but is not limited to dust management (e.g. minimising the height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blown dust emissions and risk of pile collapse; damp down surfaces in dry conditions, etc), noise management (acoustic barriers, reduced quantity and/or on-time of the excavators and dozers operating within 300m of receptors), air pollution control measures (e.g. switching off all vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use) and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. The delivery of these commitments are secured under Requirement 3 as set out in the Draft Development Consent Application <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Noise and vibration; Air quality; Landscape and visual effects	Having a flyover right near our home especially garden will add to noise and pollution and aesthetic effect.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's concern regarding the visual effect of the grade separated junction. The landscape and visual effect of the Cattle Market Junction has been assessed and the outcomes are reported in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Tree and shrub planting would be provided wherever possible to aid the softening and screening of the grade separated junction over time. Further details are presented within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's concern regarding noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that there are no residual significant effects anticipated in the vicinity of the Consultee's property during construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be provided including a noise barrier along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. This mitigation has been designed to alleviate any potential significant adverse impacts for</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>noise during operation. Mitigation measures for potential impacts during the construction stage of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>A Scheme specific air quality monitoring survey was undertaken for six months between May 2022 and November 2022. The results from the monitoring study are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and show that NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations along the Scheme alignment and surrounding areas are well below the annual mean objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The highest concentration recorded overall was 33.0µg/m<sup>3</sup>, at a receptor located on the A1133 adjacent to Winthorpe Roundabout. An assessment of air quality impacts during construction has also been undertaken, which confirmed that no significant effects would arise at any human health receptors during construction following adherence with mitigation measures. Further to this, during operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed during operation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Biodiversity; Cultural heritage; Land ownership	<p>We obviously hope there is as little environmental impact as possible during and after construction. You propose to take our adjoining paddock land, owned jointly between us and [redacted]. We currently use this land recreationally on a daily basis so this is an upheaval for us. There are also many badgers, foxes, deer and birds using this habitat.</p> <p>Within our land boundaries there is a 19<sup>th</sup> century Grade II listed windmill (built 1823) along with a bakehouse.</p> <p>We would like assurance that this structure will not be damaged or undermined in any way.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments about biodiversity. The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures would be provided to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects would also be provided, for example, habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Further details of the assessment can be found in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation measures would be put in place to protect wildlife and such details are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. An Ecological Clerk of Works would be employed during construction to provide advice and monitor adherence to the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and will undertake pre-works checks as necessary.</p> <p>With regards to Farndon Windmill, Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> discusses possible impacts during construction. The chapter highlights the potential for significant effects upon the Windmill however structural monitoring for vibration impacts has been secured as part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Structural monitoring for vibration impacts would be undertaken prior to construction to provide a baseline. This monitoring would continue throughout construction, and for a period of time after to account for any ground settlement or seasonal changes.</p> <p>Mitigation measures of relevance during construction are included within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Should issues arise during construction, works would stop while the cause of the damage was investigated, and an alternative method would be adopted if appropriate. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGA-V	Climate; Air quality; Noise and vibration; Consultation – general	<p>The environmental information contained in your materials are very skewed, describing only a positive impact for our environment. On page 9 you state ' Deliver better environmental outcomes', which I doubt will be the case.</p> <p>The materials barely reference the biggest environmental impact of the proposed design, which is increased CO2 emissions. This is a global problem, which will become very real within the life time of my grandchildren, and has been totally ignored in your documentation.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments relating to environmental information. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>As I mentioned in Q2b above, I am devastated that you will be felling mature trees, with negative environmental impacts. I expect you to plant mature trees as a replacement.</p> <p>The noise impact for local residents on Crees lane and surrounding residential areas will be significantly increased, and this has not been fully considered in your proposal. In addition, the air quality in my garden will be dramatically reduced and as a keen gardener this is of significant importance to me.</p>			<p>the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects where possible. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comments regarding planting, planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. Some mature tree planting would be considered; however, the smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p> <p>No ancient woodlands or ancient trees have been identified within 1 km of the Order Limits. Whilst four veteran trees were identified within the Order Limits, these are not expected to be lost as part of the Scheme. A mature tree is categorised when its full potential height and canopy spread have been achieved and is normally past two thirds of its overall life expectancy.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>With regards to Air Quality, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction of the Scheme on air quality. During construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact of pollution generation on habitats to result in no change or a negligible impacts level.</p> <p>The construction mitigation measures that would be provided are detailed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>• Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>• Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or cover, seed or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>• Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>• Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washes</li> <li>• Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>• Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>• Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>• All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>• High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for ensuring the above mitigation is adhered to through daily inspections across the construction site.</p> <p>Once operational the Scheme as assessed does not result in any significant air quality effects, as such no mitigation or monitoring is proposed.</p> <p>With regards to noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge in the form of noise barriers. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). The noise assessment concludes the impacts on Crees Lane would be negligible with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. The assessment relies upon traffic modelling information for the users of the road network in operation, as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation. The assessment concluded there would not be any significant impact on climate during construction or operation of the Scheme. This assessment can be found within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). During construction there is anticipated to be a reduction in carbon emissions compared to the preferred route (baseline) as a result of implementing resource efficiency, optimised design and low carbon materials.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is undertaken by comparing the emissions from the Scheme against the relevant UK Government carbon budget for that period. The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO<sub>2</sub>e and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.38 National Policy Statement for National Networks, necessitates the need to deal with the potential impacts of climate change. Also per the requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes no likely significant effect. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> states: ‘...assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction target’.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) reports a 44% reduction in construction emissions compared to the baseline figure presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. National Highways’ <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant’s strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation and includes that ‘net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset’ and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary.</p> <p>This assessment is based upon a worst-case scenario. The assessment of operation does not consider the Department for Transport’s ‘<i>Transport Decarbonisation Plan</i>’, which will support road user emissions working towards the 2050 net zero target.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Road drainage and the water	6. DRAINAGE In respect of drainage, the scheme design must incorporate detailed provisions for dealing with field drainage during construction and post-construction and drainage associated with	N/A	Y	With regard to drainage, where adjacent land falls towards the Scheme, a detailed assessment will be carried out during the next design phase with suitable mitigation proposed where appropriate. Attenuation basins have been sized based on the upper limit estimation

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	environment; Land ownership; Geology and soils	<p>the new access drive.</p> <p><b>7. GENERAL LAND REMEDIATION</b> In respect of the condition of land which is used during construction and then returned to our client, we request specific proposals from NH as to how they propose to deal with the topsoil and subsoil that is removed and how that will be managed during the construction period. This should also include proposals for temporary drainage solutions and maintenance of topsoil whilst in storage prior to final remediation works.</p> <p><b>8. ECOLOGICAL MITIGATION &amp; LANDSCAPING</b> The proposals indicate the allocation of existing grassland for ecological mitigation (tree planting) and landscape enhancement purposes on the General Arrangement plans. The loss of grassland, currently actively used for livestock grazing and hay/silage making, will result in a loss of income to our clients.</p> <p>We are unsure from the Indicative Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3) whether the grassland area indicated within the development boundary to the east of the A1133 on our client's land is proposed to be permanent land take. If so, our client objects to any permanent land take for this purpose. If not permanent land take, our client requests confirmation as to whether any long-term obligations or rights are proposed to be imposed on our client.</p> <p>Furthermore, the general arrangement proposals indicate that part of my client's land will be used as a balancing pond for overflow drainage (to the north east of the roundabout). We note that further balancing ponds are also proposed to the north west, south east and south west of the roundabout. Our client's request further information on the technical justification for the extent of balancing ponds in numerous locations and therefore the reasoning for a balancing pond on their land.</p>			<p>from the MicroDrainage Quick Storage Estimate, which uses site characteristics and rainfall data to estimate an attenuation requirement per catchment. A detailed model would be produced at the next design stage where the size of basins would be reviewed.</p> <p>Swales, ponds and basins in their end state would perform the role of management of the surface water during temporary works and construction to manage the potential for pollution, silting and surface water flooding. Technical details of the drainage strategy can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding general land remediation, an Outline Soil Management Plan has been developed. This can be found within Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which outlines the topsoil and subsoil removal and how this would be managed during construction. The Outline Soils Management Plan incorporates the hierarchical system of avoidance, reduction and remediation, following <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 – Environmental assessment and monitoring guidance</i>.</p> <p>Landscape areas of grassland and planting have been altered to address concerns raised by the Consultee. Unless otherwise agreed with the landowner, where agricultural land is to be returned to the landowner, it should be returned to its previous use as determined by the Agricultural Land Classification survey as set out in Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Land beyond the requested bund and associated planting is now shown to be returned to its existing land use. Information relating to the permanent and temporary land take for the land referred to by the Consultee is shown on the <b>Land Plans (TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and the <b>Works Plans (TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussions with the landowner about a possible legal agreement in relation to the use of their land and access for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Cultural heritage; Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity; Road layout	<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Please see section on landscape and visual. I am particularly concerned regarding the impact on Winthorpe's conservation area, and grade II listed properties within it, as well as non-listed historic properties (my house included – which was built in 1870).</p> <p>Landscape and visual</p> <p>The new bypass is a large scale project that will have a detrimental impact on the visual enjoyment of Newark and surrounding locations. Currently road noise can be heard as far away as walking paths on the River Trent. This area is already burdened with the blight of traffic noise. The new A46 will further dominate the landscape and create further negative impact for people who live and work here, and use it as a recreational space. The heights are not clearly mapped in the consultation materials, but the new bypass and associated infrastructure will be anything between 7.8 metres and 10.9 meters high. This is intrusive on the landscape and will cause visual pollution.</p> <p>I am especially concerned about the height of the Cattle Market flyover- which is 8 metres. This will be a blot on the landscape, potentially interfering with sight lines at the castle. The second thing I am particularly concerned about is the height of the new A1 over bridge (this being 10.9 metres). This will be catastrophic for my neighbours who live in a grade II listed property. They will have clear line of site of this bridge but thus far, National Highways has offered NO mitigation. This will blight the environment of an historically significant property. Furthermore, this property sits within the conservation area of Newark. Therefore, by default, this bridge compromises the very conservation area of Winthorpe. And Newark Sherwood District Council agree with me when they say "The new bridge over the A1 and</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding Cultural Heritage. Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings, and historic landscapes).</p> <p>This assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 106 - Cultural heritage assessment</i> and agreed with key heritage stakeholders such as Nottinghamshire County Council Archaeology and Heritage Officers, Newark and Sherwood District Council Heritage and Conservation Officers and Historic England.</p> <p>From a cultural heritage perspective, the impacts upon Winthorpe Conservation Area during construction have been assessed as temporary moderate adverse. Upon completion of construction of the Scheme, the impacts have been assessed as permanent slight adverse, once planting mitigation is established.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. New and replacement planting would be provided in order to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme, this includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration, softening built aspects (including embankments) and over time, provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors.</p> <p>From a landscape and visual impact perspective, the impacts upon Winthorpe Conservation Area and the open break are assessed as part of the broader impacts upon landscape</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>road section down to the Winthorpe junction results in substantial impact on the setting and significance of the Winthorpe CA." (TR010065-000046-A46N – Scoping Opinion).</p> <p>The embankment widths are also considerable. Although it will vary, at certain points the embankment will be 100 metres wide. This will also have a negative impact on the landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>The open break between Newark and Winthorpe will be destroyed by the new road. The construction of a new roundabout, with associated lanes, and a brand-new section of dual carriageway at this point, will result in an intensification of road between Newark and Winthorpe. In total, this amounts to ten lanes of road. The existing open break consisting of fields will be eradicated. Instead, it will be a field full of roads. Farmers' fields – currently comprising the rural landscape of the area – will literally be tarmacked over.</p>			<p>character within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Section 7.11.30 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) notes that the development would include an above grade crossing of the A1 (A1/A46 Crossing), bringing additional bridge structures, slip roads and a roundabout to an area defined as an Open Break in the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework which currently provides an open break between settlements.</p> <p>With regards to the height of the new A1/A46 Crossing as part of the Scheme design, the clearance beneath the new bridge is very similar to the existing bridge crossing. However due to the large span of the new bridge required across the A1, the depth is much greater, which raises the road alignment.</p> <p>The new infrastructure would reduce the sense of openness between settlements. Widening of the A46 corridor to include a link road to the south-east of Winthorpe would reduce the area of farmland surrounding the village. By Year 15 (2045, 15 years after Scheme opening) woodland planting, linear belts of shrubs and trees as well as hedgerow planting would reduce the impact of the presence of new highway infrastructure on the wider landscape, although the localised alteration to field patterns and partial loss of open landscape around Winthorpe would remain.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken to reduce effects upon the grade II listed property with the provision of a new woodland between the property and the A46. Further mitigation measures, including a new landscape bund and planting, would be provided to the south-east of Winthorpe along the A46 providing screening of the road and passing traffic over time, details of which can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects; Air quality; Road drainage and the water environment; Construction; Land ownership	The flyover at castle/ cattle market roundabout will increase noise, light and air pollution to our property. It will increase the flood risk (see enclosed the recent floods) and we are not confident the current plans to alleviate flood risk. The work itself will also be disruptive. There is a definite potential that the value of our property will decrease as a result of the additional noise, light and air pollution plus flood risk. Screening of the flyover will take years to be fully effective (trees). Better to improve roundabout rather than flyover.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee. With regards to increased noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the route. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Information regarding air quality impacts is found within Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment presented in this chapter considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. The chapter also includes mitigation measures for construction dust to be implemented during construction of the Scheme, which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The purpose of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> is to detail how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>environmental effects of the Scheme as identified within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and to demonstrate compliance with environmental legislation.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. The construction assessment of air quality concluded that adherence with the mitigation measures outlined in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments would ensure no significant effects would arise at any nearby receptors during construction. Once operational the Scheme as assessed does not result in any significant air quality effects, as such no mitigation or monitoring is proposed.</p> <p>With regard to flooding, detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team which has informed the Flood Risk Assessment conducted and can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>A mitigation scheme has been developed (that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment) to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Floodplain compensation areas would be included at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). Meetings have been held with Newark and Sherwood District Council to ensure that their works to reduce flood risk to the local community around Tolney Lane are not impacted by the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's comments about disruption, an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) would be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and would aim to minimise disruption to the traveling public during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new A1/A46 Crossing. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>With regards to planting, new and replacement planting would be provided in order to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration and over time, provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Planting would be provided around Cattle Market Junction. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The options for Cattle Market Junction were assessed prior to the preferred route announcement. The option selected fulfilled the needs of current (2028, year Scheme is open to traffic) and future (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) traffic growth. Grade separation at Cattle Market is required as there is high demand from all routes to the junction and a conventional roundabout at existing ground level would not have dealt with the conflicting demands. Very large queues would continue to form as already occurs on the existing roundabout.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Environment – general; Road drainage and	There will be an environmental negative impact during construction but if aesthetic considerations are also considered ultimately, there shouldn't be too great an impact though increased speed will be a factor. Prevention of waterlogging/ flooding is vital and needs to be realised that Kelham road has already got waterlogging problems.	2C	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ) details the Flood Risk Assessment undertaken including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, including Kelham Road. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement,



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the water environment				<p>with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which includes roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors. Integration of floodplain compensation areas and highway drainage has also been a key consideration in the development of the Scheme design using based solutions wherever possible. Mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Existing road drainage would be maintained by the Applicant as part of the established maintenance regime.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Landscape and visual effects; Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; A1/A46 Crossing	5. What mitigation will be offered for areas impacted by visual pollution of the new road, in particular, at the Cattle Market and at the A1 overbridge?	2C	N	<p>New and replacement planting would be provided to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration and over time, provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Planting would also be provided around Cattle Market Junction as well as around the A1/46 Crossing. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Landscape and visual effects	I have concerns about any environmental areas that are going to put in place by National Highways as the existing areas ie. trees along banking are not maintained!	2C	N	<p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented relating to landscape are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The final version of the Environmental Management Plan, the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan, will be prepared at the end of the construction phase in accordance with Requirement 4 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> and will cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. This Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. A commitment would be made to ensure the successful establishment of the environmental mitigation via the development consent application to ensure that planting matures to meet its intended function.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3K-J	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Land ownership	<p>As we live in very close proximity to the road, bridge and roundabout, we understand the need for some traffic control - eg traffic lights, but are concerned that this will increase the noise and emissions from idling traffic.</p> <p>Also the potentially huge increase of traffic, coupled with the increased noise and pollution, will adversely affect our health and welfare, and the resale value of our home.</p> <p>These issues, will affect our property, and us personally, during and after construction. We want to be assured that sufficient acoustic, light pollution and emission barriers will be put in place. These need to be in place from commencement, and continue after completion.</p>	2B	N	<p><b>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided including low noise road surfacing along the Scheme. Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge, in the form of permanent noise barriers. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The existing open mesh on the eastern side of Windmill Viaduct would be replaced with solid infill panel to reduce noise transmission to adjacent properties and prevent vehicle headlights shining through. The extent of street lighting would remain as existing and is not extended beyond the current location at Farndon Roundabout.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice measures. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the potential impacts associated with both the construction and operation of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 105 - Air quality.</p> <p>The chapter confirms that emissions from construction equipment, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are also not predicted to be significant. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, which is mentioned above.</p> <p>Air quality dispersion modelling was undertaken for the operational phase using <i>ADMS-Roads</i>, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling takes into account the effects of additional emissions generated by standing traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals during operation. The modelling demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors in the vicinity of Farndon Roundabout are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the opening year of the Scheme, with annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations up to 18.3µg/m<sup>3</sup> being predicted in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme). Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance, so no mitigation measures are proposed during operation.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation.</p> <p>No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme, including on this property. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> does not assess house prices or resale value.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and vibration	The nature of both businesses means that a large proportion of the day the owners and their staff work outside, exercising and training dogs so the health and wellbeing of both humans and dogs from a noise and pollution level will be greatly impacted by the road development being so close to the property.	2H	N	<p>The Applicant recognises the concerns related to accessibility and environmental effects during construction. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the amenity effects of the Scheme, including the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts on community receptors. There are no significant amenity impacts on this property identified as a result of the population and human health assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and	Adverse impacts on those living at [redacted] is anticipated to be a loss in quality of life from noise, vibration, pollution, and loss of outlook. There is also a strong possibility of a loss of income short and long term for the businesses which results in the loss of pension for the owners.	2I		<p>The air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/ 6.1)</b> assesses receptors which are located within 200m of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	vibration				<p>Scheme's affected road network and where the effects of changes in traffic on air quality are greatest. The assessment included the property referred to in Consultee's response</p> <p>in the operational phase modelling. Pollutant concentrations at the receptor modelled under two scenarios, Do Minimum (without the Scheme) and Do Something (with the Scheme). The modelling demonstrated annual mean pollutant concentrations at this location are predicted to be 19.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> in the year the Scheme is open to traffic which is well below the air quality objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. An acoustic barrier along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station would provide some mitigation of noise levels from the A46 at the property. However due to the fact that the A1 remains the dominant source of noise at this location, the change in traffic on the A1 as a result of the Scheme is negligible, therefore the change in noise is also negligible, no adverse impacts are expected at the property for noise.</p> <p>Further to this, the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme – this includes, but is not limited to, acoustic barriers, minimising the height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blown dust emissions and switching off all construction vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that any policies relating to the temporary or permanent use of land are clear and understood and an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information on methods of engagement. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Noise and vibration; Air quality; Landscape and visual effects	<p>The proposed mitigation measures to reduce the impact of noise and light pollution look to be inadequate for a Scheme of this size and closeness to existing communities. There is no mention of fencing or acoustic barriers, which would be beneficial in the short to medium term.</p> <p>To rely on mounds and young saplings to protect us from the adverse impact of noise increase and more light pollution appears inadequate.</p> <p>The removal of the major tree line previously mentioned and the introduction of the new A1 crossing and the additional two lanes of traffic running next to the existing A46 opens up the whole of Winthorpe to far more noise, light and air pollution.</p> <p>The proposed 50 MPH speed limit may help provided this is granted. Likewise a quieter tarmac road surfacing to all roadways will be welcome, although no doubt all stopping zones will have a rougher surface treatment.</p>	2C	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, which sets out the statutory regulations that Environmental Impact Assessments should be carried out in accordance with. It has been developed in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities (Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council) and statutory environmental bodies, including Natural England. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, for example, informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures would be provided to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects would be provided, for example, habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and continues the approach of reducing noise as close to source as is feasible.</p> <p>The final design of the noise barriers will continue to be developed at the locations specified in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Details on speed limits can be found in the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. This includes the retention of areas of existing intervening vegetation which is located between Winthorpe and the Currys Distribution Centre. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme which would also reinstate screening value of views towards the distribution centre. There are several lines of vegetation that would be provided between the village and the centre.</p> <p>Lighting proposals for the Scheme have been developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which has sought to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. Adherence to the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be secured by Requirement 3 in the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Road drainage and the water environment	I would like to see more detail for maintaining adequate water flow down the stream which runs through the village of Winthorpe. ie where it crosses the A46.	2C	N	<p>The tributary of the Fleet (stream which flows through Winthorpe) would be utilised as an outfall for the Scheme. The drainage system discharges into the tributary of The Fleet after it crosses the A46.</p> <p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures such as attenuation basins to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The use of attenuation basins would reduce the risk of flooding while maintaining adequate water flow down the stream. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW9R-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	I am concerned about the amount of water which may drain into the ditch that goes from the Mint Leaf to the Lord Nelson and the problems this may cause in the future. Whilst all this infrastructure work is going on, it might present an opportunity to reroute some of this water.	2H	N	<p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures such as attenuation basins to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The use of attenuation basins would reduce the risk of flooding while maintaining adequate water flow down the stream. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) includes information on the mitigation developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>This includes flood risk from the Slough Dyke, Winthorpe Airfield Drain and other Ordinary Watercourses local to Winthorpe. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas being provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Until we know exact finished levels comment is difficult at this time.</p> <p>Manual sluices should be avoided as these require maintenance and the local authority to operate them in times of flood threat.</p>	2G	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures including attenuation basins to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> details the Flood Risk Assessment that has been undertaken, as well as a mitigation scheme that has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The floodplain compensation areas do not include any sluices, manually operated or otherwise. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZS-1	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>I am not absolutely clear about the proposed floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>My fear is that the scheme will put the village (Averham) at more risk of flooding.</p>	2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, including Averham.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBG-W	Traffic forecasts; Climate	<p>I am dissatisfied as I feel there is no actual need for such a scheme. At a time of growing climate change we need to be using cars and other petrol/diesel/electric vehicles less. Widening roads will only encourage more traffic, as your proposals on page 29 appears to indicate.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the objection to the Scheme. The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>In March 2020, the Government's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> included a commitment for National Highways to improve the A46 Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor. Congestion on the single carriageway section of the A46 means that journeys are unreliable and take longer than they should.</p> <p>The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBQ-7	Road drainage and the water environment; Noise and vibration; Air quality	<p>Proposed Borrow Pits opposite our house on the other side of the river which will increase noise and dust levels even further over a sustained period of time.</p>	2B	N	<p>Three potential borrow pits are proposed to support the creation of embankments required for the Scheme. Further details on these are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be secured by Requirement 3 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>, and this sets out a number of commitments and control measures to mitigate impacts as a result of the Scheme, including impact due to borrow pit works.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction phase of the Scheme, including the use of borrow pits.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. The chapter</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					confirms that construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant.
ANON-559H-RWBQ-7	Road drainage and the water environment	Do not create a quarry there.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the borrow pits and floodplain compensation area at Farndon. The borrow pits at this location would be re-instated as floodplain compensation areas and essential mitigation as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Locations of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is detailed within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWED-W	Road drainage and the water environment; Noise and vibration	<p>I have noted that the boundary appears to lie on the public footpath directly outside my house at [redacted]. Will the proposed changes on the floodplain affect my property both noise wise and with more water flowing towards my house post-Scheme?</p> <p>What impact will the changes have post-scheme?</p> <p>If the water levels rise post Scheme. What rights do the current [redacted] and other riverside houses have? A clear explanation of this would be advantageous.</p>	2C/2G	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has determined that there would be no significant adverse noise effects at the property referred to in Consultee's response.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the property referred to in Consultee's response, a detailed analysis of the registered land title deeds for the properties has been conducted. This revealed that there were not any previous or existing rights or easements relating to the risk of flooding from the River Trent for these properties.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Existing road drainage would be maintained by the Applicant as part of the established maintenance regime.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Consultation – general; Air quality; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity	<p>Air quality details and impact are scant.</p> <p>Noise levels indicate significant problems on the south and east side of the village.</p> <p>The impact of airborne pollution on the primary school isn't covered.</p> <p>Deer wildlife isn't covered. Deer live in the woods around my house.</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, including information on air quality impacts. This enabled consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise and vibration assessment has identified no significant effects at any receptors during operation. The assessment concludes that there would be no significant adverse noise effects in Winthorpe.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) as they are not a protected species by law. However as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species, however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Existing commuting or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole. Any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water voles. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population. The retention of existing commuting or foraging routes will ensure safe movement of these species in proximity to the Scheme, where possible, minimising any long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) undertakes an assessment of the impacts of the A46 on air quality during construction and operation. For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction equipment, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Human health receptors in the operational phase assessment have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. Winthorpe village and primary school are located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore have not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. These receptors are likely to experience the highest pollutant concentrations or highest level of change in pollutant concentrations within the vicinity of Winthorpe village and primary school. During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Drainage and flood risk needs careful consideration with respect to the Fleet and Slough dyke.</p> <p>How deep will the attenuation ponds be/ Will they be a danger to children and wildlife?</p>	2H	N	<p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. For example, the inclusion of attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of the surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas being provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>The hydraulic modelling demonstrates that there would be negligible change to existing flow rates of the Slough Dyke (also referred to as the Fleet).</p> <p>Attenuation ponds and basins would be provided within fenced private land only. The ponds and basins have been designed in accordance with the Sustainable Drainage System, regarding safe side slope and depths and in close collaboration with the ecology and wider environment team to ensure that the maximum biodiversity potential is achieved. Details of the drainage strategy can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and locations of the attenuation basins can be seen on the Outline Drainage Works Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN8-T	Environment – general; Consultation – general	The reports list potential environmental impacts and how they may be monitored. There is very little detail, at this stage, on what the scale and nature of the impacts will be. Consequently, it is impossible to make an objective assessment of the proposed mitigation solutions.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 state that Environmental Impact Assessments must be developed in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities (Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council) and statutory environmental bodies, including Natural England.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme and identifies actions and commitments (via the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments) demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNB-4	Road drainage and the water environment	The flood planes are already overloaded, this will only make it worse	2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>All works would be undertaken in accordance with mitigation measures outlined in the Register of Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and vibration; Route corridor	The environmental concerns regarding noise and air pollution are very grave for our health and wellbeing. Both noise and air pollution are linked to negative health outcomes. This is not only applicable for our own health and wellbeing but also our neighbours and anyone living in close proximity to the Scheme. Newark already suffers an unfair burden of road infrastructure given it is the location where the A1, A17 and A46 meet. And for a conservation village, Winthorpe disproportionately is impacted by road noise. A key question must arise regarding whether the intensification of road infrastructure in such a small space which is in such close proximity to housing (e.g. Winthorpe Village and Winthorpe Road Estate) is appropriate. I urge National Highways to re-examine the route corridor selection to determine whether the cost of people's health – and lives – is worth compromising for a Scheme that is coming so close to people's houses. In short, there is simply not enough space in route corridor C to install new road infrastructure. The most sensible route corridor is corridor E – in the vicinity	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes comments from Consultees relating to population and human health, air quality, noise and vibration, biodiversity and the chosen route corridor. Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from the construction and operation of the Scheme. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> secures these commitments as part of the planning process. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, clear information regarding walker, cyclist and horse-rider diversions, and general best practice</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		of the Southern link road. A proper dual carriageway here would recalibrate how freight use the routes, taking off any traffic wanting to go A1 northbound and going on the A17. This would make a significant contribution to alleviating congestion at peak times. The existing plans for route corridor E are inadequate as the southern link route has been designed not as a route for freight, but getting vehicles to residential properties in the expansive Fernwood. This is a missed opportunity.			<p>construction practices. There are expected to be no significant impacts on human health, as concluded by the population and human health assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, the assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. These mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area (including those in Newark-on-Trent and on outskirts of Winthorpe along the A46 and A1, which represent worst-case locations for human receptors in Winthorpe village) and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment undertaken demonstrates that road traffic noise is reduced for most properties within Winthorpe and does not increase noise at any receptor in Winthorpe by more than 1dB 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic in 2043. No significant noise and vibration related effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Details of the noise mitigation are presented in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and secured by way of Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The current design team working on the Scheme were not involved in the previous Options Identification Stage. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides justification for the corridor and route that was chosen. Initially the five corridors were assessed against the Scheme objectives, the National Policy Statement for National Networks, and Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Sifting Tool</i>. This approach aligns with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Appraisal Guidance</i> when sifting options at an early design stage. Projects or studies that require government approval are expected to make use of <i>Transport Appraisal Guidance</i> in a manner appropriate for that project or study.</p> <p>The <i>Early Assessment and Sifting Tool</i> criteria for choosing the corridor to take forward considered impacts on biodiversity and people and communities qualitatively as well as impacts on other environmental disciplines. Route Corridor C was the most direct route and scored better than the other four corridors (such as Corridor E) for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups and environment, and the Applicant provided robust justification for their corridor selection.</p> <p>Following this sifting, the remaining route and junction options which were identified in the sifting process above were combined into Scheme options for further assessment. All four options were evaluated against the engineering, traffic and economic, environmental, social and safety, operation, technology and maintenance assessments. The four options were reduced to two options and were taken forward to an options consultation. Option two was chosen over option one primarily because it minimised land take. In turn, the option is less likely to have significant adverse effects on landscape, townscape and visual receptors, water, mineral resources, waste generation, and materials asset use. Also, it is less likely to have significant adverse environmental effects due to less habitat fragmentation, have fewer heritage assets and a smaller impact on affected listed structures along the A616, and have the least likely significant adverse effects predicted for noise.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Route corridor; Population and human health; Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	<p>You need to reconsider your route corridor. No ifs or buts. More scientific evidence has been published since the route corridor was chosen, indicating how problematic roads are for people's health. Building dual-carriageway roads so closely to people's houses has to be stopped. Furthermore, the design team for the A46 has completely changed, and this resulted in a major shift in the Scheme's design in the summer of 2022. Therefore, given that design team 2 were at odds with the design choices of design team 1 within corridor C, other decisions that have been made also need to be re-evaluated with greater evidence and information now available. Neither design team has been able to produce a design that will have a neutral impact on the Newark community. Indeed, in your own documentation you state that "It may not be possible to fully mitigate all significant visual effects during operation, particularly for visual receptors with direct views to the Scheme, or where at height structures such as bridges are notable within a view". And this is only taking into account visuals – and does not include the damaging effects of noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Were the new design team involved in the decision-making regarding the chosen route corridor?</li> <li>2. If the design team were to re-evaluate the route corridors, what would their assessment be of using route corridor E?</li> <li>3. To what extent was population health taken into consideration when deciding on the route corridors?</li> <li>4. To what extent was biodiversity loss taken into consideration when deciding on the route corridors?</li> <li>5. What route corridor would now be chosen if the robust scientific evidence regarding the problematics of building roads in such close proximity to established communities was seriously considered?</li> </ol>	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW3K-J	Noise and vibration; Road layout; Landscape and visual effects	<p>Some very simple, but we accept not without cost, measures are vital! Protect the residents from noise with acoustic barriers, make changes to the expansion joints on the bridge. Reduce light pollution during and after construction.</p> <p>To live With a Continuous bubum! Bubum! And rattling of heavy goods, day and night is very difficult. It is impossible to have windows open, in warm weather. The choice is to be overheated, or unable to sleep through the noise.</p>	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> provides the most robust means for assessing a development of this size and nature, and therefore has been implemented within this chapter. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> employs the standard <i>Calculation of Road Traffic Noise</i> using annualised average weekday traffic in order to assess the effects of noise on sensitive receptors.</p> <p>With regards to bridge expansion joints, the Applicant assumes the reference is made in relation to Windmill Viaduct crossing the River Trent. The existing viaduct would carry the new southbound A46 carriageway, and the intention is to replace the bridge joints with new joints as part of the top layer of surfacing replacement during the works. This renewal is secured in the Applicant's <i>Asset Renewals Matrix Agreement</i> which is managed by an operations directorate. A new viaduct would be built alongside the existing to carry the A46 northbound carriageway. This would be designed in such a way that the gaps at the ends are much smaller than the existing viaduct, enabling a quieter type of joint to be installed.</p> <p>However, as well as a low noise running surface, noise mitigation measures would be provided at Windmill Viaduct, Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway and the northern side of the A46 at Winthorpe. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, and therefore continues the approach of reducing noise as close to source as is feasible. The mitigation measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environment Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The final design of the noise barriers will continue to be developed at the locations specified in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environment Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since the statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The Friendly Farmer Link Road is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. Adherence to the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) will be secured by Requirement 3 in the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWZK-S	Road drainage and the water environment	Please see attached plans you issued daily amended to reflect the ownership/ siting of properties. You flood compensation area on the map does not include the sewage pumping station but it should be noted that in November 2020 this flooded and I called out the council to clear the water and then have drains installed on church lane. All surface water from church lane goes into the drainage ditch which also flooded from the backflow from the River Trent where it joins the drainage ditch Kelham Hall. If under the A46 Scheme proposed these is more backflow from the miles there could be a serious risk to properties along the ditch.	2G	N	<p>The extent of the Order Limits in the area of Averham, including the field near to the sewage pumping station referenced by the Consultee, have been changed since the statutory consultation and completion of the flood risk modelling.</p> <p>The floodplain compensation areas included as part of the Scheme are predominantly on the northern side of the A617 and provide additional storage volume for flood water by lowering the existing land.</p> <p>With regards to the comment relating to the sewage pumping station, the flood risk at the sewage pumping station would not be increased by the Scheme. Issues relating to flooding on Church Lane are the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWQ-V	Road drainage and the water environment; Consultation - general	I do not know much about this despite reading the material - its hard to understand.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment relating to the explanation of floodplain compensation areas in the consultation materials. Information about the floodplain compensation areas was included within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> as well as within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> as part of the statutory consultation. These materials included different levels of technical detail on this aspect of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant aimed to make the language used in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> as easy to understand as possible. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme. The Applicant also included contact details so that the consultees could contact the Applicant with questions about the Scheme or for clarification of any technical detail, including a Customer Contact Centre telephone number and direct project email address.</p> <p>Locations of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is detailed within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW3K-J	Population and human health; Traffic forecasts; Environment - general; Land ownership	<p>Whilst we accept that this Scheme will make life much easier for through traffic, it will not have the same effect to residents.</p> <p>We already have access to the A46 routes. The main effect on us will simply be more of the bad effects.</p> <p>Whilst this may sound very self centred, our environment will be permanently changed. The traffic WILL increase, especially heavy goods.</p> <p>As there is, at present, no barrier: Life in our home and garden will be a much less pleasant experience. We will lose value on our property due to the effect of the road our health, and mental wellbeing will suffer.</p>	2H	N	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Scheme. The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This considers the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of a Scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts on amenity on the local community. Amenity is an assessment which accounts for air quality, noise, and landscape and visual impacts. As there are no significant air quality or noise impacts on residential properties, it is concluded that there would be no significant amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>When the Scheme is introduced, the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Information on detailed journey time savings is presented in the in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) demonstrating the benefits of the Scheme. The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and would encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. Further details can be found in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads through Newark-on-Trent, including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road. More detail on the volume of flow decreases in included in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Road drainage and the water environment; Land ownership	<p>An area of the property belonging to [redacted] has been identified on the development plans as part of the Brownhills borrow pit / floodplain compensation area. What does this mean and how does this affect it? It has not been identified in Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1 as a permanent land requirement, however if it is to be permanently under higher threat of flooding or likely to be wet all year round then this is catastrophic to the businesses at [redacted].</p> <p>That land is a CRITICAL part of both [redacted] and [redacted] businesses, neither can function without the use of this land. It is used all day as free running exercise area for the 40 show dogs and for the 30 boarding kennel dogs.</p> <p>To what extent will this land be flooded? For how long? Will it still be useable? Will it remain as part of [redacted] or is it intended to be purchased? What are the knock-on effects to the other areas of the property regards floodplain? Will this area be dug out as it is indicated it is part of the borrow pit?</p> <p>It has been stated in Preliminary Environmental Information vol.1 That there will be an increase in flood risk once the road is in operation and the solution is the floodplain compensation sites meaning water will be diverted to this area.</p> <p>[Redacted] representatives visited [redacted] only a few days after the release of the new development plans to include the Brownhills junction. They came to explain what the plans involved. At no point during this meeting did they explain that part of the property was included in the proposed borrow pit and floodplain, even though it was discussed what impact the flood area could have on [redacted]. It was described as an area of wetland to be developed in the area surrounding the road and at no point was the inclusion of the field pointed out. The proposal of the inclusion of the land has only come to light since the owners have read the plans attached to a lamp post outside their house.</p> <p>As stated in Preliminary Environmental Information Vol. 1 p. 45, the proposed new roundabout at Brownhills junction is adjacent to an established drain and there WILL BE an INCREASED RISK of surface water runoff directly into this drain. The concern is that since the site adjacent to [redacted] was illegally covered in many tonnes of hardcore, previously agricultural land, they experience a much larger and more frequent increase in surface run off which floods the area directly outside the property and flows down the driveway to contribute to flooding under the A1 bridge.</p> <p>It also states that the additional roundabout and proposed new roads at Brownhills junction will be 2m above existing ground levels which is within an area of flood risk. Impacts to flood</p>	2G	Y	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee regarding the points raised.</p> <p>This has resulted in changes being made to the Scheme design in relation to the area of the Consultee's land identified on the <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> (produced for the statutory consultation) for use as the 'Brownhills borrow pit/floodplain compensation area'. This area in relation to the Consultee's land has been removed from the Scheme and the Order Limits have been adjusted to account for this. This is shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>The flood risk to the property referred to in Consultee's response would not increase due to the Scheme. The additional highway run-off from the increased paved area would be attenuated within the attenuation basins located to the south of the new Brownhills Underbridge.</p> <p>The upper bound storage requirements have been conservatively used for the design of the attenuation basins at the concept design stage of the Scheme. The basin storage requirement would be re-calculated using a detailed model (created at the detailed design stage of the Scheme) to ensure they are adequate to attenuate run-off and discharge to the Slough Dyke at two locations upstream of the property at a restricted rate.</p> <p>This rate of discharge has been agreed upon with Nottinghamshire County Council who are the Lead Local Flood Authority within the area. The rate has been agreed on the basis that it does not increase flood risk to the Slough Dyke.</p> <p>Details of the drainage strategy, and the rates of discharge, can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and the location of the attenuation basins proposed around the property are presented on the Outline Drainage Works Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.6</b>).</p> <p>During construction the hardstanding used to fabricate the new A1/A46 Crossing would be bunded and the surface water collected in temporary holding areas to ensure it is clean and that the run-off is managed in the same way as the permanent attenuation areas.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation in the form of floodplain compensation areas to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>plain compensation requirements and flood propagation will need to be managed. How will this be done?</p> <p>The proposed plans include the entire field of [redacted] as borrow pit/floodplain compensation area for the development. Aside from the field being an integral part of both the businesses which cannot operate without it, there are also several other concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property currently sits on a zone 2 flood plain so is at medium risk of flooding. The field sits in flood zone 3 for the river Trent, so is at the highest risk of flooding and during wetter months will be muddy to boggy.</li> <li>The Environment Agency shows [redacted] on the Newark Parish flood map PDF as being part of flood zone 3. (<a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/newark-and-sherwood/images-and-files/flooding/parish-flood-maps/newark300small.pdf">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/newark-and-sherwood/images-and-files/flooding/parish-flood-maps/newark300small.pdf</a>)</li> <li>It was explained to us by [redacted] from Skanska that the area designated as floodplain is most likely to be wetland area, being wet for most of the time. This raises concern for the increased risk to humans and dogs on the premises from rodents and water-borne disease, of most concern, rats and Leptospirosis. How will this be managed?</li> <li>If the field is to become wetland as described, how can it then still be used as a floodplain for the river Trent and how would the increased flood risk to [redacted] be managed?</li> <li>How can it be guaranteed that with the increase in concrete structures from the substantial development of the A46, slip road and roundabout and the subsequent decrease in surrounding agricultural land which would naturally drain and store water that the property and businesses would not be at a greater flood risk? The living accommodation for the boarding kennel dogs meets the borderline of the proposed floodplain compensation area. Will this increase the insurance premiums for the property and businesses?</li> </ul> <p>In 2019 part of the field was underwater for a significant period. There is a contributor stream which flows from the village, under the A1 bridge and directly across the middle the field which in times of heavy rain can become active. Has this been considered in the design?</p> <p>When determining any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. (14.2.17 Preliminary Environmental Information Report Vol.1) When assessing the development of living accommodation on the land adjacent to [redacted] 26.02.2019, [redacted], inspector appointed by the secretary of state deduced that the Environment Agency hydraulic model for the river Trent should use the proxy for the 1 in 1000-year event plus 50% allowance for climate change so estimate that would produce a flood level of 11.09m. At the height of the house at [redacted] flood depths of 0.29m and at the field level flood depths of 2.32m could be expected. This view was upheld by [redacted], 20.01.22, another inspector appointed on behalf of the secretary of state. By designating the highest flood risk level part of the property as part of the borrow pit/flood plain/wetland for the scheme development, would this increase the risk also to the house, dogs living accommodation and boarding kennels? If there was an increased risk of flooding to these premises an emergency evacuation plan would be needed to evacuate 30 boarding kennel dogs and 40 show dogs as they would be closest to the floodplain.</p>			<p>The new roundabout included as art of the Brownhills Junction is no longer 2m above existing ground level and has been reduced to match the adjacent A1. The impact of this and the new highway links and bridges have been included within the flood model to ensure there is no increased risk of flooding to surrounding properties.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV5-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Flooding is an ongoing problem and although this appears to have been addressed there needs to be a detailed study to at least make sure problems aren't exacerbated and preferably improved by the scheme.</p>	2C	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted, which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, which includes floodplain compensation areas. Detailed hydraulic modelling has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. For example the inclusion of attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQF-B	Road drainage and the water environment; Land ownership	<p>I live on Broadgate lane in Kelham and I am worried that the field opposite my house is to be a flood plane.</p> <p>What steps are being made to ensure properties do not flood.</p> <p>The cost of house insurance will increase by quite a bit if we are to be in a flood area. The only way to avoid this extra cost is not to be getting a floodplain nearby. why would a floodplain be made beside properties potentially devaluing them.</p>	2B	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors (including those in Kelham) to flooding with consideration for future climate change effects.</p> <p>The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. As a part of this modelling, it was identified that no residential property would change category from being within a Flood Zone 1 area to a Flood Zone 2/3 area as a result of the Scheme. Outside of the scope of the Scheme, the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) are responsible for wider flood risk issues in the area and look at wider flood resilience issues.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>All works would be undertaken in accordance with mitigation measures outlined in the Register of Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Road drainage and the water environment</p> <p>- I am very concerned about the impact on the water table near my house and the increased likelihood of flooding, given my house is at the bottom of a hill. There is a stream that runs close to my house but currently there is a lot of land available for drainage and run off. Yet our neighbours on the other side of the A1 have experienced greater flooding in the fields near their house, exacerbated by the small amount of concreting enacted by their neighbours who erected caravans on the site. If this small development can have such a large impact on drainage in the vicinity, I am extremely concerned about the negative impact of the new road being built, given that it will effectively concrete over a whole field near me. I would like to know exactly what the flood risks are as a result of the new Scheme and how likely it is that my property will flood (and my neighbours' properties too).</p>	2C	N	<p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. For example, the inclusion of attenuation basins, the locations of which can be found on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding with consideration for future climate change effects. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, the results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Outside of the scope of the Scheme, the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) are responsible for wider flood risk issues in the area and look at wider flood resilience issues.</p> <p>All works would be undertaken in accordance with mitigation measures outlined in the Register of Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Groundwater levels are considered in both the Flood Risk Assessment and in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Short-term temporary changes to groundwater levels may occur during construction. Dewatering environmental permits would be sought from the Environment Agency before commencement of dewatering activity. A 'no derogation' agreement would be made with the owner/operator of any private groundwater supply which may be temporarily impacted by dewatering.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The Consents and Agreements Position Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.3</b> ) provides further information on such permits and agreements. With appropriate mitigation, the Scheme would not result in permanent significant adverse effects from groundwater levels to local receptors.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Road drainage and the water environment	What mapping has been done to understand the flooding dynamics at the south end of Winthorpe Village? What impact will it have when a field close to our houses is tarmacked over for new road? Where will this water go? Will our houses flood?	2C	N	<p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. For example, the inclusion of attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted, which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, including those in the southern end of Winthorpe, with consideration for future climate change effects.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Existing road drainage would be maintained as part of the existing maintenance regime. Details on the floodplain compensation areas (the mitigation scheme) can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Geology and soils – No comments.</p> <p>Road drainage and water environment – significant risk associated with filling of existing floodplain areas is likely. The Brownhills borrowpit area already experiences significant water logging and flooding. This has recently increased due to the presence of the traveller's site at the Stable Yards.</p> <p>This is directly adjacent to the Slough Dyke which currently copes well with flood events but any change in this may directly my property and a number of others on the south of the village.</p>	2C	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted, which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Existing road drainage would be maintained as part of the existing maintenance regime. Details on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>This hydraulic modelling demonstrates that there is negligible change to existing flow rates of the Slough Dyke as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW32-S	Environment - general	The site opposite my house on Kelham Road has been unused for 10 years. Apart from 3 months for Covid testing which was a nightmare and caused many inconvenient problems. But it would make a fantastic parkland for residents and locals.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to a potential local site that could be used for environmental enhancements. The Applicant understands that this comment is regarding the old Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Maintenance Depot site. This area of land would be the main construction compound during construction of the Scheme, housing the main offices and storage areas. This information is detailed further in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and is also shown on the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ). When the Scheme is completed, it would be handed back to Nottinghamshire County Council, who own the land.
ANON-559H-RW8S-Y	Environment - general	In addition to noise barriers, make the section between Fardon round around and Cattle Market a green corridor.	2E/2F	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Fardon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> </ul>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>New and replacement planting would be provided in order to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration and over time provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Planting would be provided around Cattle Market Junction as well as around the A1/A46 Crossing. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Environment - general	The field adjacent to the dog kennels (near Winthorpe Underpass) could be made into a large area of woodland.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to a potentially available local location that could be used for environmental enhancements. Since statutory consultation, the design has continued to be developed and informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, which is detailed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . As such, the land parcel adjacent to the boarding kennels and the existing A46 would now become woodland. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDU-D	Environment - general	Area between A46 and Fosse Road from Farndon Island. Enhance existing open areas.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the area between the A46 and Fosse Road from Farndon Island has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWN2-M	Environment - general	Land parcel [redacted], part of it will be taken up with the new road. The rest of it may as well be planted up with trees as there will be little of the parcel left. I am the tenant on this land, you would need to speak to Landlord about this suggestion.  Part of land parcel [redacted] to the east of the A46 could be looked at for habitat creation and I would be happy to discuss this further, I own this area.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestions with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Both land parcels mentioned by the Consultee have been included in the environmental design of the Scheme to help deliver essential mitigation, including habitat creation, and net gain in biodiversity for the Scheme. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWFK-K	Environment - general	all along the route as it passes Winthorpe and avoid unnecessary tree demolition for drainage ponds for example	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Since statutory consultation, the potential loss of existing vegetation has continued to be minimised during the design evolution in line with principles of the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts wherever possible in the first instance. Where vegetation removal is unavoidable, replacement planting would be

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					provided. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Environment - general	The disregard for the other options before the environmental consideration was developed is inexcusable and goes against all of the latest guidelines.	2B	N	<p>The Consultee response does not identify the guidelines it refers to. However, Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for the route that was chosen.</p> <p>During the corridor sifting stage corridor routes A-E were assessed. Corridor C, the most direct route using the existing A46 corridor, scored highest for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups as well as environmental criteria. Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Siting Tool</i> was used to sift the four options identified within the preferred route corridor which considered how the options fit against specific strategic, economic, managerial, financial and commercial criteria. The Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Siting Tool</i> applies a 5-point scale on carbon emissions, economic growth, wellbeing, local environment and socio-distributional impacts to appraise the Scheme.</p> <p>The four options were reduced to two options which were taken forward to options consultation. Option 2 Modified was chosen over Option 1 primarily because it minimised land take. In turn, the option is less likely to have significant adverse effects on landscape, townscape and visual receptors, water, mineral resources, waste generation, and materials asset use. It is also less likely to have significant adverse environmental effects due to less habitat fragmentation, as well as having less impact heritage assets and affected listed structures along the A616. Finally, it had the least likely significant adverse effects predicted for noise. Further information about the development of Option 2 Modified is outlined in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement and environmental surveys and assessments have informed the iterative design of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Environment - general	<p>All the documentation that has been produced for the above contains little detailed information. A lot of big words and potential impacts and possible mitigations means very little.</p> <p>To date there appears to have been very little real impact work actually completed so that I can comment.</p> <p>This is an extremely important part of the project.</p> <p>I agree with the issues raised by the Newark Bypass Environment Group.</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The statutory consultation responses and ongoing surveys have informed the iterative design process. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application provides required information on the likely significant effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction as well as during operation of the Scheme are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>As part of the Applicant's application for development consent, it is proposing to lower the ground in two locations within the fields to the north of the A617 between the villages of Kelham and Averham to create floodplain compensation areas for the Scheme, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The excavated material from these areas would be transported to the soil stockpile areas on the northern end of the Scheme between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts.</p> <p>The need for specific interventions, such as temporary signal control, would be assessed and reviewed with the local highway authority during the development of the Traffic Management Plan for the Scheme in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR0100765/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the reference to the issues raised by the Newark Bypass Environment Group. The Applicant has shown regard to the Newark Bypass Environment Group within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> against Response ID reference ANON-559H-RWVY-3.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Landscape and visual effects; Land ownership	When any 'borrowed' land is returned to us after road construction, we would like trees and bushes re-introduced, replacing and compensating for any lost wildlife habitat.  Having spoken at length with [redacted], it is proposed that a row of trees be planted prior to any building works beginning, as screening. We would welcome this.	2D	N	Habitats such as grassland and linear belts of shrubs and trees would be provided in this area. Details are set out in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).  With regards to the request from the Consultee for planting to take place prior to any construction works beginning, the Applicant would, where reasonably practical, undertake planting along the southern boundary of the Consultee's land prior to commencement of works. Details of planting specification and specific locations will be discussed with the Consultee during detailed design of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Land ownership	As above, screening is needed prior to and during building works to minimise noise and pollution impact on our property and our daily lives.  We would like a screen of evergreen trees planting to aid this.  We would also like our property cleaning (windows) should the building works cause invasive dust.	2E/2F	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Noise mitigation would be provided during construction of the Scheme including site hoardings and construction plant usage measures. There are no significant adverse effects for construction anticipated with mitigation in place.  Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5). This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (TR010065/APP/3.1).
ANON-559H-RWN6-R	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	Planting more trees on the Winthorpe side of the proposed 'farmers entry track' would provide another barrier for noise and visual enhancement plus chance for nesting birds further from the A46.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to a potentially available location or site that could be used for environmental enhancements. Since the statutory consultation, the design has evolved to include a new native hedgerow with trees that would be provided on the Winthorpe side of the access tracks and a walking and cycling route to Winthorpe Roundabout. In order to further aid screening, the bunds alongside the A46 would also be planted with trees and shrubs. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Environment – general; Landscape and visual effects	South border of Winthorpe village Conservation area adjacent to A1 and associated overbridge. If this parcel of agricultural land is not handed back, there is scope to increase tree plantations here to increase visual and environmental screening of the new road layout.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to a potentially available local location or site that could be used for environmental enhancements. Woodland planting, as well as a planted landscape bund and native hedgerow with trees would be provided in this area in order to reduce adverse effects upon the southern edge of Winthorpe village. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Environment – general; Landscape and visual effects	More land could be purchased on the south side of Winthorpe village adjacent the A1 and new A1 crossing. This field could be fully planted with mixed trees and shrubs, perhaps with a circular walk. This would create a fantastic amenity and wildlife area. Over time this would help to reduce noise and light pollution further and act as a carbon sink.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards a potentially available local location or site that could be used for environmental enhancements. The land suggested which borders the A1 at the south of Winthorpe village is included within the Order Limits. As part of the Scheme, it would have a mixture of grassland, planting and individual trees as well as retaining some existing vegetation. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2). Planting such as tree and shrub, woodland, hedgerow and grassland would be provided alongside the Scheme to aid landscape integration and visual screening.
ANON-559H-RWN8-T	Road drainage and the water environment; Biodiversity	The proposed floodland compensation areas, while not suitable for other uses, could be used for habitat (wetland?) creation.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements.  The floodplain compensation areas are designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape. The floodplain compensation areas are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).  The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.  The detailed environmental design of the floodplain compensation areas will be developed in due course. Further details of the floodplain compensation areas are provided in Chapter 2

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					(The Scheme), Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Biodiversity; Construction; Population and human health	<p>A large section of wildlife corridor will be destroyed and disrupted by the construction of the Brownhills junction with no replacement or mitigation features seeming feasible at the location due to the nature of the design.</p> <p>It will be having a severe negative impact on the lifestyle, health and wellbeing of the 40+ show dogs that live at [redacted] plus those who stay at the boarding kennels.</p>	2E/2F	N	<p>Planting of trees and shrubs would be provided in this area in order to reduce visual impacts associated with the A1/A46 Crossing, softening the built aspects of the structure and aiding its screening over time as planting matures. Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. Where necessary, mitigation (such as habitat manipulation to divert species from collision risk areas) would be provided within the Scheme's Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies that no significant effects would occur at the property as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Biodiversity	<p>Concern about wildlife pathways between habitats.</p> <p>No mention of an attempt to try and connect habitat pockets.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to wildlife pathways. A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/ 6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds and mammals, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. Should potential impacts be anticipated to an ecological receptor, mitigation measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identify actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation. Both construction and operation mitigation measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, such as employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to provide specialist advice and monitor adherence to construction mitigation measures.</p> <p>The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat. Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole.</p> <p>Any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water voles. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population. The retention of existing commuting or foraging routes would ensure</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>safe movement of these species in proximity to the Scheme, where possible, minimising any long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>Mitigation measures were presented to stakeholders including Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust in June 2023, after incorporating previous comments from each representative. There were no objections to the mitigation which was well received as it was demonstrated that measures had been informed by robust survey data and desk study data (roadkill records). With the retention of existing safe passages, provision of the aforementioned planting and adoption of mitigation embedded into the Scheme, no significant impacts are anticipated upon terrestrial wildlife that would commute across the Scheme.</p> <p>Planting detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> would provide a commuting corridor parallel to the widened A46 carriageway, connecting existing and newly created habitats and would direct wildlife to existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> also considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on foraging, commuting and migration routes for wildlife recorded in the area. The chapter details appropriate and proportional mitigation informed by robust survey data and desk study records, and an assessment of likely significant effects. The Habitat Regulations Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/6.6)</b> assesses the above on river and sea lamprey in greater detail (qualifying features for the designation of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar), as the River Trent intersects the Scheme and is a known migratory route for lamprey. No residual significant effects are anticipated on the movement of protected species.</p>
ANON-559H-RWED-W	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	Farmers field opposite [redacted] needs more trees on the tree line to minimise the noise and any new bridge needs to be to the left of the current Farndon Bridge and away from the adjacent houses.	2E/2F	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment has concluded no significant noise effects at the property during construction or operation with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge in the form of noise barriers. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise. Low noise running surface would also be provided along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The new bridge would run adjacent to the western side of the existing bridge. Planting would be provided on associated embankments running up to the river crossing to aid screening from the south-west.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Environment – general; Road layout	Fields town side of A46 near Newark cricket club will be affected. Habitat/ hedgerows/ trees will be lost. Extended dual carriage on non-town side to protect this habitat.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Widening works would be undertaken on the non-town side with the exception of slip roads for Cattle Market Junction which would require localised widening and some areas of vegetation removal to accommodate the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Replacement planting of trees and shrubs would be provided alongside the newly widened embankments as well as neighbouring land parcels. Additional native hedgerows with trees would also be provided in this area.</p> <p>Moving the slip roads further away from these fields would reduce the length of existing A46 that can be converted into the new southbound carriageway. It would also move the roundabout gyratory further north which would require the listed Smeaton's Arches structure to be removed as well as impacting two priority habitats and require one veteran tree to be removed. As a result of the associated adverse impacts, this change will not be provided by the Scheme. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further information with regards to landscape proposals.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Environment - general	Immediately around the Cattle Market roundabout the sandhill area.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to a potentially available location or site that could be used for environmental enhancements. Planting of trees and shrubs would be provided in this area where possible in order to aid the reduction of visual impacts associated with the new grade separated junction (Cattle Market Junction), softening the built aspects of the structure and aiding its screening over time as planting matures.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further information with regards to landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Road drainage and the water environment	Lack of confidence in the flood alleviation measures proposed.	2C	N	<p>Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides details of the Flood Risk Assessment that has been conducted. A mitigation scheme (floodplain compensation) has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding with consideration for future climate change effects.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Existing road drainage would be maintained as part of the existing maintenance regime. Details on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDU-D	Road drainage and the water environment	(Flood compensation areas) Not sure how this compensation works.	2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A mitigation scheme (floodplain compensation) has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Floodplain compensation areas work by offsetting the lost floodplain that is taken by the Scheme, providing equivalent floodplain on suitable land in another part of the floodplain.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Road drainage and the water environment	Waterlogging and flood prevention for Kelham road and sandhill area vital given increasingly heavy rainfall periods.	2G	N	<p>With regards to the Consultee's comments relating to the River Devon, the Applicant is only required to mitigate the flood risks caused by the Scheme. Therefore, the floodplain compensation areas are targeted to the floodplain that the Scheme interacts with.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Road drainage and the water environment	Does not appear to be alleviation close to our property. Appears to be in place to improve Trent flooding whereas flooding near us is from a tributary (Devon?). Also flooding is as a result of groundwater levels (town side of flood band) not always river flooding.	2G	N	<p>The Flood Risk Assessment found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> concluded that the Scheme would not have a negative impact on flood levels in the River Devon's floodplain. As such, the River Devon is outside the scope of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWTU-W	Road drainage and the water environment	Since the earth mounding on the grass verge opposite our entrance the road and our gateway are prone to flooding. It is quite extensive up to 4ins deep.	2G	N	<p>The drainage strategy would provide adequate storm water attenuation for the Scheme. At this design stage, a MicroDrainage Quick Storage Estimate has been used to estimate the required attenuation storage based on catchment descriptions and rainfall data, the locations</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>of the attenuation basins are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. A detailed model of the drainage system would be produced at the next design stage where the sizes of attenuation basins would be reviewed, and the attenuation volume would be finalised.</p> <p>The drainage strategy can be seen in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Existing road drainage would be maintained by National Highways, Nottinghamshire County Council and the Environment Agency as part of the established maintenance regime. A draft Asset Management Plan, which breaks down the maintenance responsibility of assets, has been included in Appendix F of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Details of the asset management plans will be finalised at the detailed design stage.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Road drainage and the water environment	Proposed flood plain would benefit from water tolerant species such as willow to help reduce flooding and soil run off from initial work and flood plain alteration.	2E/F	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation area is to ensure land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees.</p> <p>Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. The Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> show all land that would need acquiring and managing for the Scheme. Discussions are ongoing with the respective landowner to agree a strategy for long term management of the Farndon East floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including an indicative plant species list, which also includes willow species.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Road drainage and the water environment	It should be noted that the paddock land adjacent to our land that you propose to take is subject to flooding and becomes waterlogged during heavy rain. Our garden, however does not. We presume this won't change.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which is detailed in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme would have no major adverse effects on the flood risk to the Consultee's garden.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWQ-V	Noise and vibration; Construction	The noise levels from the construction work over the next few years will add to the already noise levels. I live right next to the A46 Brownhills part and the noise levels are already too much. I have earplugs in and good noise proof windows – the vehicle noise levels distends my sleep in the day.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at properties including those at Brownhills. Suitable mitigation measures are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Such measures include, but are not limited, to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary acoustic barriers to be erected at several locations</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations on the timing of construction machinery known to generate significant noise to minimise potential disruption</li> <li>• Construction plant to be fitted with noise reduction equipment where possible</li> <li>• Use of acoustic dampened sheet piles to minimise noise generation during piling activities</li> </ul> <p>With such mitigation in place, no significant effects are anticipated at all locations during construction including near Brownhills.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN1-K	Environment – general	<p>My thoughts accord with those of the Environment Group. I am very disappointed that plans actually give little indication of any positive attempt to prevent damage to the environment, to mitigate or repair. Again, its not possible to comment on plans that do not exist !</p> <p>[The remainder of this consultee response contains the same as the Newark Bypass Environment Group (NBEG) response for the same question number. The consultee also responded to questions 2D, 2E,2G and 2H using the same text as the NBEG. Please see response ANON-559H-RWVY-3 to see how the Applicant has shown regard to this.]</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>This Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> relates to an application made by the Applicant to the Secretary of State for Transport, via the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 for a Development Consent Order for the Scheme. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects where possible. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Population and human health	<p>The owners [redacted] show dogs are 68 years and 64 years old. The businesses they have developed are designed to earn them the money to live through their retirement and pay for the food and vet bills for their show dogs. The potential development of such a massive road infrastructure in such proximity to their home and businesses seriously threatens their health and wellbeing and their financial income both in the short and long term. [Redacted] has only recently been [redacted] and has debilitated mobility as he is awaiting a hip replacement so the realisation of this 10m high new road development surrounding his property and flooding his field, threatening his business and the security in his retirement which he has worked hard is creating him much unneeded anxiety and stress.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee to discuss potential impacts and possible mitigation measures. The engagement resulted in updates to the Scheme design, for example, adjusting the Order Limits to remove part of the landowner's property proposed for business operations.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee in relation to any specific accommodation works in order to address their concerns about the operation of their business. Any accommodation works will be confirmed during detailed design. Table 5-19 in the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> provides further details of changes made to the Scheme as a result of consultation with this Consultee.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This takes into consideration amenity effects which includes the coexistence of environmental effects such as air quality,</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>noise and vibration, and landscape and visual amenity. The assessment found there to be no amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses receptors which are located within 200m of the Scheme's affected road network and where the effects of changes in traffic on air quality are greatest. The assessment has included the property in the operational phase modelling. Pollutant concentrations at the receptor have been predicted using modelling of Do Minimum (without the Scheme) and Do Something (with the Scheme) scenarios. The modelling demonstrated that annual mean pollutant concentrations at this location are predicted to be 19.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> in the year the Scheme is open to traffic which is well below the air quality objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in this location.</p> <p>From a landscape assessment perspective, the property has been captured within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and assessed as a residential dwelling as well as a business with workers and visitors. As detailed in Appendix 7.2 (Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>), the Scheme would have a large adverse effect on this visual receptor during construction and Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic), reducing to a non-significant slight adverse effect by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) of operation once mitigation vegetation has had time to mature.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential construction and operational noise and vibration impacts at relevant noise sensitive receptors including the property referred to in Consultee's response.</p> <p>A noise barrier from the northbound carriageway at Brownhills Junction, extending across Brownhills Underbridge, the A1/A46 Crossing to the Esso Service Station would provide mitigation of noise levels from the A46 at the property. This can be seen within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Despite the Scheme moving the A46 closer to these receptors, the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and therefore a slight increase in the noise contribution from the Scheme would not be perceivable. The assessment therefore concludes that receptors at the property would have negligible effects from the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management (e.g. minimising the height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blown dust emissions and risk of pile collapse; damp down surfaces in dry conditions, etc.), noise management (acoustic barriers, reduced quantity and/or on-time of the excavators and dozers operating within 300m of receptors), air pollution control measures (e.g. switching off all vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use) and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Population and human health	The changes to the design since the Preferred Route announcement have direct impact on my life, as the additional Brownhills junction roundabout is in close proximity of my property, and its additional impact on numerous environmental factors will, I believe, have a deleterious impact on my quality of life, over and above the significant impact of the existing A46 realignment (e.g. proximity of elevated dual carriageway and A1 overbridge).	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to changes to the Scheme design in relation to the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction. The new roundabout was introduced to provide direct access to residents and a business but also remove the sub-standard northbound slip road to Brownhills Roundabout. This also allowed Brownhills Underbridge to be moved very close to the A1/A46 Crossing which significantly reduced the length and height of the raised embankment, therefore reducing the visual impact of the Scheme for the Winthorpe estate to the south.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the of impacts of the Scheme on human health, reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This takes into consideration amenity effects which includes the coexistence of environmental effects such as air quality, noise and vibration, and landscape and visual amenity. The assessment found there to be no amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at properties including those at Brownhills Junction. The mitigation measures are set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, such measures include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary acoustic barriers to be erected at several locations</li> <li>• Limitations on the timing of construction machinery known to generate significant noise to minimise potential disruption</li> <li>• Construction plant to be fitted with noise reduction equipment where possible</li> <li>• Use of acoustic dampened sheet piles to minimise noise generation during piling activities</li> </ul> <p>With such mitigation in place potentially significant adverse noise effects would be avoided at all locations during construction, including near Brownhills.</p> <p>Planting of trees and shrubs would be provided in this area in order to reduce visual impacts associated with the new A1/A46 Crossing, softening the built aspects of the structure and aiding its screening over time as planting matures. Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p> <p>The Applicant has also worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme, including those near the Brownhills Junction. This includes but is not limited to dust management (e.g. minimising the height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blown dust emissions and risk of pile collapse; damp down surfaces in dry conditions, etc.), noise management (acoustic barriers, reduced quantity and/or on-time of the excavators and dozers operating within 300m of receptors), air pollution control measures (e.g. switching off all vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use) and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. The delivery of these commitments is secured under Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RVVQ-U	Population and human health	This Scheme is going to have a massive impact on the lives of people within close proximity of the construction site.	2H	N	<p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This takes into consideration amenity effects which includes the coexistence of environmental effects such as air quality, noise and vibration, and landscape and visual amenity. The assessment found there to be no amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management (e.g. minimising the height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blown dust emissions and risk of pile collapse; damp</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>down surfaces in dry conditions, etc), noise management (acoustic barriers, reduced quantity and/or on-time of the excavators and dozers operating within 300m of receptors), air pollution control measures (e.g. switching off all vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use) and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. The delivery of these commitments is secured under Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Traffic forecasts; Drove Lane	<p>The but is I would like formal confirmation of the earth bund height; details of the proposed landscaping; details of the proposed noise reduction surface; details of the action proposed to reduce lorry vibration and traffic headlight pollution; details of the restrictions to be imposed on the non-vehicular access track; similar landscaping measures along the A1133 to reduce the visual intrusion of traffic on my property and the north-east side of Winthorpe. Impact of the through about A1133/A46 roundabout of traffic flow and queuing (see comments later).</p> <p>Drove Lane will become more of a rat run and therefore more measures are needed to restrict weight and speed along this road.</p>	2B	N	<p>The landscape bunds are typically 3m high with tree and shrub planting. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment can be found in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Details of the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). This also shows the planting along the A1133.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. In order to mitigate the effects to Winthorpe village, permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. Low noise road surfacing would be provided on the widened and existing A46, the Friendly Farmer Link Road and all new slip roads. Vibration from lorries would be mitigated in part by the low noise surfacing provided.</p> <p>With regards to the visual intrusion of traffic onto the Consultee's property, the noise barrier and bunds stretching from the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway to Winthorpe Roundabout would provide screening from vehicle headlights. These mitigation measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Vehicle anti-access barriers would be provided on all walking and cycling routes and the specification of these would be agreed with the local authority. These measures, as well as those previously mentioned, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Winthorpe Roundabout (referred to as the through-about by the Consultee) is forecast to improve flows significantly from the A1133 and Drove Lane onto the A46 and the Friendly Farmer Link Road as the signals provide good inter-green time to allow traffic to enter. Drove Lane would be used less as the queues at Friendly Farmer Roundabout would be reduced from those that exist at present and would reduce the demand for rat-running along Drove Lane. Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Brownhills Junction; Noise and vibration	<p>The newly proposed round-about adjacent to the dog kennels needs more thought. As a proportion of the traffic the number of road users needing to access the kennels will be very small. Is the huge roundabout that is being proposed really necessary? The height of this roundabout also raises concern around noise and vibrational impact to south Winthorpe and there is little information available around what the combined impact of this AND the new A46 bridge AND the A1 will mean in terms of noise pollution.</p>	2B	Y	<p>After the preferred route announcement, the Brownhills Junction Roundabout was introduced into the design to shorten the slip road and move the crossing point beneath the new A46, closer to the A1, therefore significantly reducing the length of the high embankment needed on the approach to this crossing. The access to the boarding kennels is low use, however the Brownhills Junction Roundabout needs to be the designed size to allow HGVs to safely navigate it. The Brownhills Junction Roundabout has an inscribed circle diameter of 60m. This is slightly smaller than the existing Brownhills Roundabout that has an approximate diameter of 70m.</p> <p>The size of the Brownhills Junction Roundabout has been designed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i> to accommodate the forecast level of traffic at the junction, including HGVs. Since the statutory consultation, the height of the roundabout has been reduced to match the height of the adjacent A1.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The new alignment of the A46, including noise from the A1 is accounted for in the assessment of noise, for all noise sensitive receptors. This includes the height and shape of the Brownhills Junction Roundabout. There is no residual significant adverse effect anticipated at the location referred to by the Consultee, with the mitigation in place as referred</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>to below.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in the form of barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>In order to mitigate the potential noise impacts in south Winthorpe, permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station. Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>These measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Brownhills Junction	Minimising the role of Brownhills Junction, its size, and the scale of the traffic this roundabout will take. One National Highways representative, at the Winthorpe consultation event, described the roundabout to me as "small" but it is larger than other roundabouts like Brownhills in the area.	2I	N	The new Brownhills Junction Roundabout has an inscribed circle diameter of 60m. This is slightly smaller than the existing Brownhills Roundabout that has an approximate diameter of 70m. The size of this roundabout has been designed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i> to accommodate the forecast level of traffic at the junction.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Noise and vibration; Brownhills Junction	<p>2. The proximity of Brownhills Junction will be in line with the rear of our property – the part of our garden which suffers least currently from road noise. Brownhills Junction will generate new kinds of road noise, as vehicles slow down and accelerate away. National Highways has failed to provide any information regarding the complex interaction of noise in this already noise sensitive area.</p> <p>National Highways has a duty to at the very least not increase noise in an existing noise sensitive area. Indeed, they should be seeking to reduce noise at NIAs. But it defies logic regarding how National Highways will be able to build this Scheme in this area without existing noise levels increasing.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate – judging in relation to a caravan site in the Winthorpe-Newark open break – a site which is further away from the existing road infrastructure than our house - deemed this location too noisy for habitation ("the Inspector ultimately concluded in strong terms that his concerns in respect of noise were so great he could not conclude that continued occupation would be in the best interests of the children. I agreed with that conclusion." – Appeal Decisions APP/B303/C/18/3196972).</p> <p>Furthermore, the size of this roundabout is being underplayed by National Highways, as they describe it as small. It is actually larger than the other roundabouts in the vicinity.</p> <p>National Highways has not been upfront or clear regarding the traffic that this new roundabout will take. Given that all traffic exiting the A46 northbound will use this roundabout, this will comprise vehicles joining the A17, A1 and local routes.</p> <p>This is a considerable number and National Highways should be honest that this roundabout will be taking significant amounts of traffic – all in close proximity to both Winthorpe Village and Winthorpe Road Estate.</p>	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the Development Consent Order application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at properties including those near Brownhills Junction. There are no significant adverse effects predicted in this location with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided. These would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. The approach aims to reduce noise as close to source as is feasible. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area, including the location referred to by the Consultee. There are no significant adverse effects predicted at any locations with mitigation in place.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comment regarding the size of the roundabout at Brownhills Junction, the Brownhills Junction Roundabout has an inscribed circle diameter of 60m. This would be slightly smaller than the existing Brownhills Roundabout that has an approximate diameter of 70m. The size of this roundabout has been designed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i> to accommodate the forecast level of traffic at the junction, including HGVs. Further details regarding traffic modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWM-R	Road layout	Good use of structures/ layout to solve traffic flow.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
BHLF-559H-RWWM-R	Road layout	A well thought out design that should address the congestion around Newark.	2H	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
ANON-559H-RWTA-9	Road layout	All junctions should be serviced by a fly over or underpass to keep through traffic moving and carbon footprint to a minimum.	2B	N	<p>With regards to the Consultee's suggestion that all junctions on the Scheme should be serviced by grade separation or an underpass, junction types were assessed at the Options Identification Stage of the Scheme. It was determined that Farndon Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout did not need to be grade separated and therefore grade separation at these roundabouts do not form part of the Scheme design.</p> <p>The roundabout and junction design developed during the Preliminary Design Stage of the Scheme perform well within traffic modelling. Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant is required under law (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. No significant effects on climate are anticipated.</p> <p>The assessment relies upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which will reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) reports a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. No significant effects on climate are anticipated. The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the greenhouse gas emissions however, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant, (less than 0.007%) and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>National Highways' <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the strategic road network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that '<i>net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset</i>' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary. The improvements to the A46 corridor are detailed within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Road layout	Can the Scheme not provide an unintended consequence of allowing access to housing development on the fields to the north and east of Winthorpe	2H	N	Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) sets out the Applicant's objectives. The objective of the Scheme is not to improve access to new housing development in the vicinity of the Scheme but to improve safety, congestion, connectivity to accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent whilst delivering better environmental outcomes and inclusivity within the Scheme, which improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Any planning applications for housing development would be determined by Newark and Sherwood District Council as the local planning authority.
ANON-559H-RW9H-N	Road layout	The proposal to put the flyover over the A1 closer to the village and to build more carriageways east of Winthorpe nearer to the village.	2B	N	The Applicant notes the Consultee's response with regards to the elements of the Scheme they are dissatisfied with.  The introduction of extra carriageways as part of the Scheme is required to provide capacity for existing and future traffic flows and to alleviate congestion on the existing junctions between Farndon Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout, and in particular increase capacity within the existing Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Further details of the traffic modelling carried out on the Scheme can be found within the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).  Ongoing engagement with stakeholders in the vicinity of Winthorpe as a result of the options consultation on the Scheme, resulted in the alignment of the road to the east of Winthorpe being moved further away from the village. This updated route alignment was presented in the statutory consultation and can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWN9-U	Land ownership; Road layout	I have to access my land [redacted] off the A46 down a narrow slip road, this is my only access. I have concerns about accessing my land during the construction phase of the project.  At the moment I put concrete blocks in the gateway of this slip road to prevent fly tipping or unwanted access by quad bikes and 4 x 4 vehicles. We need to come up with a system to prevent this during the construction phase and once the Scheme is complete. Perhaps a substantial barrier that can be locked with a tamper proof padlock can be installed to mitigate these effects. A discussion with me on design and installation before the project starts would be most helpful.  A suitable slip road needs to be designed to allow safe exit and entry onto the A46, consultation with me beforehand would be desirable.  At the moment I have about 200 - 250 metre of visibility for traffic driving south on the A46 from my slip road and I have to make a split second decision when to pull out onto the A46, which can be alarming when driving slow agricultural machinery. My concern is when the project is finished traffic will be travelling even faster than before, giving me less time to make the decision when to pull onto the road. How can this be made easier, safer for me and the other road users. Do we need signage, interactive signs that light up to warn drivers, lighting, 50 mph speed limit? A discussion with me before the design is finalised needs to happen.	2H	Y	The Applicant acknowledges the comments received and will continue to engage with the stakeholder throughout the Development Consent Order examination process. In response to the matters raised, the existing direct access from the A46 would be retained and would remain accessible during both the construction and operation phases. To improve highway safety, merge and diverge splays would be provided and existing vegetation would be trimmed back within the verge to provide better visibility and to account for the increase in speed limit from 60mph to 70mph. Access and egress would be from the southbound carriageway only. In order to prevent unauthorised access, the Applicant is proposing a secure gated system for which the Applicant and the landowner would have keys. The type and form would be agreed with both parties.
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Land ownership	Whilst we are generally in favour of the proposed road improvement, we are very concerned about the amount of land we may be personally losing.  Having studied proposed plans and spoken with your representatives at public consultations and also at our home, it remains unclear exactly which areas of our land you require, either temporarily or permanently. We have sent email enquiries querying this too but have not received any satisfactory answers as yet. We would like this clarifying as soon as possible please.  It is of the utmost importance that we do not lose our mooring area (approximately 200 feet) abutting the river. This piece of land is of great value to us both recreationally and financially, and also to the heritage of our unusual property.	2B	N	The Consultee's land identified within the Order Limits would be acquired temporarily to facilitate closure of the Bridleway BW2 during construction, the extent of land required to be taken is shown on the Land Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.2</b> ). The Consultee would retain the ability to access their mooring during construction, all accesses are shown on the Works Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.3</b> ).  Permanent land would be required along the new widened embankment between the pedestrian underpass at Farndon Roundabout and Windmill Viaduct. The remaining land within the area to the west of the new embankment is included in the environment design of the Scheme to help deliver essential mitigation and biodiversity net gain for the Scheme. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.  The Applicant will continue discussions with the landowner regarding the long-term ownership and maintenance of this land that is required for essential mitigation.
ANON-559H-RW75-Z	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders;	At the consultation meeting held at Winthorpe village hall, the access track across [redacted] land providing access to the [redacted] land was proposed to also be a footpath/ cycle way.	2H	Y	The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the combined access track/footway/cycleway between Winthorpe village and the A46, included as part of the Scheme design during statutory consultation. This was referred to as the 'Accommodation

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Road layout; Land ownership	<p>When this was questioned, [redacted] told the room that the cost of the access track would be in the region of £1 million pounds, and that the only way this cost could be justified would be to make it for public access too. This would also require Thoroughfare Lane to be reopened and an additional footpath constructed along the inside of the field boundary on the southern side of the A1133.</p> <p>[Redacted] told the meeting that National Highways weren't under any commitment to provide footpaths for public access, so I do wonder why as a landowners and farmer I hadn't been consulted prior to the meeting about this proposed access, and why I received the distinct impression it was 'fait accompli'?</p> <p>The proposed cost of the access track/ footpath is an enormous cost, which I imagine in part is because the proposed access trackway would be either be of concrete or tarmac construction, which after speaking with [redacted] is entirely unnecessary as both they and I [redacted] would be perfectly happy with merely a crushed stone trackway, which would be far, far less costly to construct.</p> <p>As the farmer of the [redacted] land I already stand to lose a very large part of the land parcel to soil banks and attenuation ponds, without losing even more land to a footpath and an access track, to the north of the parcel and an access track to the east of the parcel, which I don't think are necessary.</p> <p>Not only that, but the resulting fields [redacted] would become so small as to become unviable/impractical for farming using modern large-scale equipment.</p> <p>There are also considerations in regards to members of the public being in close proximity to farming operations/ large pieces of dangerous machinery, and Agri chemicals when they are being applied, with potential for injuries to be sustained and resultant legal proceedings, which are currently are not a risk as there is no public access.</p> <p>During the meeting [redacted] proposed that he would be happy for the pathway across the land he farms [redacted] be public being accessed via Hargon Lane and returning along the existing footpath past the Lord Nelson pub, which becomes then a circuitous route, which could be a metalled surface suitable for walkers cyclists.</p> <p>If the footpath/ cycle way along thoroughfare lane and the side of the A1133 weren't constructed, or the access track along the side of [redacted], the distance appears to be approximately one third of the total distance.</p> <p>In this case, using the figure that [redacted] the saving to the public purse would be approximately one third of a million pounds, a not inconsiderable amount of money in the currently financial climate.</p> <p>Additional concerns about having public access around the perimeter of the village on a vehicular access track also include problems with hare coursing and the associated criminality, and the ease of access/escape from the village by burglars/ thieves via a 'back entrance'.</p> <p>I propose therefore that the access track should only be constructed along the [redacted] land, starting at Hargon Lane, and the footpath follow the same route, saving the cost of any tracks/ paths being built upon [redacted].</p>			<p>Works Access Track' on the <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> used at the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee and the relevant landowner following statutory consultation in relation to the walking and cycling route included within the Scheme between Hargon Lane and the A1133. This engagement has also included discussions relating to the use of land for landscaping mitigation and attenuation basins.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, and following further targeted consultation, feedback received from the Consultee resulted in the combined access track/footway/cycleway, from the A1133 to Hargon Lane, as referred to by the Consultee, being removed from the Scheme design.</p> <p>Hargon Lane would provide a connection from Winthorpe village to a new combined access track/footway/cycleway heading towards Friendly Farmer Roundabout. There would also be a walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout. Thoroughfare Lane was considered as a potential route however this was subsequently discounted when assessing all options as the central location of the Hargon Lane benefited the wider population of Winthorpe on a more even distribution.</p> <p>Where walking and cycling routes join the existing A46, the end of Hargon Lane and the A1133, measures would be installed to prevent motorised user access to the walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>Further information on the combined access track/footway/cycleway near to Winthorpe village, as well as all walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVX-2	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Road layout; Land ownership	<p>Five of the charity's six trustees live in Winthorpe and thus have the opportunity to provide comments via their own personal response to the consultation.</p> <p>ALL further comments below this point relate solely to and the impact upon the land owned by the charity [redacted]; these comments have been unanimously approved by the trustees.</p> <p>Trustees OBJECT to the proposed "Accommodation Works Access Track" between its start position on the A1133 (almost) immediately adjacent to the new Winthorpe junction and where it crosses the end of Hargon Lane next to the existing dual carriageway (the FIRST SECTION).</p>	2B	Y	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the combined access track/footway/cycleway between Winthorpe village and the A46, included as part of the Scheme design during statutory consultation. This was referred to as the 'Accommodation Works Access Track' on the <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> used at the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee following statutory consultation in relation to this access track. This engagement has also included discussions relating to the use of land for landscaping mitigation and attenuation basins.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Please note we accept the case for an access track beyond the end of Hargon Lane going south towards the Shell Service station but as this is on land not owned by the charity we make no further comment.</p> <p>The reasons for our objection to the FIRST SECTION of track are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not necessary for our tenant farmer who already has access into the rented fields directly from the A1133 and we would expect this to be maintained in any event and under any circumstances that may develop later in the project.</li> <li>2. The FIRST SECTION of track is not the only option available to gain access to the fields that are to the south of the end of Hargon Lane, as access would be available via Gainsborough Road and Hargon Lane through Winthorpe itself. Gainsborough Road and Hargon Lane are already used to gain access to fields off Hargon Lane. In our view, the proposal for the FIRST SECTION is very convenient for farmer(s) in avoiding having to drive through the village but this would be infrequent anyway and furthermore from the charity's perspective, requires yet more land to be subject to any compulsory purchase order.</li> <li>3. Any access track adjacent to the charity's land brings with it an increased risk of trespass and associated crop damage for our tenant farmer, both from wilful damage and, for example, dog walkers. Historically, such issues have never arisen for us. Please note that trustees remain unclear at this stage whether the proposed access track will effectively be private i.e. for farmer use only with appropriate signage and access security (locked gates), or whether other vehicular access and / or pedestrian and/or cycle access is proposed. To be clear, we remain opposed whatever is intended.</li> </ol> <p>Should our objections to the FIRST SECTION not be successful and the proposal as-is goes ahead, we would stress at this point that all land required for it is included in any compulsory purchase order i.e. the charity would not end up with an access track running through its land at the end of the project with the liabilities and ongoing responsibilities associated with it, as the track would be owned by National Highways or another third party.</p>			<p>Since the statutory consultation, and following further targeted consultation, feedback received from the Consultee resulted in the access track from the A1133 to Hargon Lane (as referred to by the Consultee) being removed from the Scheme design.</p> <p>Hargon Lane would provide a connection from Winthorpe village to a new combined access track/footway/cycleway heading towards Friendly Farmer Roundabout. There would also be a walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout. Thoroughfare Lane as a potential route was considered however this was subsequently discounted when assessing all options as the central location of the Hargon Lane benefited the wider population of Winthorpe on a more even distribution.</p> <p>Where walking and cycling routes join the existing A46, the end of Hargon Lane and the A1133, measures would be installed to prevent motorised user access to the walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>Further information on the combined access track/footway/cycleway near to Winthorpe village as well as all walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7M-R	Road layout; Traffic forecasts; Newark Showground	<p>The proposed Scheme will significantly improve traffic flows, reduce congestion and deliver a real economic benefit to Newark Showground and consequently the surrounding region.</p> <p>The new access points to the Showground (from the A46 and Drove Lane) will deliver immediate and significant improvements to the area driving jobs, economic development and enhanced user experience.</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regards to the improvement the Scheme would have on traffic flows and congestion related to Newark Showground.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee following statutory consultation in relation to Showground entry and exit points included within the Scheme design.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, and following further targeted consultation, the Scheme design has been updated to include a left out only exit onto Drove Lane from Newark Showground. This has been designed alongside the entry access point off the Friendly Farmer Link Road, to assist traffic flows entering and exiting Newark Showground.</p> <p>This provides a solution that balances differing needs of the Consultee, to let the Newark Showground operate effectively and prevent queues occurring on the Winthorpe Roundabout and the Friendly Farmer Link Road, which continues to provide the benefits outlined by the Consultee.</p> <p>Further information regarding this is outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and illustrated on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7M-R	Road layout; Newark Showground	<p>The left turn into Newark Showground from the new relief road also needs to provide for a left turn out in order to improve traffic flows around the site and ease traffic from having to use the new Winthorpe Roundabout. The reduction in congestion and journey times will significantly improve the utility and quality of life and environment for the surrounding area.</p> <p>A right turn lane into the Showground on Drove Lane, close to the improved Winthorpe Roundabout, would further enhance the speed of access into the Showground and consequently reduce the potential for queuing traffic to back up to the roundabout causing delays.</p>	2B	N	<p>As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and illustrated on Sheets 4 and 6 of the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) the access to the Newark Showground would be amended with the creation of a new left turn only in from the Friendly Farmer Link Road.</p> <p>The access and exit arrangements from the Showground have been amended such that the existing bowling club access from Drove Lane would be left out only, preventing right turning traffic potentially queuing back onto Winthorpe Roundabout. This has also negated the need for the additional right turn lane as requested by the Consultee for the bowling club entrance.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW3G-E	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Road layout	I think the exit slips from Cattlemarket require a long run with a long merging point, similar to the A1 North and Southbound slip roads. Please do not make it like Widmerpool or where A616 joins A1 at Muskham (near Ashiana).	2B	N	<p>The entry and exit slip roads on Cattle Market Roundabout have been designed to provide adequate merging length and visibility. These entry and exit slip roads have been designed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 109 – Highway link design</i>, which provides requirements and advice for all aspects of highway link design to be used for both new and improved all-purpose and motorway trunk roads.</p> <p>A microsimulation model of the merge was produced, and this showed that it operated safely and had adequate capacity. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. For more information on the traffic modelling undertaken, please refer to the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Traffic signals would be provided at the end of the southbound exit slip road and on the roundabout at this location to control flows at this location, further details can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction	Entry point on the Cattle Market slip road needs to be open for longer to aid visibility. For example not like joining A46 from Widmerpool roundabout where it is a long slip with small exit window. Needs to be more like A1 southbound slip road, especially if traffic increases on A46.			
ANON-559H-RWE5-E	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Traffic lights/signals	Severe delays in the Cattle Market area are infrequent and short lived. However, the roundabout is difficult to negotiate. A set of traffic lights would vastly improve safety and ease of use.	2D	N	The existing Cattle Market Roundabout is too small to be signalised as it does not have stacking space around it. The new Cattle Market Roundabout would be partially signalised to improve flows.
ANON-559H-RWN8-T	Congestion	<p>There is an existing congestion problem at the junction of Trent Lane and North Gate during peak periods. Traffic turning right from Trent Lane has to cross both oncoming traffic on Northgate, and traffic in the lane for turning right into Trent Lane. This problem will become worse when the Scheme begins.</p> <p>Some form of traffic control is required. Traffic lights and a revised turning layout would seem to be the most obvious solution.</p> <p>Depending upon the size of vehicles being moved along Trent Lane, I would suggest the width and parking arrangements be reviewed. Periodically, Trent Lane is reduced to single car width traffic.</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that using Trent Lane off Northgate for access is an area of concern by some stakeholders when the construction of the Scheme begins. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides the current details for the temporary traffic management measures that are expected to be implemented during the construction of the Scheme. This includes restricted delivery times for large construction equipment, so that construction activities do not impact peak hour traffic.</p> <p>While it is not currently possible to specify precisely what traffic control measures would be implemented, under Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>), a Traffic Management Plan would be produced in consultation with the local highway authorities and stakeholders such as emergency services, with aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction. The Traffic Management Plan must be in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>). As such, this plan would build on and comply with the commitments made in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWED-W	Farndon roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The Scheme needs more than traffic lights at Farndon Island. It's a dangerous crossing. Especially for those cars trying to get to the school at Farndon from Farndon road. You take your life and your kids lives in your hands getting across. Especially as the outer lane, traffic goes far too fast to get across safely.	2B	N	<p>Traffic signals would be provided on the Farndon Roundabout arms with the A46 and on the gyratory where it intersects the A46 mainline. This would interrupt the flow of the mainline A46 traffic and provide gaps between green lights to allow traffic to leave Farndon Road safely and enter the roundabout, details can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGU-G	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Farndon Island: will there be traffic lights on all roads entering the island? My concerns are the Farndon Road, from Newark town centre, will be just a Give Way.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWED-W	Farndon village	Something needs to be done to improve access to Farndon itself from Newark to access the local school.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	A1/A46 Crossing	The new A46 Bypass Bridge over the A1 is too high. The bridge will be 2m higher than the current A46 Bridge over the A1. The height of this bridge will contribute significantly to the noise and vibrational impact felt in south Winthorpe.	2B	N	<p>With regards to the height of the new bridge crossing the A1 (A1/A46 Crossing) as part of the Scheme design, the clearance beneath the new bridge is very similar to the existing A1/A46 crossing. However due to the large span of the new bridge required across the A1, the depth is much greater, which raises the road alignment.</p> <p>Safety during construction and during use for maintenance and visibility, ruled out the introduction of intermediate supports to potentially reduce the bridge depth.</p> <p>The location of the bridge has been optimised as part of the ongoing Scheme design. The revised design improves the horizontal alignment and reduces the impact of the structure on the Winthorpe estate and Winthorpe village.</p> <p>With regards to the potential noise and vibration impacts of the A1/A46 Crossing in the village of Winthorpe, suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided in the form of barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures</p>
ANON-559H-RWN6-R	A1/A46 Crossing	I'm very unhappy that the flyover the A1 is still closer to Winthorpe than before. I am happier that the Think Again's Group proposals have been used to place it slightly further away than NH first plans.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	A1/A46 Crossing	The location and proposed height of the new A1 crossing is worrying.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	A1/A46 Crossing	The height of the A1 crossing needs to be set as low as practicable to reduce it's impact on the village.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The low noise surfacing by its nature is a smooth surface that won't cause vehicles to generate vibrations when driving along the carriageway. Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration, including low noise surfacing, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment undertaken demonstrates that road traffic noise would be reduced for most properties within Winthorpe and does not increase noise at any receptor in Winthorpe by more than 1dB 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic in 2043. No significant noise and vibration related effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN2-M	Land ownership; Road drainage and water environment	On land parcel [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted] I would like the red line boundary to be reduced as soon as possible to accurately reflect the land being used for the floodplain compensation. Hopefully this will be done in early February 2022.	2G	N	Following the statutory consultation, the Applicant has amended the Order Limits of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> . The modelling work undertaken and the reduction in floodplain compensation required due to the reduced footprint of the Scheme has allowed the Applicant to reduce the land required. The Order Limits have been reduced on all the land parcels mentioned by the Consultee which is reflected in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW3G-E	Winthorpe Roundabout	I don't think the through roundabout at Winthorpe is safe. It will be the new pinch point and 'black' spot on the 46 near Newark.	2B	N	<p>The design of Winthorpe Roundabout has been tested in traffic modelling and shows no issues with regards to capacity or significant queueing. Further details on forecast modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. A risk assessment has compared the Winthorpe Roundabout design with a conventional roundabout and both are comparable with the design of Winthorpe Roundabout being slightly safer overall.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design is used throughout the strategic road network and generally works like a standard roundabout. Signing would be used within the roundabout to guide southbound traffic to the A1 and Newark-on-Trent or to continue on the A46. The design of the Scheme roundabouts can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>A grade separated option at Winthorpe Roundabout was assessed at the Options Identification Stage of the Scheme but it was determined that this was not needed and therefore has not been included within the Scheme design. The roundabout developed during the Preliminary Design Stage performs well within traffic modelling, further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout, which has been updated since the statutory consultation and was included as part of the targeted consultation, performs well in years 2028 (year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years on from Scheme opening). This allows for traffic growth. Other options were explored but were not viable.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p>
ANON-559H-RW75-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout	It would be far better to have either an overpass or an underpass at the site of the Winthorpe roundabout to maintain traffic flow, but I appreciate there are financial constraints.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Winthorpe Roundabout	I believe the Winthorpe roundabout should be a flyover type and without one congestion on event days at the Newark show ground will be bad.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	I don't think the through roundabout at Winthorpe is a safe option. A flyover would be better as the through roundabout won't cope with future traffic levels and will be a new accident 'hot spot' or point of congestion due to the lights.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFB-V	Winthorpe Roundabout	Although very satisfied, I am a little concerned about the 'through about' at the Winthorpe end. Most people have never heard of one of these, let alone used one, so I would foresee a fair bit of confusion there.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The following measures can be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of the Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage between the Applicant, Newark Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>The results of the traffic modelling indicate that there is forecast to be a reduction in traffic on Drove Lane as a result of the Scheme, with daily traffic reducing from around 2,900 vehicles per day in 2028 to around 2,200 vehicles per day in 2028 with the Scheme (-24%). Further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Applicant is not proposing to introduce a reduced speed limit on Drove Lane as there are no changes to the current situation and traffic flows are anticipated to reduce. The request to change the speed limit falls under the remit of Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority in relation to Drove Lane.</p>
ANON-559H-RWTU-W	Winthorpe Roundabout; Congestion; Newark Showground; Road layout; Speed limit; Drove Lane	<p>The Scheme is very good from Farndon to Friendly Farmer roundabouts which are dangerous due mainly to the gradient of the roundabouts and congestion of traffic.</p> <p>The Winthorpe roundabout does not address the problem sufficiently. The volume of traffic on the road during a normal day is bad enough but when there is an event at Newark &amp; Notts Showground it will not alleviate the problem. On show days traffic is backed up on the bypass from the Friendly Farmer roundabout and passed the turning to Winthorpe village going North on A1133.</p> <p>Not only that the roundabout is blocked solid it can take up to an hour to get to our business. The answer would be a fly over also at Winthorpe then the traffic would flow, and disruption would be minimised. We had planned to put a drone up this weekend to show the extent of the problem on show days, but this was not possible.</p> <p>Another issue is the speed of the traffic coming off the A46 down Drove Lane. At present vehicles come off the roundabout, if clear, are exiting at a speed in excess of 50mph. The volume &amp; speed makes it dangerous for vehicles to get out of our entrance. It will make it even worse if the layout is not reconsidered. Moving of the entrance of the Golf Driving Range to within a few metres of our entrance will be disastrous. Also, the existing entrance to the Newark &amp; Notts Showground is already virtually opposite our entrance. This needs to be reconsidered if a flyover is not feasible the road needs to have a speed restriction imposed on it. The majority of people not attending venues down drove lane are using it as a cut through to the estates at the south of Newark.</p>	2B	N	<p>As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> the access to the Newark Showground would be amended with the creation of a new left turn only in from the Friendly Farmer Link Road.</p> <p>The existing access to the bowling club area would be changed to a left out only to remove the risk of traffic using the bowling club entrance queuing back onto Winthorpe Roundabout. This also negated the need for an additional right turn lane for the bowling club entrance. Improving the first Newark Showground entrance is outside the scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>Traffic using Drove Lane as a cut through to the south of Newark-on-Trent is forecast to reduce as the delays encountered at the Friendly Farmer Roundabout would reduce and make this a faster journey than using Drove Lane. Further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it will be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be utilised to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Newark Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane; Congestion; Speed limit	<p>The new through about A1133/A46 will require careful management to prevent excessive queuing. Can you include the measures being considered to reduce queuing particularly on major event days at the showground? Can you confirm the maximum queuing times and lengths? Particularly returning to the A1133 from the Newark direction</p> <p>Drove Lane will become a rat run and will require weight-limiting signage and speed restrictions to prevent traffic chaos.</p>	2H	N	<p>Signing would be used within the Winthorpe Roundabout to guide southbound traffic to the A1 and Newark-on-Trent or to continue on the A46. This can also be altered during Newark Showground events to prioritise movements in and out of it, managed by the event organiser.</p> <p>Actual queue lengths vary on the time of day but at peak times the traffic modelling forecast the queues are acceptable, when assessed for the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) plus 15 years after Scheme opening (2043).</p> <p>Traffic on Drove Lane is forecast to reduce as it would take longer than using the shorter route to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout where the delays have been alleviated by the A46 traffic bypassing the junction. It is not envisaged that weight limits are required as the route is less desirable to HGV's when compared to current situation. Further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7M-R	Newark Showground; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout Drove Lane; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>The left turn into Newark Showground from the new relief road also needs to provide for a left turn out in order to improve traffic flows around the site and ease traffic using the new Winthorpe roundabout.</p> <p>A right turn lane into the Showground on Drove Lane, close to the improved Winthorpe Roundabout, would further enhance the speed of access into the Showground and consequently reduce the potential for queuing traffic to back up to the roundabout causing delays.</p> <p>Provision of pedestrian and dedicated cycle facilities from Newark to the Winthorpe Roundabout would ease access, reduce pollution and enhance safety.</p>	2D	N	<p>The existing access to the bowling club at Newark Showground has been changed to a left out exit only in order to minimise the risk of traffic queuing back onto Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's request for a left turn out from Newark Showground onto Friendly Farmer Link Road, the Applicant has assessed additional options for turning movements onto Friendly Farmer Link Road from Newark Showground. The assessment showed that additional turning movements were not required to deal with traffic and also presented an increased risk of queues on the link road, which could have led to rear end shunt incidents.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment relating to the provision of dedicated pedestrian and dedicated cycle facilities improving safety and reducing pollution. Walking and cycling routes are provided to the Newark Showground entrance from Newark by utilising the existing crossing on the A17 to Godfrey Drive and from Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Further information on the route from Winthorpe village as well as all walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Road layout	The provision of a pair of bus stops near the Newark showground would be very useful.	2D	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Bus stops would not be provided as part of the Scheme however, the Applicant has shared this request with Nottinghamshire County Council, as the relevant authority.
ANON-559H-RW3G-E	Speed limit	I agree with the 50 mph speed limit on the Cattlemarket stretch.	2B	N	<p>A speed limit would be allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. These speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>The Friendly Farmer Link Road between Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout would be 50mph, with the speed limit of Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and the link between them also being reduced from 60mph to 50mph to match.</p> <p>All local roads have been designed to retain the speed limits currently in place on the existing road network with the exception of a short length on the Great North Road south of Cattle Market, which would be reduced from national speed limit to 30mph.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Speed limit	I support the proposed 50mph speed limit on this stretch of the A46.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Speed limit	speed limit to 50 mph on the Winthorpe stretch from the A1 to A1133	2D		
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Speed limit	A 50mph speed limit has been discussed between Farndon and Winthorpe but not confirmed. This speed limit is necessary from a road safety perspective – given the curvature of the road – as well as a mitigating measure for noise pollution for residents.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW9T-1	Speed limit	Given that its is hoped to reduce congestion on the great north road between the Cattlemarket roundabout and the level crossing at Newark Castle station, could signage be improved to reinforce the 30mph limit? Traffic routinely disregards this limit when given the chance to. This is both ways, driving into Newark from the A46 and leaving Newark from the castle/Tolney Lane area. Flashing signs to remind traffic of the limit would help.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Speed limit	12. A1133 SPEED LIMIT	N/A		
		It is not clear what specific measures are proposed in respect of speed limit zones at the junction of the new A1133 layout and the roundabout.			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Our client proposes that a 40mph speed limit is imposed as close to the roundabout junction as possible and ahead of where our client's preferred location for the new access drive meets with the A1133. It is our client's view that a 40mph speed limit boundary should be positioned in the indicative location on the attached plan; subject to any technical highways requirements by law.			The Applicant does not consider it necessary to introduce a 40mph speed limit on the A1133 as part of the Scheme as the Scheme does not introduce any changes to the A1133. The request to change this to 40mph falls under the remit of Nottinghamshire County Council, as local highway authority.
ANON-559H-RWVA-B	Winthorpe village; Road layout	The impact would be lessened by taking the road further away at Winthorpe to the other side of the road behind the petrol station which would then have little impact on the village	2D	N	<p>With regards to the Consultee's comments relating to the impact of the Scheme design on Winthorpe village, the alignment shown within the statutory consultation material had already been moved as far away as possible from Winthorpe village, avoiding the Esso Service Station.</p> <p>This alignment retains the existing dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout, minimising the impact on Winthorpe village. This can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The suggestion by the Consultee to move the route further away from Winthorpe village would impact the existing Brownhills Junction and also impact residents within the Winthorpe estate to the south.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Traffic lights/signals	Put traffic lights on current roundabouts.	2D	N	<p>As set out in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> one of the key objectives of the Scheme is to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. Traffic modelling was completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. This modelling assessed current and future traffic flows and included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043). Traffic signals have only been added to the roundabouts where they are required to cater for predicted traffic flows in 2043.</p> <p>Traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.</p> <p>Traffic signals at Winthorpe Roundabout are required to help manage the flow of traffic at the junction, especially from the new Friendly Farmer Link Road. Traffic modelling shows signals are not required at the Drove Lane and A1133 arms as this traffic enters the roundabout when other traffic entering the roundabout has been stopped by signals.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ2-Z	Road layout	Winthorpe end looks overcomplicated why not use the existing underpass on A1 to access kennels as travellers site has to be closed by high court order and provide walkway/cycle route under new A46 on line of existing??	2B	N	<p>The Winthorpe Roundabout would operate as a standard roundabout. This roundabout would be enlarged and partially signalised, with the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic passing through the centre of the roundabout. Eastbound and westbound slip roads would be provided to allow traffic to merge and diverge between the mainline and the roundabout. The roundabout layout can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment regarding utilising the existing underpass on the A1 to access the boarding kennels. Whilst the access to the boarding kennels could in part be through the existing underpass, it is not tall enough for large vehicles to pass through should they need to. Creation of walking and cycling routes on the line of existing routes were considered but the majority of the consultees responding to the statutory consultation did not like the idea of a long subway.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Land ownership; Winthorpe village; Road layout; Noise and vibration	<p>The Scheme is personally very damaging to our property. The Scheme will negatively impact on the enjoyment of our property, in particular, our garden. This is for a number of reasons:</p> <p>1. National Highways has generated much promotion of the idea that, compared with the original road design, a) they moved the road away from Winthorpe and b) they moved the road away from Winthorpe Road Estate. Both statements cannot be fully accurate. And indeed, this is only partially true.</p> <p>The truth of the matter is that NH moved the road away from Winthorpe only on the east side. In fact, under the new design released in August 2022, the road now comes closer to the south of Winthorpe and our property.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the impact of the Scheme on their property at the south of Winthorpe on Gainsborough Road.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's point 1a and 1b, in the Scheme design shown at statutory consultation, the A46 dual carriageway had been moved away from Winthorpe village so that it utilises the existing carriageway between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout. The introduction of a new roundabout and exit slip road at Brownhills Junction, does bring this part of the Scheme design closer to the south of Winthorpe, compared to the Scheme design shown at preferred route announcement.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		Yet whereas the east of Winthorpe has been designated mitigation (e.g. bunds) over and above low noise tarmac (which fails quicker and cannot in any way be deemed a good enough response to noise pollution on its own), NO mitigation has been offered for properties in the south of Winthorpe, despite these same properties being the ones already disproportionately impacted by road noise (the A1).			<p>In order to mitigate the effects to the south of Winthorpe village, permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout, including a combination of permanent noise barriers and landscape bunds. With the mitigation in place there are no significant noise effects predicted at the south of Winthorpe.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station and also from the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent. Details of the barriers and bunds can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Low noise surfacing would be provided along the widened A46 and slip roads to mitigate noise. The lifespan of low noise surfacing is typically between 8-12 years depending upon many factors. The noise assessment undertaken demonstrates that road traffic noise is reduced for most properties within Winthorpe and does not increase noise at any receptor in Winthorpe by more than 1dB in the 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opens to traffic).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Speed limit; Road layout; Landscape and visual effects	<p>Lower speed limit on the new A46 section of 50mph.</p> <p>Lowering the height of the roads and remove the roundabout.</p> <p>Only planting very mature trees to compensate and mitigate the additional light, noise and emissions.</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant can confirm that a 50mph speed limit would be applied between Cattle Market and Winthorpe. The proposed speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>.</p> <p>Lowering the road to remove roundabouts is not required as the roundabouts have sufficient capacity when modelled for growth in 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>At detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be further defined.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and continues the approach of reducing noise as close to the source as is feasible.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>These noise mitigation methods are more feasible, simple to install, and more effective than mature trees and would also mitigate light pollution from vehicle headlights. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on air quality. No significant air quality related effects are predicted during the operation of the Scheme, so no mitigation measures are required.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Road drainage and the water environment; Construction; Consultation – general	<p>This is a significant engineering project in and of itself, yet there is scant detail about it for this statutory consultation.</p> <p>What is the specific cost of the construction of the floodplain?</p> <p>Has this been costed into the cost-benefit analysis of the Scheme?</p>	2G	N	<p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that particular stage.</p> <p>A further targeted consultation also took place from 17 March until 16 April 2023 and provided an opportunity for prescribed consultees, landowners and community stakeholders who could be impacted by or interested in six updates to the Scheme, to provide their feedback.</p> <p>For further information relating to the statutory and targeted consultation, please see Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme as submitted, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>The estimated cost of the Scheme is included within the Funding Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/4.2</b>). This includes the costs associated with the floodplain compensation works and working within the floodplain.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDH-Z	Land ownership; Assets; Population and human health	<p>I confirm that we are instructed by Shell U.K. Limited in relation to the Newark Service Station ("the Service Station") located at the intersection of the A46, A1 and A17 strategic roads.</p> <p>My client is a leading operator of roadside facilities that are designed to address the needs of the travelling road user. It is extremely concerned that the emerging road proposals for the A46 Newark Bypass would, if implemented as currently proposed, will have a serious and adverse effect on the ability of the Service Station to meet the needs of road users on this part of the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>I should be grateful therefore if you would accept this representation as an objection to the Scheme as presently proposed. The Service Station is designed to meet the needs of all categories of road user, having dedicated motorists' and HGV fuel forecourts served by a sales building. It is accessible to all approaching traffic using the adjoining intersection by an access on the A17 and an access with the A46. Traffic flows within the site are carefully managed through design to accommodate all categories of road user. The Service Station is a large modern facility and makes a significant contribution towards meeting the needs of passing road users on this section of the Strategic Road Network. The importance that roadside facilities fulfil in meeting the needs of the road user is recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework and specifically in Department for Transport Circular 02/2013.</p> <p>Roadside facilities play an essential role in supporting road safety by encouraging road users to park and rest, take refreshment and visit the toilet, as well as providing opportunities for refuelling. The policy recognises the contribution to road safety that is made by taking regular stops when travelling longer distances. The importance of these principles is longstanding, having been established in government policies over many years and this safety focus is likely to be reconfirmed in a new addition of the Circular, following a consultation that has taken place during the Summer of 2022.</p> <p>Having undertaken a review of the likely effect of the proposals on the Service Station, it is evident that they would, if implemented as currently proposed, seriously reduce the likelihood of road users stopping to use the facilities, and potentially directly interfere with their operation.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee and met with representatives of Shell UK Ltd following the statutory consultation to discuss the issues raised.</p> <p>The Scheme details were discussed, and it was explained that the access would be through the existing A17 entrance and the exit from the current access/egress route on the A46 which now forms the link road between the Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>The service area within the forecourt would continue to operate with one way moving traffic through the site and there is therefore no impact for motorists using the site. Plans for the proposed layout have been shared with Shell UK Ltd for them to consider the operational impacts further. This can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant notes the Consultee's point about ensuring that there are a sufficient number of services within the vicinity of the Scheme. It is the Applicant's view that the Scheme does not impact the number of service stations along this route to the extent that it would impact driver safety.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee to ensure that any policies relating to the temporary or permanent use of land, including the possible provision of any additional signage if required, are clear and understood and an open line of communication is available for queries or concerns to be dealt with.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>To be effective roadside facilities must be located conveniently so as to be readily accessible to passing motorists. The Service Station is currently prominent and highly accessible to passing road users. It comprises what is referred to in policy terms as a directly accessed 'online' site. The policy contained in Circular 02/2013 confirms a preference for such online facilities because they are more readily accessible than offline sites where a significant detour from the main road is often required to reach them. The Service Station is a successful operation, to a large degree because of its ability to conveniently serve the passing road user. The proposals would take away the main south-west bound traffic flow of the A46 which currently passes immediately outside the Service Area onto a new alignment, effectively converting the Service Station to a remote offline facility, remote from passing traffic. It would only be accessible to A46 traffic by means of a significant detour. Consequently, A46 road users will be much less likely to take a break in their journey and use the facilities for rest refreshment and facilities than is presently the case. Instead, they will pass the facilities and drive on. Roadside facilities on the A46, in particular are limited and a substantial gap in facilities will be created by the effective loss of this site. Additional detailed evidence can be provided on this issue when required but it is my view that the proposals as currently formulated will cause a significant reduction in the provision of effective roadside facilities with adverse consequences for the safety objectives contained in circular 2/2013.</p> <p>Furthermore, on the basis of the plans provided so far, it is likely that the changes in the configuration of the layout of the highway in the immediate vicinity of the Service Station will directly affect its access arrangements and thereby interfere with the internal circulation arrangements. Against this background, my client's position is fully reserved whilst it seeks urgent detailed discussions in relation to the Scheme, including issues relating to signage and access.</p>			
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Brownhills Junction	Furthermore, the addition of Brownhills Junction actually makes it more cumbersome for freight leaving the A46 northbound as they will have another roundabout to navigate.	2B	N	The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is necessary in order to retain access to the properties on Winthorpe Road. The geometric requirements of the roundabout have been designed to cater for the use of HGVs in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i> .
ANON-559H-RW9R-Y	Drove Lane; Speed limit	The impact of the new roundabout near the Showground and the Friendly Farmer roundabout means that Drove Lane, Coddington, already used as a rat run, is very likely to have increased traffic as more drivers realise that it is a shortcut between the A17 and the A46. If Drove Lane does not come under the new Scheme, I would like my comments to be forwarded to whoever it may concern. The speed limit on Drove Lane is currently 60 mph and local traffic (pedestrians, cyclists, farm traffic) do not mix well with general road users travelling at speed. Consideration should be given to making the access to it less accessible, coupled with a reduced speed limit.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling has been carried out to support the development of the Scheme. The results of this traffic modelling indicate that there is forecast to be a reduction in traffic on Drove Lane to the A46 east as a result of the Scheme. Further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant is not proposing to introduce a reduced speed limit on Drove Lane as part of the Scheme as there are no changes to the current layout and traffic flows are anticipated to reduce due to the queues at the Friendly Farmer Roundabout being removed. The request to change the speed falls under the remit of Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority. Making Drove Lane less accessible is not required and also not feasible as this is the main access to the Newark Showground and a number of businesses and properties along the route.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Route corridor	Will National Highways revisit the route corridor selection? If not, why not? The decision-making for route corridors seems to have been made years ago. What reflections have been made about the limitations of Corridor C as a corridor choice?	2B	N	<p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides justification for the corridor and route that was chosen. Corridor C was taken forward as it was the most direct route, so scored better than corridors A, B, D and E for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups and environment.</p> <p>The remaining corridors were discounted as Corridors A and D scored poorly against the Scheme's objectives for environment and <i>Early Assessment and Sifting Tool</i> appraisal outcomes. Corridors B and E were eliminated because of their non-compliance with environmental policy.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Route corridor	I support the research and questions raised by the work of the Newark Bypass Environment Group.	2B	N	<p>As set out in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. This included consultation on the proposed options, which was held between December 2020 and February 2021. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022, following consideration of comments received during the options consultation. Information relating to the options consultation and preferred route announcement can be found in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) gives an overview of the analysis undertaken by the Applicant on the option selection process, including comments and views expressed during the options consultation, to recommend a preferred option for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Route corridor	I believe that there is a fundamental flaw in the process as I am of the strong belief that the route corridor choice is wrong. Constructing bad on bad does not result in satisfactory conclusion.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Route corridor	I suggest that a step back is taken and review the decision regarding the choice of route corridor.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Route corridor	I agree with the issues raised by the Newark Bypass Environment Group.			
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Route corridor	I agree with the comments and questions raised by the Newark Bypass Environment Group but reinforce my comment the route choice is fundamentally flawed.			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In the period between the preferred route announcement and the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with a range of stakeholders with regards to the design of the Scheme, further details can be found within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b>, and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Road layout	The new design creates a bottle neck which should any part of the new proposed Brownhills junction become blocked, including if there is an accident which results in a blockage of the existing Brownhills roundabout means that it would be impossible to leave the premises and emergency services, staff and customers would be unable to access it. Currently there is the option to turn either left or right at the end of Winthorpe Road should one direction be blocked.	2B	Y	The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regards to access to the Consultee's property. The Applicant has engaged further with the Consultee on this matter and would carry out drainage works to enable the Consultee to use the existing access beneath the A1 as a secondary access to their property in the event that they are unable to access from Brownhills Junction for any reason.
BHLF-559H-RWXC-F	Road layout; Dual carriageway	My only concern, as a resident of [redacted] at the end of Kelham Road, derives from the detailed plan we saw and discussed with National Highways staff in Kelham Road a few weeks ago. We were informed that thought was being given to dualling part of the road from the Cattle Market Roundabout towards the castle. We already have trouble exiting Kelham Road when going into town. You know how helpful other motorists are letting you out of a side road!	2B	N	The Scheme would widen the existing Great North Road to two lanes for the southbound traffic from Cattle Market Roundabout to the Kelham Road junction. This has been developed in line with the results of traffic modelling and discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority. Traffic modelling forecasts that this widening prevents traffic queues caused by Newark Castle level crossing from backing up onto the Cattle Market Roundabout.
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	Concern about exit from New Aerospace college onto the dual aspect of Great North Road. Traffic lights suggested to protect young drivers exiting the site in the future.	2H	N	Traffic modelling also shows that the changes made to the design of Great North Road between Cattle Market Roundabout and Newark Castle level crossing are not anticipated to change the current situation for exiting Kelham Road to head towards Newark-on-Trent. Further information regarding traffic modelling undertaken on the Scheme can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Road layout; Traffic lights/signals; Speed limit	Same concern with Kelham Road exit and speed limit. Proposed increased traffic volumes may make a mini roundabout ineffective due to right of way to commuters leaving Newark in the morning. Light sensitive traffic lights would be a better option.	2H	N	The access to the new aerospace college is not impacted by the Scheme as this would use the existing entrance to the Newark and Sherwood District Council offices, which is not altered by the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Road layout; Land ownership; Cultural heritage	<p>5. PRINCIPAL ACCESS DRIVE TO [redacted] AND ADJOINING LAND/PROPERTY</p> <p>As shown on the general arrangement plan (sheet 6 of 8), a new access drive has been proposed from a new access point on the A1133 to the north west of our client's land. Without prejudice to our client's general objection, our client agrees with the Scheme proposals to provide a new access but objects to the proposed location.</p> <p>The route as proposed:</p> <p>a. Does not provide for a specific entrance drive to the [redacted] and is not commensurate with the heritage status of the Grade II* listed [redacted] and its curtilage;</p> <p>b. Would mean the loss of established, dense woodland;</p> <p>c. Impacts on the use of the existing residential amenity area of the [redacted] and properties;</p> <p>d. Does not incorporate a turning circle at [redacted] to accommodate large vehicles (e.g. refuse collection and heating oil deliveries);</p> <p>In response, and without prejudice to their general objection, our clients propose the following to a specification to be agreed by our clients and NH:</p> <p>(i) that the new drive and entrance should instead be located to the east of the [redacted] as shown on the plan attached and should be constructed to a standard and design which compliments the setting of the [redacted] ;</p> <p>(ii) the new drive should be designed to incorporate landscaping, fencing, gating and avenue tree planting which is consistent with the existing access drive;</p> <p>(iii) estate fencing to all new boundaries;</p>	N/A	Y	Ongoing engagement and consultation has been carried out with the Consultee regarding the points raised, resulting in changes being made to the Scheme design in relation to the access drive and the adjoining land/property. The Applicant has agreed the details of a new access drive, including location, layout and landscaping with the Consultee and altered the Order Limits to account for it. Further details can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		(iv) ducting for utilities and service media along the new drive; (v) full land remediation to include topsoil and re-seeding following construction of the new drive			
ANON-559H-RW99-6	Population and human health	<p>As the CEO of a large local business with a turnover of c.£90m, employing over 190 employees mostly living in the Newark area, I must point out that the proposed Scheme which incidentally I wholly support, will likely have an adverse effect on our business as there is no doubt that we benefit from the congestion of slow-moving traffic passing right past our site advertising that we are the UK's largest motorhome dealership. We know that many customers have become aware of our site whilst slowly passing by us and that when they have reached a stage in life that they are ready to buy a motorhome, they have known where to come.</p> <p>When the flyover is built, the amount of passing traffic will significantly reduce and what traffic that continues to pass us will undoubtedly do so at faster speeds that is currently the case.</p> <p>Despite being a single site, we are a nationally recognised company in the motorhome world with customers from throughout the UK travelling a long way to visit us.</p> <p>Therefore, we would make one request of the Scheme please – that included within the new signs you put up, you include directions on the approaches from Winthorpe or Farndon to 'Brownhills Roundabout' which is the recognised name for it in your literature as we appreciate that a sign for 'Brownhills Motorhomes' would probably be a step too far though we would certainly take it if on offer.</p> <p>Brownhills Motorhomes Ltd is an EOT (Employee Owned Trust) meaning that it is owned by a trust on behalf of its 190+ mainly local living employees which puts a lot of money into the local economy so I hope you can agree to our request for the Newark Bypass signage to mention 'Brownhills Roundabout' to signpost customers our way.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regards to the potential impact on their business as a result of the Scheme, including the forecast reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout. The traffic modelling predicts that traffic using Brownhills Roundabout would reduce and delays are expected to reduce as a result of the Scheme. Further information regarding traffic forecasts can be found in Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's request to include reference to 'Brownhills Roundabout' on A46 signage, the Brownhills Roundabout would be named on signs on the roundabout junction but not on the A46 dual carriageway signage, due to the standards outlined in the <i>Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016</i> and <i>Traffic Signs Manual</i>.</p> <p>New applications for signage to retail destinations can be submitted using the process outlined in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TD 53/05 – Traffic signs to retail destinations and exhibition centres in England and Wales – trunk roads</i> which is available on the gov.uk website under the 'Apply for brown tourist signs on roads Highways England manage' guidance page. This website provides further information about the application process including traffic signs to retail destinations and exhibitions centres in England and Wales.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	There is no footpath shown allowing people access from Winthorpe to the Newark Show Ground. It is unsafe to go to an event other than by car. The government are encouraging everyone to walk or cycle, so can we have a route (a safe one).  The proposed footpath route from Newark to Winthorpe requires adequate security lighting. All crossing points need barriers to prevent children and pets from stepping out directly into oncoming traffic.	2D	N	Winthorpe Footpath FP2 historically linked Winthorpe to Newark Showground but was previously severed by the existing A46 when it was constructed, as can be seen on existing Public Rights of Way maps held by Nottinghamshire County Council.  A new walking and cycling crossing would be provided beneath the new A46 alongside the A1 and back onto the A46 between Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout, where a new signalised crossing is provided. This then links to the footbridge across the A1 southbound exit slip road and to the existing crossing of the A17 to Godfrey Drive, where a new link would be provided up to the first Newark Showground entrance.
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Create a safe footpath access to exit the village and allow foot travel to the showground and Godfrey Drive	2D		
ANON-559H-RWTA-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	A foot bridge over the existing road and the new road to link Winthorpe with the showground and industrial developments at the master care area which eliminate the use of a car to feel safe.	2D		The walking and cycling route along Winthorpe Road would be diverted beneath the new Brownhills Underbridge with a signalised crossing across the new Brownhills Junction exit slip road.  From the routes shown at statutory consultation, a new route from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout has been added where it then crosses to the east to join Drove Lane and the first Newark Showground entrance. This also provides a circular route to the route that passes beneath the A46 alongside the A1.  Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) will be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. Further information about the safety of the Scheme design is included within the Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b> . Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	13. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY LINKAGE  The general arrangement plan (sheet 6 of 8) shows a proposed new route coloured orange to the northwest of the roundabout.  Our client suggests that there should also be a link to connect to Thoroughfare Lane as shown along the indicative route coloured pink on the attached plan.	N/A	N	Hargon Lane would provide a walking and cycling connection from Winthorpe village to a new combined access track and walking and cycling route heading towards Friendly Farmer Roundabout. There would also be a walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout. Due to existing property and land boundary constraints, it is not possible to create a link to connect to Thoroughfare Lane.
ANON-559H-RW9R-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Relating to the footpath provisions, the footpath that goes from Winthorpe village at the Lord Nelson pub to the Service Station and beyond needs to be diverted to the edge of the field along the dyke (west side) so that it comes closer to the proposed footpath crossing the new A46. This would be more direct and would not hinder agricultural practices in the grass field. Further to this, as I understand that walkers would like a circular route, they could make use of the track that runs from Gainsborough Road near to the A1 underpass to the A46.	2B	N	Winthorpe Footpath FP2, which provides a connection from the vicinity of Lord Nelson pub to the A46, was historically a direct route from Winthorpe to the Newark Showground. This was severed by the existing A46 when constructed, however under the Scheme, Winthorpe Footpath FP2 would be connected by a combined access track/footway/cycleway which would form part of a new circular walking and cycling route, connecting Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout.  With regards to the Consultee's comment relating to the impact of the existing footpath on agricultural practices, and the request to divert this footpath, the Scheme is not altering the route of the existing footpath. If this path was realigned it would result in extra cost, construction requirements and an increase in the carbon footprint of the Scheme. There could also be objections from homeowners as it would then pass along the end of their gardens. Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWBG-W	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I am also concerned that not enough has been done for walkers and cyclists. For instance the Trent Valley Way, in theory a major footpath, seems to be being ignored in these plans.	2B	N	As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided. The improvements for walkers and cyclist include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Engagement with the A46 Active Travel Partnership has influenced the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes developed as part of the Scheme, including a signalised walking and cycling route across Winthorpe Roundabout between the A1133 and Drove Lane. Engagement has also resulted in a change being made to a walking and cycling route at Brownhills Junction and has influenced the Applicant to look into options for the improvement of active travel routes during the ongoing development of the Scheme. A summary of engagement with this group can be found within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Trent Valley Way crosses the Scheme at two locations, Cattle Market Junction and the existing Winthorpe Road. At Cattle Market Junction, new signalised crossings and a combined access track/footway/cycleway would be provided in the vicinity of the junction. At Winthorpe Road, a new shared-use route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection to Newark-on-Trent. Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE5-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Provision in the plans for pedestrian and cycle access to Kelham Village or the Newark showground are inadequate.	2H	N	<p>Following statutory consultation, the walking and cycling provisions have been enhanced. A new walking and cycling route would be provided from Drove Lane towards Winthorpe Roundabout, whereby it would link to the northern side of the A46 using the new signalised facilities at Winthorpe Roundabout. This would then connect into a walking and cycling route which would connect Hargon Lane and Winthorpe Footpath FP2, and then travel under the A1/A46 Crossing adjacent the A1.</p> <p>This shared use path would then connect into Friendly Farmer Roundabout and onwards using the existing infrastructure on the A17. This would form a 'circular' route adjacent to the Newark Showground which would provide pedestrian and cycle travel in all directions.</p> <p>Currently, Kelham is served by an existing walking route on Kelham Road, and Farndon Footpath FP5, which also serves as the Trent Valley Way. Both of these routes connect Kelham to Cattle Market Junction. Substantial widening to Kelham Road and associated land take would be required to improve these facilities in order to provide a shared use route for pedestrians and cyclists, which would connect Kelham to Cattle Market Junction and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent. This is not being undertaken as the route is not impacted by the Scheme and it would have a large cost and environmental impact.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The proposed pedestrian crossing over the new A46 to replace the current walkway from Winthorpe Estate to Winthorpe is not fit for purpose. The route will be longer and require pedestrians and other NMU users to cross a main road in order to access Winthorpe. Given this is one of the main access routes for the primary school there are many very young pedestrians who walk and cycle this route twice a day. We do not believe this is fit for purpose and will make access to the primary school VERY dangerous. The potential consequential impact of this for Winthorpe Primary school could be very damaging. The school currently relies on pupils from Winthorpe Estate due to the ageing population in Winthorpe Village.	2B	N	<p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A new signalised crossing would be provided across the exit slip road at the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safer crossing of the carriageway, details of this can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>. This new walking and cycling provision which is 105m longer would connect into the existing cycle path beneath the existing A46 and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assessed the impacts of the Scheme on local population, services, and human health. Winthorpe Primary School was identified as a receptor and included in the assessment. The assessment found that there would not be a significant impact on access to the school as access via the A1133 would be maintained throughout construction.
ANON-559H-RWN6-R	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I support all the proposals that the Think Again group have put forward and feel they have thankfully had an effect on your latest updated plans. I do not though want to see a full footpath put in around the village linking it through Thoroughfare Lane. I foresee that as another escape route for criminals performing burglaries and having a second quick getaway out of the village to the A46. The proposed track needs to have locked gates for the farmers only. Its bad enough that the footpath past the Lord Nelson pub and up to the Petrol station is used by noisy motorbikes all the time.	2I	N	The Applicant notes the comments in relation to the engagement undertaken with the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. Further information relating to engagement with this group can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> .  Winthorpe Footpath FP2, which provides a connection from the vicinity of Lord Nelson pub to the A46, was historically a direct route from Winthorpe to the Newark Showground. Due to severance by the existing A46, Winthorpe Footpath FP2 would now be connected by a walking and cycling route adjacent to the A46 which would connect Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. During the detailed design, anti-motorbike barriers may be considered as a design addition to Winthorpe Footpath FP2, to deter motorcycles from using this route. Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Restrictions on access to the non-vehicular path	2D	N	The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the combined access track/footway/cycleway between Winthorpe village and the A46, included as part of the Scheme design during statutory consultation.  Following the statutory consultation, the combined access track/footway/cycleway from the A1133 to Hargon Lane has been removed. A walking and cycling route would be provided between Hargon Lane and the A1133. This is linked to a route around the Winthorpe Roundabout to Drove Lane and the first main entrance to Newark Showground. Where walking and cycling routes join the existing A46, the end of Hargon Lane and the A1133, measures would be installed to prevent motorised user access to the walking and cycling routes.
ANON-559H-RW9K-R	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I have submitted previous comments for consideration in the consultation however I am becoming increasingly concerned about plans for the non-motorised track way from the A1133 to the fields close to the A1 running parallel with the northbound carriage way of the A46.  I question: is a non motorised track necessary from the A1133? what measures will be put in place to stop its use by motorcycles and anti-social behaviour on the track from pedestrians?  I understand opening the full length of Hargon Lane for farm vehicles to access the track is an option again why? access is available from halfway down Hargon Lane already for farm vehicles. More farm traffic equals more mud on the road and other smelly substances. There is no clean-up. Pedestrian access will create a new walkway however as there is no other circular walk Hargon Lane will become like Skegness seafront with associated litter and dog mess.  I think the idea will not work and create more problems.  Is there alternative access to the farm field close to the A1 from the garage service road say or from access using low wood lane?	2H	Y	The farm access track has been removed between the A1133 and Hargon following consultation with landowners and users. The walking and cycling route has been retained and anti-vehicle access barriers would be provided to deter misuse. Farm traffic using Hargon Lane would access the fields as is currently done. Alternative routes were considered but Hargon Lane provides access from the centre of Winthorpe village and connections to the Newark Showground and routes south of the A1/A46 interface.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Population and human health; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Population and human health –  A more joined up approach is required when considering population and human health. This section needs to foreground the two key health concerns in relation to roads – noise and air pollution – instead of emphasising environmental enhancements such as footpaths.  What you are basically suggesting is the creation of recreational paths that will be in close proximity to road infrastructure which will cause harm to health. It is therefore nonsensical to suggest that walking routes in the vicinity of roads can in some way compensate for the polluting effect of increased traffic and carbon emissions, especially when it is in the very vicinity of these polluting roads that the recreational facilities are being created.	2C	N	One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity, which includes improving facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes within the Order Limits that are used by walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users. The improvements of these routes and facilities is separate to the environmental assessment process on noise and air pollution.  Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which considers the implication of air quality and noise on receptors. No significant adverse effects on human health have been identified as a result of air and noise pollution. Appropriate mitigation for

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>The safety of walkers and cyclists is of concern. I am a user of the PRow between Winthorpe and Winthorpe Road Estate. I have used this route very late at night when cycling home from the London train coming into Newark Northgate Station. The existing route is to be made longer and will also include sections where roads need to be crossed, and where cyclists and pedestrians will need to stop at traffic signalling. As a cyclist using this route at a vulnerable time (late evening, up to midnight), and as a woman, who will have to stop my bicycle to cross the road, how safe will this be, especially if people are loitering in the area, as they do now under the A46 bypass?</p> <p>How safe is it for pedestrians and cyclists to cross a busy slip road, which will take a considerable amount of traffic?</p>			<p>any adverse noise and air quality effects have been incorporated into the Scheme and are set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments and demonstrates compliance with environmental legislation. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>17. What mapping have you done regarding the rerouted pedestrian/cycle way between Winthorpe and Winthorpe Road Estate on the basis of safety for pedestrians? Does this analysis include whether risk is exacerbated (due to the lengthening of the route and the need to stop at signals) for vulnerable populations such as lone women using the route late at night?</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> confirms that there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme. Human health receptors have been chosen at sensitive locations within 200m of the air quality affected road network and include residential properties, schools and hospitals (where present), in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The air quality objectives are not typically assessed at walking and cycling routes as the short-term (1-hour) air quality objectives are unlikely to be exceeded and members of the public are not reasonably expected to spend one hour or longer at any single location along a walking and cycling route. Changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant at any of the human health receptors so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route path would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safer crossing of the carriageway when compared to an uncontrolled crossing. Lighting would be provided along the route between Winthorpe Road Estate and Winthorpe. The design of this walking and cycling route has been amended to allow for better lines of sight and space for walkers and cyclists following feedback received during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Vulnerable users have been considered during the Preliminary Design Stage. Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Appendix 4.3 (Record of Environmental Engagement) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> summarise the Applicant's stakeholder engagement with statutory environmental bodies.</p> <p>Further details of the Schemes walking and cycling routes are presented in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWTA-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Congestion	<p>There needs to be better pedestrian access to the showground via a bridge.</p> <p>To put traffic lights for pedestrians at the master care roundabout would cause the roundabout to become blocked therefore causing queuing on the A1.</p>	2H	N	<p>Detailed traffic modelling has been conducted for the A46, and junctions along the A46, including Winthorpe Roundabout. Since statutory consultation, a walking and cycling route would now be provided around the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout to connect the Newark Showground with the A1133 and Hargon Lane within Winthorpe village. Due to the reduced traffic between Brownhills Roundabout and the Friendly Farmer Roundabout the signalised crossing at this location does not cause queues back onto the A1. Further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>A new combined access track/footway/cycleway would be provided as part of the Scheme and would connect Winthorpe to Newark Showground, connecting into the existing Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and Hargon Lane. The new shared use route would then connect to Winthorpe Roundabout and provide a safer route to the Newark Showground on the southern side of the A46 via a new at-grade signalised crossing.</p> <p>Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXC-F	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>I am also a cyclist and 2 to 3 times a week need to cross this road to get onto the path that leads to the pedestrian crossing on the A46, to proceed up past the Sugar Beet Factory on the designated path.</p> <p>I do believe that if this dualling was adopted, it would become very difficult for us to exit Kelham Road.</p>	2B	N	<p>At Cattle Market, the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road. The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWGA-V	Overall scheme	Whilst there is currently a small amount of congestion on this bypass, a radical solution should be sought to invest in enhanced public transport options, rather than just building bigger roads.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides information on an Alternative Modes Assessment that was carried out on the Scheme, which suggested that the existing public transport network does not generally offer comparable alternatives to cars for most movements. Small traffic flows were distributed over a large area and therefore are not suited to be catered for by public transport.</p> <p>Therefore, a review of the largest public transport flows (represented by local bus services) suggested that there was no obvious non-highways intervention that could cater to any substantial proportion of these flows.</p> <p>Possible solutions for the Scheme were identified by the Applicant through collating evidence relating to network performance issues and engaging with local stakeholders.</p> <p>The Applicant's statutory remit is to manage and maintain the strategic road network, and the delivery of the Scheme seeks to enable traffic to stay on strategic routes, therefore reducing delays and congestion. The problems along the A46 need road improvement solutions consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, as pursued via the Government's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> for upgrading the A46 to a high-quality dual carriageway between Lincoln and Gloucestershire. Much of this road is already high-quality dual carriageway, and by filling in key sections, a coast-to-coast highway can be created without need for major new road building across open countryside. The single greatest gap in this route is the A46 at Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The Scheme is identified as a capital enhancement in the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i>. The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>) sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Alternative transport measures (including rail improvements) would make little headway in addressing the problems on the A46; instead, the proposed road improvement is needed to address the problems and deliver the objectives set for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBG-W	Overall scheme	How about not doing it and spending the money on improving public transport? At a time of national austerity the money could be better spent on funding much needed social care improvements.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWGA-V	Overall scheme	A more progressive view of transport planning and identifying a solution that would minimise road traffic rather than increase it further. There seems to be no evidence of evaluating alternative rail solutions for the Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor, which would be more aligned to environmental planning considerations.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Overall scheme	Emphasis appears to be to improve route for lorries. Spend money to improve transportation of goods by train and reduce carbon emissions.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Overall scheme	The cost, disruption, effect on local environment is totally disproportionate to the amount of time that will be saved by motorist. At some point the Government and agencies need to divert their funding to finding solutions to the real problems that the world is facing around climate change/ loss of habitat/ declining stock of fuel etc.  Thinking 'short term' when should be thinking 'long term'.	2H	N	<p>The Scheme is identified as a capital enhancement in the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i>. The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>) sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE5	Overall scheme	As an ex Londoner I know about traffic jams. I am bemused and disturbed by the idea that there are plans to spend £450 000 000 upgrading the A46. I have lived in the area for over 12 months now and have only occasionally been delayed by traffic on this road, and even then these delays were very short. It seems the height of madness to spend this considerable amount of money when delays are so infrequent and so short lived, particularly at a time when Government spending is so tight and there are so many other areas where the problems are acute, 24/7 and 365. I am thinking specifically of social care and other support services. In addition, I suspect that as fuel prices and energy prices rise traffic in the area will fall, making the project an even greater waste of money	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Overall scheme	Maintenance to existing trees and roadside - currently non-existent	2D	N	The Applicant notes these comments relating to the existing road network.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Overall scheme	National Highways needs to pay attention to areas of planting that are compromised and badly managed on their existing road network. The bottom of Gainsborough Road – and the edge of a conservation area in Winthorpe that borders the A1 – is a case in point. National Highways has failed in its duty to care for this location adequately, and is now proposing to build more road behind the A1.  This does not bode well when National Highways has allowed third party agencies to compromise the tree line so that more of the road is visible on the Winthorpe side. This includes the savage cutting of the tree line as well as the removal of trees – all without consultation. This area is ripe for investigation regarding an intensification of planting to	2E/2F	N	Under Requirement 6 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ), the Applicant is required to prepare a landscaping scheme which must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		create some semblance of a buffer between the conservation area and the road infrastructure that will soon also include a much closer A46.			<p>The Scheme must be landscaped in accordance with the landscape scheme. Furthermore, Requirement 6 ensures that any plant tree or shrub planted as part of the landscaping scheme that, within a period of five years after planting, is removed, dies or becomes damaged or diseased must be replaced.</p> <p>The Applicant carries out regular inspections and maintenance activities on the existing network but is keen to hear comments around any maintenance issues. This could be anything from a broken sign or barrier, to litter, overgrown vegetation, or potholes. The Applicant encourages any comments relating to the maintenance of the existing road network to be reported directly to its Customer Contact Centre via telephone on 0300 123 5000 or by using the online 'Report a maintenance issue' tool on the Applicant's webpage. This webpage provides regular updates on the status of the report.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWTV-X	Overall scheme	please build it as soon and quickly as possible!!	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The Scheme is required to submit a development consent application to the Secretary of State before works can commence. The application would be independently examined by a single or panel of Inspectors who would make their recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether development consent should be granted. This process takes approximately 18 months from submission of the application.
BHLF-559H-RWD8-G	Overall scheme	We feel in general the proposed scheme will solve the majority of the traffic flow problems.	2B	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
BHLF-559H-RW9T-1	Overall scheme	Are there any plans to rename the Cattlemarket roundabout now that Cattlemarket does not exist?	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comment with regards to the Cattle Market at Newark-on-Trent no longer existing. There are however no immediate plans to change the name of the Cattle Market Roundabout as part of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWN1-K	Overall scheme	<p>Frankly I think its 'dogs dinner' ! My thoughts accord with those of the Newark By-pass Environment Group of which I am a member.</p> <p>The theme seems to have been designed as an ideal 'paper exercise' with little link to the realities on the ground – fundamental parts of the scheme, and damage prevention and mitigation have not even been addressed at any level yet – so it is not possible to properly to 'respond' in a consultation</p> <p>This scheme does not accord with the principles of Sustainable Planning and Spacial Planning – neither is there any indication that it even pays lip-service to things like The Environment Act 2021.</p> <p>RIS2 was claimed to 'have people at its centre' - this scheme certainly has people at the centre - the people of Newark-on-Trent and its wanting to run rings around them using freight lorries and concrete . I don't think this is entirely the fault of the current Design Team - they have taken on a scheme part way along; I believe that fundamental flaws became set into the scheme at early stage in 2018, this was never reviewed and tested when the scheme was opened up for action in 2020 - so the stage was set. This was a mistake - but someone has to be brave enough to call for a deep review and evaluation.</p> <p>[The remainder of this response is the same as the Newark Bypass Environment Group (NBEG) response for the same question number. Please see response ANON-559H-RWVY-3]</p>	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development. An Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>The Scheme does accord with the principles of sustainable planning and spatial planning and consideration has also been given to the Environment Act 2021 within the Legislation and Policy section for each of the environmental topics (Chapters 5 to 15) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) where relevant.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, for example, habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Where necessary, monitoring requirements have also been specified. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The development of the <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> was based on research to identify road users' priorities and the Applicant has developed the Scheme to align with these priorities. More detail on the preparation of the <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> is detailed within the Department for Transport's <i>Preparing the Second Roads Investment Strategy</i> policy paper.</p> <p>The current design team working on the Scheme were not involved in the previous Options Identification Stage. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for the corridor and route that was chosen. Initially five corridors were assessed against the Scheme objectives, the National Policy Statement for National Networks, and Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Sifting Tool</i>. This approach aligns with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Appraisal Guidance</i> when sifting options at an early design stage. Projects or studies that require government approval are expected to make use of <i>Transport Appraisal Guidance</i> in a manner appropriate for that project or study.</p> <p>Following this sifting, the remaining route and junction options which were identified in the sifting process above were combined into Scheme options for further assessment. All four options were evaluated against the engineering, traffic and economic, environmental, social and safety, operation, technology and maintenance assessments. The four options were reduced to two options and were taken forward to an options consultation in 2020. Information relating to the options consultation is detailed in Chapter 2 (Options consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWTA-9	Stakeholder engagement	Local knowledge and experience has been ignored!	2C	N	<p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008. Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation.</p> <p>All comments received as part of the statutory consultation have been considered by the Applicant and where appropriate, changes have been made during the development of the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>). Information regarding changes made to the Scheme as a result of the statutory consultation are detailed within Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Scheme to understand the effects of the Scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions would be agreed on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.</p> <p>Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Applicant to consult with the local community. 8,979 <i>Consultation Brochures</i> providing information about the Scheme were distributed to the local community on 21 October 2022. This included local residents, businesses and special interest groups. As well as the consultation events held during the statutory consultation, several resident events were held before statutory consultation for communities near to the Scheme where information was available in relation to the latest design development and upcoming statutory consultation. Information relating to resident events can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) and Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNB-4	Consultation - general	Done very poorly with lack of communication to the houses that are mostly affected by the road	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Consultation - general	question whether comments received will even be considered. Got to consult so do, but decision already made. Consultation a tick box exercise. Lets see...	2I		
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Consultation - general	Would be nice to have some guarantees to our views and opinions will be listened to and acted upon	2I		
ANON-559H-RWVZ-4	Consultation - general	<p>The consultation process is fronted by the designer/contractor that appears to have been appointed recently and don't appear to be interested in concerns about the historic route choice.</p> <p>They are blinded by the need to shave a few minutes of the A46 drivers route without considering the massive impact on the town of Newark.</p>	2I	N	<p>Alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. An options consultation was held between December 2020 and February 2021 which sought the local community's views to inform the decision on the preferred route. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022. Information relating to the alternatives considered during the development of the Scheme is detailed in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Information relating to the options consultation and preferred route announcement is detailed in Chapter 2 (Options consultation) and Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>In addition to journey time savings, the objectives for the Scheme cover a range of topics. The Scheme objectives are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Safety</b> - Improve safety through Scheme design to reduce collisions for all users of the Scheme</li> <li>• <b>Congestion</b> - Improve journey time and journey time reliability along the A46 and its junctions between Farndon and Winthorpe, including all approaches and A1 slip roads</li> <li>• <b>Connectivity</b> - Accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent and the wider area by improving its strategic and local connectivity</li> <li>• <b>Environment</b> - Deliver better environmental outcomes by achieving a net gain in biodiversity, and improve noise levels at noise important areas along the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> <li>• <b>Customer</b> - Build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected</li> </ul> <p>The Scheme objectives as well as the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The benefits and costs are</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWV5-Y	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	The fact that the initial questionnaire was returned to us as you had no valid Freepost licence and incorrect people were shown as living here doesn't inspire confidence.	2I	N	This Consultee comment is referring to the <i>Land Interest Questionnaire</i> process, carried out as part of identifying land interest information for the purposes of the Book of Reference <b>(TR010065/APP/4.3)</b> . This was an isolated incident that was highlighted to the Applicant by the Consultee and follow up correspondence took place with the Consultee in order to explain the issue they experienced and for them to provide the relevant information required by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RW3Y-Z	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>I am a statutory consultee (affected landowner in flood mitigation area red line) and I do not feel that the consultation/negotiation process undertaken by Skanska and National Highways has shown fair treatment or due consideration for my disability.</p> <p>I am hard of hearing and have made Skanska and National Highways personnel aware of that on several occasions.</p> <p>In consideration of my disability, I have requested that meetings take place face to face (not online), in private, and in a quiet office space - I have made my office at [redacted] freely available at no cost for such meetings on every occasion requested.</p> <p>However, meetings have been called via Teams and have on occasion moved at short notice on occasion by Skanska personnel - one meeting has been held on a Public House (the Fox Inn at Kelham Public Consultation meeting in a noisy room), where we were required to disclose personal information.</p> <p>I have requested detail of what land National Highways intend to take on several occasions but although dates for release of such information have been verbally offered, they have always been moved forward as they became due and to be issued 'soon'.</p> <p>Time spent dealing with NH on this matter is distracting me from my day to day work as an aircraft engineer and the stress involved is affecting my ability to work safely and effectively, with considerable adverse affect on my business and possibly flight safety.</p> <p>In short, I do not feel that National Highways are showing due consideration for hearing difficulty for the time their proposals require of affected landowners and the adverse effect on business activity and planning options.</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant has carried out regular weekly engagement meetings with the Consultees (and their land agent representative) using in person meetings as a preference, however a number of meetings have taken place using the Microsoft Teams online platform. One meeting took place in a side room during a public consultation event in order to enable all required attendees to be present as well as technical staff working at the event. The Applicant offered to move the meeting to another location however this offer was not taken up by the Consultee.</p> <p>Reasonable adjustments were made to reduce noise levels in the room and provide an additional level of confidentiality. The Applicant will continue to consider the communication needs of the Consultee during future engagement that takes place.</p> <p>The Applicant has shared information with the Consultee as early as possible during the Scheme's development to enable negotiations relating to the use of land for floodplain compensation to progress effectively. Ongoing engagement will continue to take place with the Consultee as the Scheme progresses and further information becomes available.</p>
ANON-559H-RW75-Z	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	During the consultation at Winthorpe village hall, when both myself and [redacted] pointed out that the local landowners felt that they hadn't been consulted on the proposed footpaths (which is rather unfortunate since we are the most affected parties) a member of staff from the A46 project team told the room that it was a consultation process, and that if Highways served a CPO on the land they could do what they wanted with the land anyway. Which to me felt tantamount to a threat, not consultative at all.	2I	N	<p>Comments made by the staff member outlined the Applicant's approach to consult with landowners to acquire land by agreement wherever possible, rather than relying on compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement and consultation has been carried out with the landowner resulting in changes being made to the Scheme design. Changes include the removal of the access track from the A1133, provision of a walking and cycling route to the Newark Showground and moving lay-bys on the access track out of the farmer's fields.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWQ-V	Consultation - general	Regardless of consultations and peoples feedback - this plan is still going to happen regardless of what anyone says. This consultation process is a paper extensive, you have not contest in local residents queries or how these roadworks will negatively impact our lives. You are just following a process.	2I	N	<p>Before any Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project can proceed, it must pass through the six stages of the development consent regime as outlined in the Planning Act 2008. This regime places significant importance on (statutory) pre-application consultation and the Applicant is required to produce a Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> setting out details of the consultation undertaken, the responses received, and the regard had to these.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate will consider whether the Applicant has complied with the pre-application procedure in deciding whether or not to accept the application for examination, including considering the adequacy of consultation. If accepted, the Scheme would be independently examined by a single or panel of Inspectors (known as the Examining Authority) who will assess the Scheme based on a range of factors before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State on whether or not the Planning Inspectorate considers it should be granted development consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through engagement, options consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation and its compliance with the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>requirements of the Planning Act 2008 is described within the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>All responses received to the statutory consultation have been considered by the Applicant and where appropriate changes have been made in developing the Scheme design. Information regarding changes made to the Scheme as a result of the statutory consultation are detailed within Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW38-Y	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>Some folk told me they could not get into the online consultation .... Maybe they have an older computer I don't know. Then I was told you could not do an online submission if you Didn't have an email address – lots of folk don't have one. I was trying to help2 people online....</p> <p>THEN a couple told me they had tried to find the drop off at the Town Hall and failed, someone there told them to post it! This older couple had already failed when trying to do it online!</p> <p>Rubbish rubbish. The Lord Ted has also been shut for most of the time, no nearby consultation event to Windmill viaduct? Rubbish!</p>	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>In addition to the online <i>Consultation Response Form</i>, printed copies were available at consultation events as well as at various deposit locations across Newark-on-Trent. Printed copies could be returned to the project team either by handing to a staff member at a consultation event or by posting using the Scheme freepost address.</p> <p>Having an email address was not a mandatory requirement for completing the online <i>Consultation Response Form</i>.</p> <p>For 28 days during the 47-day consultation period, the Lord Ted was inaccessible as a deposit location due to refurbishment works. This closure was not communicated to the Applicant by the venue when the deposit location was organised and only took place for part of the advertised 47-day consultation period. Signage was erected at the deposit location site informing visitors of the reason for the closure, where alternative deposit locations were available and how consultation materials could be viewed online.</p> <p>Due to this deposit location being unavailable for only part of the consultation period, six other locations being available (two of them being within two miles of the Lord Ted) and no other suitable deposit locations being available in this area, the Applicant considered a new location was not required to replace the Lord Ted as a deposit location.</p> <p>A total of 14 consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. Twelve were held in person and two were online.</p> <p>The consultation event locations were chosen deliberately so that they were spread out across the length of the Scheme. Suitably sized venues with available car parking were selected and it was ensured that each location was easily accessible for the public both via walking and public transport. Event locations were also selected based on their proximity to affected residents. The consultation event held nearest to the Windmill Viaduct (approximately one mile away) was at Farndon Memorial Hall on 8 November 2022.</p>
ANON-559H-RWED-W	Consultation – positive feedback	Thank-you for the time to put it together. Changes are needed. The traffic in Newark if there is an accident is horrendous and on more than ten occasions has made us late to pick up children from school/nursery.	21	N	The Applicant notes these comments in relation to the consultation undertaken.
ANON-559H-RW9R-Y	Consultation – positive feedback	Consultation Events with your representatives have been very informative. They have been more than willing to discuss the Scheme and its implications and to listen to our concerns.	21		
ANON-559H-RW8P-V	Consultation – positive feedback	We attended a drop in session at Newark Town Hall on 9 <sup>th</sup> November. The staff who were there were excellent – they answered questions and provided information, were very knowledgeable, friendly, and directly answered all our questions.	21		
ANON-559H-RW78-3	Consultation – positive feedback	The consultation period has been good with knowledgeable people answering queries at the local meetings.	21		
BHLF-559H-RW33-T	Consultation – positive feedback	<p>Finally, may I congratulate you for the way you have provided information which is very thorough and consultation to people in this area who may be or not affected by the construction of the A46 Newark Bypass.</p> <p>Also the number of surveys carried out, effect of nature and the environment etc. prior to any work being carried out.</p> <p>Well done.</p>	21		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	<p>The information is vague in actual specific details, there is a lot of information presented as jargon and lots of abbreviations used which makes it difficult to read for the layman. It also refers to other information not contained within the consultation presentation, rendering it useless without the access to the online additional information.</p> <p>The actual design drawings are not to scale so give no indication of impact on residents houses regarding proximity or height or the land take and the artists impressions do not reflect what the design will look like upon completion.</p> <p>There are no sound proofing measures included such as fencing and the trees and foliage are all at a 20 year plus growth phase.</p> <p>The face to face consultation with highways representatives was unhelpful, they were not informed of details of the design or impact measures and it felt like a spin exercise to try and promote the road without any thought of those affected.</p> <p>The owner informed Skanska of the land owned by [redacted] on a previous request form, but the same information was still asked for on a leaflet tied to a lamppost outside the property.</p> <p>National highways have since been contacted for further meetings regarding the proposed Scheme but emails have not been replied to.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1 states that several receptors including residential properties and businesses are within or adjacent to the draft Order Limits and will potentially experience considerable adverse effects during construction. It does not however highlight those properties or businesses or explain in what way they will be impacted.</p>	21	N	<p>Following the statutory consultation, the Consultee has been engaged with by the Applicant including a face-to-face meeting where their queries and concerns were discussed.</p> <p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a customer friendly style <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>fly-through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.</p> <p>Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards. Printed copies of all consultation materials were available at public consultation events and could be received by post upon request as an alternative to the information available online.</p> <p>The technical drawings published as part of the statutory consultation included scale measurements on them. The <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> that were produced depicted the Scheme 10 years following completion. The locations of the <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> presented at statutory consultation were selected based on locations where the Scheme design is elevated near to Farndon, Cattle Market and Winthorpe.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the Scheme within its setting. The photomontages present the Scheme at Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and at Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening), during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Public Rights of Way Farndon Footpath FP5</li> <li>• View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> <li>• View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>• View south from Public Right of Way Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at the consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme. The Applicant also included contact details so that consultees could contact the Applicant with questions about the Scheme or for clarification of any technical detail.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments on the Consultee's experience at consultation events. Following the consultation, this Consultee has been engaged with by the Applicant including a face-to-face meeting where their queries and concerns were discussed. As a result of this engagement, issues raised by the Consultee have been addressed.</p> <p>Planting is not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise. Instead, where needed, landscape bunds, temporary acoustic barriers or permanent noise barriers would be provided. Further detail on the specific measures to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Measures such as landscaping bunds are anticipated to be effective in minimising impacts on sensitive receptors from the point at which the Scheme is operational. These landscape bunds would also be planted to soften the visual appearance of built features, contribute to habitat creation and align with the local landscape character.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Low noise surfacing would be implemented along the Scheme to mitigate noise. In addition, permanent 2m barriers (from the road surface/or from local ground) noise would be provided along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station and to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund. Additional locations of proposed noise mitigation are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments with regards to the Consultee informing the Applicant about the status of their land ownership. Information regarding land ownership was requested using both land information questionnaires and unregistered land notices. This process was carried out in parallel, therefore information provided by the landowner regarding the unregistered land may not have been received by the Applicant prior to the unregistered land notice being displayed outside the property.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. An Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application. The potential impacts, mitigation measures and associated effects on properties and businesses for the Scheme are considered for a number of environmental factors and are detailed within Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	When will a visual be provided to depict the road Scheme from the ground within the Winthorpe Open Break?	2B	N	<p><i>Artist's impressions from selected locations</i> along the Scheme were produced following requests from community stakeholders and were published online and shown at statutory consultation events from 16 November to 26 December 2022.</p> <p>Locations south of Winthorpe were included but not specifically from the Winthorpe Open Break. However, a photomontage from this location has been included within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, which can be found within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The effects upon the Winthorpe Open Break, are addressed within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> details the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the Scheme within its setting.</p> <p>The photomontages present the Scheme at Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and at Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening), during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Public Rights of Way Farndon Footpath FP5</li> <li>• View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> <li>• View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>• View south from Public Rights of Way Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RW78-3	Consultation – more information/	I'm confused by the description above that this refers to preliminary design. I thought this was regarding the latest proposals.	2B	N	<p>The consultation materials outlined the history of the Scheme design and the latest design information that was being consulted on at that time.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	publicity/time requested				
ANON-559H-RWN8-T	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The consultation process appears to have been thorough, but the consultation materials are very light on hard data with regard to impacts.	21	N	The Applicant notes the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out.  A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information relating to the impacts of the Scheme that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i> , <i>Fly-through video</i> , <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.  Page 14 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> provided information on where further copies of consultation materials were available including online.
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	This time around the process has been much smoother, however the differing site plans are confusing. There are slightly different routes shown on the various documents. This is not only confusing but worrying as I feel I am not sure of the exact routes.	21		Printed copies of all consultation materials that were online were also available at consultation events and could be posted upon request, as an alternative to accessing the information online.  The <i>Consultation Brochure</i> included information regarding the key impacts of the Scheme in relation to traffic flows and network performance, walking and cycling routes and potential environmental effects during the construction and operational stage of the Scheme. Further information and data relating to environmental impacts and mitigation were available within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> documents.  The Scheme route was included within several documents as part of the consultation materials published for the statutory consultation. The route shown on the <i>General Arrangement Plans</i> and <i>Plan and Profile Drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation, as well as the Scheme route overview in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> is the same, however was presented in slightly different formats.  The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for the statutory consultation included images of previous routes consulted upon during the options consultation (page 35), the preferred route selected following the options consultation (page 38), well as the preliminary design consulted on during the statutory consultation (page 20).  Information regarding the borrow pits was included on pages 18, 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and assessed within the <i>Preliminary Environmental information Report</i> , using the information available at the time.  The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. Environmental concerns are being addressed through the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which is based on the Scheme design submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWBQ-7	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The 'borrow pits' were not sufficiently and reasonably pointed out in the brochure. It feels like the environmental concerns are not being taken seriously to keep costs down.	21		
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	It is disappointing that the Statutory consultation has opened with numerous incomplete and missing reports - notably on population and human health.  A key question therefore is how can we comment on areas where information is currently missing?	21	N	The Applicant notes the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out.  A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development.  An Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which accompanies the development consent application and assess the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the environment.  Information regarding population and human health was included on page 43 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and further detailed findings of the assessments in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>A population and human health assessment was undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and presented in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). It assessed the impacts of the Scheme on land use and accessibility, access to services, amenity impacts, access to green space and recreation, employment and income, and social cohesion. The assessment found no significant impacts on human health either during construction or operation.</p> <p>There are significant impacts as a result of temporary and permanent agricultural land take as part of the Land Use and Accessibility Assessment.</p> <p>There are significant impacts on access to walking, cycling and horse-riding routes Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark FP48#1 during construction due to the length of their diversions. There is a significant operational impact on users of the Trent Valley Way as a result of the diversion to facilitate the Scheme. Temporary diversions can be found in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Consultation - general	<p>I am appreciative of the fact that you do seem to be listening now and the new agents do have local knowledge and have appreciated the villagers' point of view. However, the reference to the Think Again option 3 design in the consultation material is wrong and should be amended.</p> <p>It is much better than the first non-statutory attempt</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments and is committed to listening to the views of local stakeholders. Following comments received from stakeholders regarding the wording of the <i>Think Again Option 3</i> within the <i>Assessment of Alternatives</i> chapter of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>, the Applicant has updated wording referring to this matter within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>There are numerous environmental reports that are yet to be completed and shared with the public. This feels like we do not have all of the complete information in order to prepare an informed view and leads us to question the validity of the statutory consultation.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment. A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Consultation - more information/	<p>As mentioned above the data presented remains substantially incomplete. Much of the research and investigative work is ongoing. This does not allow the consultees to have a full picture of the environmental impact.</p>	2I	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	publicity/time requested	<p>Although I understand the data is presented in an agreed format and a standardised process is followed, the information presented is not 'accessible' to most consultees. Despite the information in the 500+ page PEI report being summarised in a number of smaller documents, these often 'sugar-coat' the information to give the narrative National Highways wish to be followed.</p> <p>As stated in a number of responses in the PINS Scoping Opinion document it should be important to translate the information presented into terms and formats the audience can better relate to. This could be through engagement events and multi-media presentations that include audio recordings of noise for example.</p> <p>In addition, I would argue that although environmental information is emotive and important to some consultees, this information is secondary to the impact on travel around the Newark area to most local residents. Although noise, air quality and biodiversity may get some reaction, I doubt most consultees will have read the summaries of sections such as material assets and waste, never mind the in-depth analysis (where complete) in the 500+ page PEI report. These need to be better woven into the narrative of the proposals that are predicated on travel improvements not environmental effects. No road is going to have a significant positive impact overall on environmental factors, but the information on the personal negatives can easily be ignored by those only engaging with plans of the road layout.</p> <p>Consultations and their associated documentation are only worthwhile if they are accessible and understood to those being consulted, and all information can be related to on a personal level.</p> <p>On a personal note, I would have appreciated if mentions of my property had been anonymised in the reports. The approach is inconsistent, with some areas codified and locations shown on maps, whereas in others direct mention of particular properties is included.</p>			<p>Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the environment, reflecting the greater level of detail associated with the Scheme design. This is an approach that complies with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>A range of printed and online materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable the consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.</p> <p>Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>A number of consultation events within the local community were held during the advertised period of the statutory consultation. The events included community events, online events and a business event to provide as much opportunity as possible to engage with a range of stakeholders. Details of the consultation events were included within the wider promotion of the statutory consultation which included posting consultation packs and information postcards to the local community, a press release, webpage updates, social media advertising, information posters and statutory notices published in local newspapers.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments relating to mentions of the Consultee's property in consultation materials. Address information but not personal details were included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> in descriptions of human health receptors to provide locational context.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>There have been no ground level visuals of Brownhills junction and many people are unaware of the height of the new A46 and the size of the Brownhills junction as this is not clear in the diagrams, only being described in technical drawings found online. None of the plans released are to scale and no details have been provided as to how close each section of this road network will be to [redacted]. Artist's impressions provide a picture of a smaller scaled design set in a greener landscape than may be the case given the scale of the road development in the space proposed.</p>	21	N	<p><i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> were produced as part of the statutory consultation materials and included the A1/A46 Crossing near to Brownhills Junction. The <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> that were produced depicted the Scheme 10 years following completion.</p> <p>Scale measurements depicting the height of Brownhills Junction and the widened A46 were included within the <i>Plan and Profile Drawings</i> published as part of the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The <i>Fly-through video</i> included within the consultation materials gives an indication of the size and scale of the Brownhills Junction within the context of the full road development.</p> <p>Further details depicting the Scheme design in the area of Brownhills Junction can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and Engineering Plans and Sections (<b>TR010065/APP/2.6</b>). Highway plans included within Volume 2: Plans, Drawings and Sections of the development consent application documents are all to scale and provide a range of information about the design.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Visual Receptor 41 is included within the photomontages which depicts the from the boarding kennels looking towards Brownhills Junction and the A1. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the Scheme within its setting.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Question: will National Highways engage a second statutory consultation when more crucial information is available?	2I	N	The required minimum period for statutory consultation is 28 days. The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation.
ANON-559H-RWTA-9	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The timescale of the consultation period has been too short for constructive and meaningful dialogue.	2I	N	<p>A targeted non-statutory consultation took place from 17 March to 16 April 2023 providing an opportunity for prescribed consultees, landowners and community stakeholders who could be impacted by or interested in updates in six areas of the Scheme, to provide their feedback.</p> <p>A further targeted statutory consultation took place from 8 September to 6 October 2023 providing an opportunity for newly identified persons with an interest in land to provide their feedback on the Scheme as presented during the previous statutory consultation and subsequent targeted non-statutory consultation. Further information relating to these consultations is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant does not intend to hold a further statutory consultation at this stage.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received. There would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBG-W	Consultation – general	I live in Kelham Road. We have not received any notice of this consultation period through our letterboxes, just laminated notices on a few lampposts. Are you following the Vagon's (Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy) example in informing the public affected by these plans?	2I	N	<p>The Applicant is aware that several addresses in this location failed to receive a copy of the consultation materials that were posted out to the general public located within the inner distribution area, sent on 21 October 2022. Information relating to the inner distribution area is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>On 10 November 2022, consultation materials (including a <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and a <i>Consultation Response Form</i>) were hand delivered to the addresses in this location by the Applicant, providing 32 days for stakeholders affected to respond to the consultation. The Planning Act 2008 requires a minimum of 28 days for statutory consultation to take place.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	<p>The first thing to flag in terms of "environmental information" is what information? In 568 pages, National Highways obfuscate. And do not actually provide the information needed in order to comment on the Scheme. Key information – such as traffic counts, complex noise modelling, projected carbon increases and air pollution data – is missing.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that National Highways has been allowed to proceed with the statutory consultation with these crucial elements of information missing, meaning that members of the public are not being given the opportunity to properly scrutinise the Scheme. A further statutory consultation should be made available to members of the public once this information can be provided. This is crucial to our democratic processes.</p> <p>What information is made available is cause for alarm.</p>	2C	N	<p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a customer friendly style <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The preliminary assessments for air quality and noise presented within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> have been informed by previous options appraisal results for the preferred route announcement, which themselves were informed by traffic forecasts.</p> <p>With regards to information relating to carbon increases and air pollution data, the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> was informed by the Stage 2 operational assessment which included the road user emissions (from traffic forecasting changes) and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the updated construction assessment based on the design of the Scheme at the time (looking at emissions from materials, transport of materials to site and construction plant activities). Information relating to this was included within Section 15.11 of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the environment, reflecting the greater level of detail associated with the Scheme design. This is an approach that complies with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which interested parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	There is little to no information about where road lights will be placed. Given the proximity of the road to numerous residential locations this needs more thought.	2B	N	<p>Information regarding lighting proposals is being developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. As a result, this information was not included within the materials produced for statutory consultation however further details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) produced for the development consent application.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Roundabout and Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area, including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road)</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on increasing safety for all road users, the design of which has sought to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced. A lighting scheme for operational highway lighting must be approved by the Secretary of State pursuant to Requirement 18 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZJ-R	Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Scheme could have highlighted more in the booklet. Provided the potential impact on flooding for Sandhills Close residents.</p> <p>Scheme could have outlined noise reduction and air pollution management measures more in the booklet. For example, planting of silver birch between A46 and Newark.</p>	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments with regards to the information provided within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i>. The brochure summarised information about the Scheme and pointed out where further information could be found relating to topics such as environmental impacts and mitigation within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time, including the potential Scheme impact on Sandhills Close.</p> <p>Flood zones were indicated in the Scheme area map in <i>Volume 2</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>Information relating to potential noise and air pollution mitigation measures, during construction and operation, were included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme and as part of this an indicative plant list of proposed trees and shrubs, which include the use of silver birch.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, details of which (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. The assessment includes mitigation measures to be implemented for construction dust, which are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The assessment identified that there would be no significant effects relating to air quality during the construction of the Scheme, following implementation of these mitigation measures. There would also be no significant effects during operation of the Scheme, so no mitigation measures are proposed during operation.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Land ownership	<p>4. PERMANENT &amp; TEMPORARY LANDTAKE</p> <p>The consultation documents whilst including general arrangement plans, do not include any detailed plans that enables our client to establish the extent of permanent and temporary land take.</p> <p>These plans have been requested in previous discussions with NH and Skanska and are imperative to assist our clients in properly considering any further impacts of the proposals and to assess the extent of land loss and disturbance during the project works.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Details relating to permanent and temporary land take are included within the Book of Reference (<b>TR010065/APP/4.3</b>) and Land Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.2</b>). Copies of land plans including land acquisition types are available as part of the development consent application.</p> <p>Details regarding the use of the Consultee's land on a permanent and temporary basis have been provided through direct meetings that have taken place with the Consultee in order for the Consultee to understand the impact on their property and business operations. Further</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					information relating to engagement with this Consultee can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDG-Y	Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested; Land ownership	<p>My particular concern is development north of the cattle market junction. In particular:</p> <p>1 - how much of my land is affected by the bypass proposals. Plan showing land title [redacted] and [redacted] indicates a significant portion of my land to the south-east of my yard including the only access.</p> <p>No detail has been given as to how my land would be accessed post the widening works to the A617.</p> <p>The land is also a Local Nature Reserve and how will the land be used, how what will be returned to me in what condition.</p> <p>In particular the access is regularly used and of great concern to me how access to the field will be enabled after the A617 arm is widened.</p>	2B	Y	<p>A section of permanent land take is required for the widening of the Kelham Road and Great North Road on the north side of the Cattle Market Junction. Temporary land take has also been identified to facilitate the construction of the widening works, which would include widening to the western side of the Smeaton's Arches. Since the statutory consultation, the Applicant has undertaken engagement with the Consultee and the land required for permanent and temporary land take has been reduced. Further information relating to engagement with this Consultee can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The existing field access track off the A617 would be used to access the works area during the construction phase of the Scheme. The Consultee would retain the existing access to their land parcel during and after the construction phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>Any land used on a temporary basis would be returned to the landowner in its current condition.</p> <p>More information is detailed within the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDG-Y	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Land ownership	2 - The proposals also suggests that the A616 Great North Road will be widened along the eastern boundary of my business premises - I would like detail on how this is to be achieved and what impacts there will be on my access and hedgerows.	2B	N	The works to widen the Great North Road do not extend to the access point of the Consultee's business premises. The existing hedgerows on the western side of the carriageway (north of the Smeaton's Arches) are retained. This information is detailed in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDG-Y	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>3. I have a planning application submitted with Nottingham Council for an extension of my business premises to the north and the road scheme will impact upon this proposal in terms of road widening and changes to the fluvial flow affecting how my site might be compensated for, especially if the land to the south is taken from my ownership.</p> <p>The above are significant questions for me and there may be the need for significant compensation if we cannot agree how to address my concerns. As such I would like to engage at the earliest opportunity with designers to address these issues.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has visited the Consultee's business premises and discussed the potential of sharing floodplain compensation for the proposed yard extension and the Scheme. This has been investigated and it cannot be done as part of the Scheme as it lies outside the Order Limits.</p> <p>However, the Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee regarding the possibility of sharing provision as part of the Consultee's planning application. Following statutory consultation, the Order Limits have been reduced on the Consultee's land parcel as part of the development of the Scheme design. This is reflected in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDG-Y	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment	I have applied for an extension to my yard to the north. The proposal suggest taking my land to the south that was being considered for flood compensation. As it is a relatively small area that is required 3,500 - 7000m3 depending on what is included. This could be compensated within one of the proposed compensation areas negating an element of financial compensation	2G		
BHLF-559H-RWDG-Y	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address the issue of access to my field</li> <li>Discuss flood compensation and access issues with respect to my yard and extension</li> <li>To avoid compensation costs by addressing the above</li> </ul>	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWUD-D	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Land ownership	We recently received the statutory consultation letter regarding the new A46 Newark bypass. Within your correspondence were 2 maps which we have enclosed which both refer to property we have an interest in. The Malt Park plan is confusing as we do not know what your intentions are and the site is well away from the proposed new road. Can you enlighten us as to your interest please	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant is seeking to obtain temporary rights for the use of Trent Lane and Maltkin Lane as an access road for construction traffic accessing the bridge sites at Nether Lock. The Applicant would also be seeking permanent rights of access along Trent Lane and Maltkin Lane for maintenance access.</p> <p>More is information is detailed within the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWTU-W	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Construction; Population and human health	<p>What provisions are in place to minimise the disruption to our business. The questions we asked are</p> <p>a) Is there any compensation for disruption especially if we are unable to operate during this period of construction?</p> <p>b) What about signage our customers already struggle to find us. We have over 200 vehicles visit our site each week. These range from cars to transporters, Motorhomes etc.</p>	2D	Y	<p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that any policies relating to the temporary or permanent use of land are clear and understood and an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		c) Our insurers insist that the gates are to be locked at all times when the circuit is not in operation. How will this be done when the frontage is removed? There is strong presence of [redacted] in Newark and the surrounding area and [redacted] take every precaution to prevent [redacted].			<p>The Applicant would provide temporary additional signage during construction but is not able to sign the facility as part of the Scheme as it does not fulfil the Department for Transport's requirements for signage from a trunk road.</p> <p>The frontage of the Consultee's business is no longer being impacted by the design of the Scheme along Drove Lane, therefore the security arrangements and locking of gates would not be impacted by the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Introductory text; Stakeholder engagement; Cultural heritage	<p>We write on behalf of our above-named clients in response to your consultation on the proposed A46 Newark Bypass. In the main, our client's representations are focused on the 'A1 crossing to Winthorpe roundabout' section.</p> <p>1. BACKGROUND</p> <p>Our clients are the freehold owners of [redacted]. The full extent of our client's freehold interest is as edged red on the attached plan.</p> <p>Their land and property comprise the Grade II* listed [redacted], [redacted]16 and various other residential, commercial, Airbnb and grassland lets. Since the publication of the initial options for the proposed bypass, our clients have engaged with National Highways ('NH') and their consultants, Skanska, in respect of the proposals for this project and the impacts on their property. We submit these representations in response to the specific proposals as outlined in the consultation document, notwithstanding ongoing discussions with NH and Skanska. We and our clients anticipate continued dialogue with NH and Skanska as they develop their plans for the bypass, including but not limited to the points we raise in this response.</p> <p>2.GENERAL OBJECTION</p> <p>Our clients object to the proposed bypass and reserve the right to make further submissions in respect of the proposals, including but not limited to, a Development Consent Order application and Examination in public (including all pre- and post-examination procedures).The representations made here are without prejudice to the above objection.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant notes these comments in relation to the impacts the Scheme has on the Consultee's business operations and residential property.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement and consultation has been carried out with the landowner resulting in changes being made to the Scheme design. The Applicant has addressed the Consultee's concerns within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWDE-W.</p>
ANON-559H-RW78-3	Stakeholder engagement	I'm pleased that NH have consulted with local groups, particularly Think Again for the Winthorpe area.	2H	N	The Applicant notes these comments.
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Stakeholder engagement	In your discussions with the showground operators it may be helpful to ask them to move the position where vehicles are stopped to collect gate money etc. to as far into the site as possible in order to give more road length for queuing vehicles back to the new Winthorpe roundabout.	2D	N	It has been agreed that the collection of gate money from the new entrance off the Friendly Farmer Link Road would be within the site so as not to cause queues back onto the link road. The current access to the bowls club off Drove Lane has been made into a left out only exit.
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Stakeholder engagement	Little or no confidence in the planning department at Newark Council as previous Schemes have created many problems. Locally it is believed that the council's planning is only considered to their financial gains - not taking into account impact on the local area.	2H	N	<p>Newark and Sherwood District Council is a statutory consultee on the Scheme and have provided their feedback as part of the statutory consultation process. The Applicant is seeking consent for the Scheme under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Under the Planning Act 2008, the Planning Inspectorate will make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Transport, who will decide whether the Scheme will be granted a Development Consent Order that allows the Scheme to proceed to construction.</p> <p>As a statutory consultee in the process Newark and Sherwood District Council will also provide the Planning Inspectorate with its views about the Scheme during the examination process.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Stakeholder engagement	<p>3. STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND</p> <p>We request that NH enter into a Statement of Common Ground with our clients, which must</p>	N/A	N	Following the statutory consultation, there has been ongoing engagement with the Consultee. With the agreement of the Consultee, a Heads of Terms document is being



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		include the measures to address the issues raised in this submission, necessary accommodation works to mitigate the impact of the Scheme and to ensure that these are addressed in further modifications to the bypass design and land use proposals.			developed to address relevant issues. This is being done instead of a Statement of Common Ground.
ANON-559H-RWTU-W	Stakeholder engagement	Finally, there is hard standing at the top of the site which as planning permission for HGV Training. This has also been approved by the Ministry of Transport. But due to economic force the outside company have not pursued this further.  This could be used by you as hard standing depending on agreement with landowner.	2H	N	The Applicant notes this comment and after further assessment, would not require the use of the hardstanding area as part of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Stakeholder engagement; Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Road layout	14. SCHEME IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES  We request that the Statement of Common Ground which we have proposed above should contain detailed impact mitigation measures prior to the proposed submission of the Scheme Development Consent Order application. These mitigation measures must include suitable landscape screening and bunding to mitigate against visual and noise impacts of the Scheme. Our client requests that the design and location of these must be included in an agreed package of accommodation works together with those matters relating to the new access drive and entrance.	N/A	N	Following the statutory consultation, a further targeted non-statutory consultation took place between March and April 2023 which included consultation with the Consultee. Further information relating to this can be seen in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> .  With the agreement of the Consultee, a Heads of Terms document is being developed to address relevant issues. This is being done instead of a Statement of Common Ground.
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	There have been a number of significant issues with the consultation process itself.  Much detail is missing from the consultation. Key facts and figures and crucial data are absent. This includes full details of carbon emissions, air quality data and traffic counts. Full mitigation measures for residents are not currently available. Furthermore, full information on how construction activities will impact on neighbourhood quality are not yet available. This information will be available much later down the line, and outside the scope of the statutory consultation. Enabling members of the public to scrutinise and feed back on this key information has therefore been denied. This is an affront to democracy. Newark residents have a right to know the full details of the Scheme and be able to air their views. At present, this is only a partial consultation based on incomplete information.  It is therefore very challenging to make informed comment on many of the areas under consideration. National Highways should deploy a second statutory consultation once all the facts are ready for public consumption.	2I	N	A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development.  The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.  If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.  Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO <sub>2</sub> e) during construction and operation.  The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> which is the standard used for all highways in England. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes. It also includes mitigation measures for the construction phase which are further detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .  Traffic forecasts are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> while information relating to traffic count data is included in Appendix A (Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) report) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .  Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> . The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population human health during both construction and operation are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic and environmental factors that influence human health status, such as neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation, and physical activity.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation – general; A1/A46 Crossing; Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction	Information that is currently available was not conveyed in an accessible format. Specialist calculations had to be performed to determine the height of key sites of new infrastructure such as the A1 overbridge and the Cattle Market flyover. Heights and size of structures are therefore not clearly stated in the consultation. You need specialist knowledge to be able to work out from the consultation documents how high bridges and infrastructure will be. This is not an inclusive way of engaging non-experts, and National Highways has failed in its duty to convey key information in an accessible manner.	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment relating to the heights of the A1/A46 Crossing and the grade separated junction at Cattle Market. Information relating to this was included within the <i>Plan and Profile Drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation. All technical drawings produced for the statutory consultation included scale measurements.</p> <p>As well as more technical reports, the Applicant also provided <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> depicting the A1/A46 Crossing and the grade separated junction at Cattle Market aspects of the Scheme as part of the materials produced for the statutory consultation.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation - general	<p>Key visuals arrived mid-way through the consultation and were not explicitly publicised. At the latter consultation events, some were tucked away in a corner (E.g. Winthorpe Community Centre) making them easy to miss. Anyone engaging with the statutory consultation and available web materials at the start of the process only would have missed this key information.</p> <p>The way information that is available has been conveyed has made use of minimisation techniques. For example:</p> <p>Video flythrough gives a birds-eye, rather than a ground level perspective. Humans will not be engaging with the environment from a birds-eye perspective so this is meaningless unless it is also accompanied by ground level visuals.</p> <p>All visuals depict the Scheme some years after completion, therefore depicting vegetation that will not be established at the time of Scheme completion. The season also depicts full greenery and not a winter scene. Indeed the Planning Inspectorate has also made the same reasonable request. A concern, however, is that visuals of this type have not been provided for the statutory consultation, which is a key point in the process when members of the general public are able to scrutinise the Scheme. This provides even more evidence for the need for another statutory consultation.</p> <p>The ground level images that were eventually provided do not visualise the Scheme from key perspectives, such as the open break between Winthorpe and Newark. As above, these images are stylised for optimal amelioration, with full planting in place.</p>	21	N	<p>Some of the visualisation materials (<i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i>) were produced during the statutory consultation as a direct response to stakeholder requests. These were displayed at public consultation events alongside other visualisation and mapping documents from 12 November to 30 November 2022 and published on the Scheme webpage from 16 November 2022, which is the main source of information for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant ensured that all consultation materials were displayed at consultation events in a consistent manner, were easily accessible and visible to event visitors. Event staff explained to event visitors what materials were being presented at the public consultation events and where they could be found.</p> <p>All information presented at the statutory consultation remains visible on the Scheme webpage and is available for further review ahead of the Applicant's development consent application submission and during a future examination process.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments regarding the perspective of the <i>Fly-through video</i> and acknowledges that this visualisation tool did not show how people would interact with the Scheme from ground level. The purpose of this visualisation tool was to depict the road layout in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure. This type of video is regularly used to assist the visualisation of infrastructure projects of this nature.</p> <p>The locations of the <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> presented at statutory consultation were selected based on locations where the road is elevated near to Farndon, Cattle Market and Winthorpe.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the Scheme within its setting. The photomontages present the Scheme at Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and at Year 15 (15 years on from Scheme opening), during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Public Rights of Way Farndon Footpath FP5</li> <li>View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers, and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>View south from Public Rights of Way Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation - general	The first public consultation event took place at a food and drink fair where the admission fee was £9 on the gate for an adult. This raises questions regarding the inclusivity of some consultation events.	21	N	<p>A total of 14 consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. Twelve were held in person and two online. The first two in person consultation events took place at Newark Showground during the Gift and Food Show, which was a ticketed event.</p> <p>The Gift and Food Show was chosen to hold an event due to the large number of visitors that attend the show, providing a prime opportunity to engage with regional and local stakeholders to promote understanding of the Scheme and the consultation period.</p> <p>In addition to the Gift and Food Show events at Newark Showground, there were also events in this area of the Scheme (i.e. 1.3 miles away in Winthorpe village) which took place later in the consultation period.</p> <p>All consultation events were advertised to the public through newspaper notices, letters sent out with <i>Consultation Brochures</i> and <i>Consultation Response Forms</i>, on the Scheme webpage, posters, social media and press notices. Overall, more than 730 visitors attended the in person and online consultation events.</p> <p>The consultation event locations were chosen deliberately so that they were spread out across the length of the Scheme. Suitably sized venues with available car parking were selected and it was ensured that each location was easily accessible for the public both via walking and public transport.</p> <p>Event locations were also selected based on their proximity to affected residents. Further details regarding the consultation events can be found in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Consultation – general	<p>It was not always clear that further extensive materials were available on the website including the 568-page environment report.</p> <p>The brochure provided to homes included many problematic summary statements that did not convey the accuracy of the mater. For example on air quality readers were reassured that 'no exceedances of air quality objectives are predicted at human receptors'. This is a deceiving statement given that PM 2.5 isn't even being mapped and the data is not yet available anyway.</p> <p>Some summaries lacked precision, such as noise and vibration resulting in increases as well as decreases, but no detail regarding where these differences occur. Again, the reader is reassured that appropriate measures will be taken – "low road noise surfacing and noise fencing". It is unfortunate that neither of these measures actually work.</p>	21	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the environment, reflecting the greater level of detail associated with the Scheme design. This is an approach that complies with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Page 14 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> details where consultees were able to get further information about the Scheme, during the statutory consultation, and states that '<i>Copies of other consultation documents and plans will be available online and for inspection only at our consultation events.</i>' The brochure also provided the Scheme webpage address.</p> <p>Printed copies of all consultation materials were available at public consultation events and could be received by post upon request as an alternative to statutory consultation materials being available online.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The preliminary assessments for air quality and noise presented within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> have been informed by previous options appraisal results for the preferred route announcement, which themselves were informed by traffic forecasts.</p> <p>Detailed environmental assessments are contained within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, building on the information included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and reflective of the environmental design development that has been informed by the assessment outputs.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> shows the environmental design, whilst air quality and noise and vibration methodologies are further detailed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, details of which (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the effectiveness of low road noise surfacing and permanent noise barriers. The mitigation for the Scheme has been designed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> which considers both of these methods to be effective in mitigating the impacts of highways noise. It cites: <i>'Measures to mitigate and manage operational noise may include, but are not limited to: 1) vertical or horizontal alignment of the road; 2) earth bunds to act as a noise barrier; 3) noise barriers; 4) low noise road surfacing; 5) speed limits; 6) restrictions on noisy vehicle types'</i>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN1-K	Consultation - general	<p>Response forms request a post code. Will responses be analysed in relation to post codes in order to help evaluate both the representation of responses and the 'success' of the consultation? - 'failure' to elicit responses from people should not be seen as 'their fault'/lack of caring - its more the failure of National Highways to engage , to communicate, to plan how to find people instead of assuming they will find you.</p> <p>[The remainder of this response is the same as the Newark Bypass Environment Group (NBEG) response for the same question number. Please see response ANON-559H-RWVY-3]</p>	21	N	<p>Postcodes were requested from consultees that completed online or printed copies of the <i>Consultation Response Form</i>. This postcode data was used by the Applicant in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To monitor the locations of those submitting consultation responses, allowing the Applicant to ensure stakeholders within the area of the Scheme were aware of the statutory consultation</li> <li>To identify an area of the Scheme or specific location that a consultee referred to in their consultation response</li> <li>To support the identification of affected stakeholders where required including local residents, business and persons with and interest in land</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has not used the postcode data to infer any level of interest from a group of consultees. Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i>, which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> and how the Applicant has complied with the commitment within it, is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>. Information relating to the analysis of responses received to the statutory consultation and targeted consultations is included within Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The statutory consultation was promoted within the area of the Scheme through numerous channels including posting consultation packs and information postcards to the local community, a press release, webpage updates, social media advertising, information posters and statutory notices published in local newspapers.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWTU-W	Land ownership; Population and human health	<p>Firstly, let me explain our position as a business. Due to the landowners imposing a restriction that only a person not a limited company can have a lease [redacted] is the named director on the lease not Express Leisure (Newark) Ltd use. [Redacted] has leased the land in his name for over 35 years.</p> <p>The Scheme appears to be taking part of our land for development Land Title [redacted] and we have the following comments regarding the land marked in red down:</p> <p>Down the A46 side of the land boundary There are the following services buried in the land: a) 440Volt Electric Cable b) BT Fibre Optic Cable c) Bore Hole Water Pipe d) Land drainage pipes originally installed for drainage of old runway and still in use. This runs the whole length of the site. Front &amp; the other side of the site a) Electricity Box and cables b) BT line c) Bore Hole –depending how far back</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE THE OPERATING OF THE CIRCUIT AND BOOKING SYSTEM IS CONTROLLED BY THE INTERNET. WITHOUT THE INTERNET WE HAVE NO TIMING SYSTEM AND WILL NOT BE ABLE TO OPERATE OUR BUSINESS.</p>	2C	N	The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee. Since the statutory consultation, the Scheme's Order Limits have been amended meaning there would be no direct impact upon the Consultee's land.
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment	If our property floods as a result when compensation could we claim from highways agency?	2C	N	<p>Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> has been conducted and a mitigation scheme has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas being provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners. Letters sent to landowners as part of the statutory consultation included details about where this information is available.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGA-V	Land ownership	<p>It is important that you provide me with clarity and agreed timing on the compensation package as a result of the compulsory purchase. This should be agreed before work on the road commences. On previous occasions, I have had to wait up to 5 years to receive compensation, which is not acceptable. The uncertainty that this has for myself and my wife is very unsettling.</p> <p>I would like to discuss with you the possibility of purchasing the residual land between the front boundary of my property and the road, running alongside Crees Lane. I would like to discuss this as part of the overall compensation package for the compulsory purchase order on my rear garden</p>	2H	N	<p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners impacted by the Scheme to ensure that any policies relating to the temporary or permanent use of land are clear and understood and an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9Q-X	Land ownership; Population and human health	<p>The noise and visual impact of this project will cause our properties in the south of the village to be substantially de-valued.</p> <p>I and many others retired to Winthorpe to enjoy our later years, particularly in our gardens, alas this will be adversely impacted.</p> <p>My comments are in addition to those from the A46 Think Again Group who I fully support.</p>	2C	N	<p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments in relation to noise and visual impacts on The Spinney area of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. In order to mitigate the effects to Winthorpe village, permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Landscape and visual effects to the south of Winthorpe are generally reported as non-significant (during operation) due to the level of planting and the landscape bund in this area. The majority of receptors in the vicinity of Winthorpe village are considered to have a neutral effect in Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) presents further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3Y-Z; ANON-559H-RWVS-W	Land ownership	<p>As a statutory consultee, it is very worrying that National Highways are not agreeing to cover solicitor and land agent fees directly – instead insisting on landowner paying the solicitor direct and invoicing NH for work done – hence the landowner carrying the financial risk in event of NH disputing an invoice.</p> <p>I believe this is contrary to stated procedure in the booklet 'Your Property and compensation for effects of our road proposals' where it explicitly states that solicitor fees will be paid direct <a href="https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/doseci3z/your-property-and-compensation-or-mitigation-for-the-effects-of-our-road-proposals.pdf">https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/doseci3z/your-property-and-compensation-or-mitigation-for-the-effects-of-our-road-proposals.pdf</a></p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged directly with the Consultee on this issue and outlined the policy with regards to payments to appointed solicitors. The procedure being referred to by the Consultee is in relation to payments made only for the purpose of compensation and/or mitigation measures, these are outlined within the 'Your property and compensation for effects of our road proposals' guidance booklet. As outlined within the guidance, payments would not be made directly to solicitors for other legal fees that have been incurred outside of this process.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDE-W	Land ownership	<p>9. MINERAL RESERVES</p> <p>Our client's land is identified as being within the East Nottinghamshire Sandlands Landscape Character area and with a geology of potential sand/gravel deposits. Our client requests that any viable sand and gravel deposits arising from the project works on their land should be compensated.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: 'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZX-6	Land ownership; Overall scheme; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>I have been instructed by our client, [redacted], to act on her behalf in respect to the A46 Newark Bypass.</p> <p>We have received the statutory consultation letter and accompanying plans identifying the impacts on our client's land as shown on your plan referenced HMLR Land Title reference [redacted]. According to the red line boundary, the proposed rights include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Use of my client's driveway which is very narrow and with a tight turn from Kelham Road and is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic.</li> <li>2) The red line colouring includes part of our client's bungalow and farm buildings.</li> <li>3) The red line colouring does not follow the existing farm track and would affect every field on the eastern side of the existing A46 road.</li> <li>4) The access rights would have to cross over the existing flood bank, potentially damaging the banks with heavy traffic and putting our client's bungalow and buildings at risk of flooding.</li> <li>5) The red line boundary does not join the existing underpass, so we cannot see how construction traffic could traverse from the east to the west side of the road during construction.</li> </ol> <p>We do not believe that National Highways have made any attempt to minimise the impacts of this Scheme on our client's land or property. We believe that there are other alternate access routes to both the east and west side of the road that could be used to minimise the impact of the project on our client, including routes past the cricket club or from the western side of the road.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant has met with the Consultee to discuss in further detail the proposals for the land in question.</p> <p>It is agreed that the driveway off Kelham Road is particularly narrow and not suitable for large construction vehicles. It is the intention of the Applicant to use the driveway, and field track to access the southern side of the eastern crossing of the Nottingham to Lincoln Railway Line, Work No. 27 as shown on the Works Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.3</b>).</p> <p>The Order Limits have been amended to remove the bungalow and farm buildings. They now follow the route of the field access track and connect to the existing concrete track under the railway bridge. This is shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>The access would be restricted to 4x4 vehicles and a trailer, which would use the access during the pre-construction and enabling works at the start of the Scheme. The vehicles would not be heavy construction equipment and would not damage the crossing over the existing flood defence embankment. The works would be limited to the installation of a security fence along the southern boundary of the Scheme, between the railway boundary and the highway boundary to deter unauthorised persons from entering the works area. This restriction is detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>).</p> <p>As discussed with the Consultee, the Applicant has made alternative arrangements to provide continued access to the plot of land to the north side of the railway bridge during the construction period. During construction, the current access track under the railway would be inaccessible due to the construction work to the new railway bridge and highway embankment.</p> <p>An alternative access from Kelham Road on the north side of the A46 would temporarily replace the current access beneath the Nottingham to Lincoln west railway bridge and would be provided in advance of closing the existing track as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). An alternative access track further west along Kelham Road is not considered suitable as it would require an existing access track to be extended and a new ditch crossing installed over the Old Trent Dyke.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWGA-V	Land ownership; Traffic forecasts; Overall scheme; Landscape and visual effects; Population and human health	<p>The proposed road widening in planned to go through my garden, taking a significant proportion (approximately third) of my land. This is the third time that the Newark Bypass project has taken a compulsory purchase order on my land, which does not feel fair nor just. My property is only one of three residential properties to be impacted by the latest bypass widening project</p> <p>This proposal ignores the fact that traffic volumes will increase as a result of the widened road, and there is no analysis provided as to when you anticipate the widened road will reach full capacity again. Will this mean you plan to make the road bigger in the future, impacting mine and my neighbour's property once again?</p> <p>Increased highway capacity is likely to ruin Newark's economy, rather than further enhance it, as you suggest in your documents. The town will become less attractive to live in, as people do not want to live near a large busy dual carriage way. I can speak from personal experience, having been impacted by your Scheme now twice and face a third round of disruption.</p> <p>My property is protected by several mature trees, many planted at my own expense, to mitigate the negative impacts of the road on my property; an unsightly view, increased noise and increased carbon emissions. I expect these trees to be replaced on a like for like basis – i.e. mature trees to be planted as a protective screen and not saplings with little or no protection from the road for several years.</p>	2B	Y	<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the Consultee and the community group of which the Consultee is part of, that represents a number of residents in the Crees Lane area. Following feedback from the Consultee and the community group there has been a change in the construction strategy to enable construction to take in the area of Farndon Roundabout and Windmill Viaduct. This has resulted in the Consultee's land no longer being required. In addition, the trees referred to in the Consultee's response are now being retained.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit vegetation clearance to the west of the A46, adjacent to Crees Lane properties and limit impacts upon biodiversity. Both the landscape and biodiversity mitigation strategies have been developed to limit adverse impacts wherever practicable. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides further details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme. Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> outlines trees to be retained and associated protection measures during construction, as well as those trees suggested for removal to accommodate the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation, a further targeted non-statutory consultation took place between March and April 2023 which included consultation with the landowner and community group. Further information relating to this is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>In line with Department for Transport modelling guidance, traffic flows have been forecast up to 2061. This modelling forecasts that the A46 is not predicted to be over capacity within these timescales, please refer to the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> and Appendix A (Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report) of Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> for further information on the traffic modelling.</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b> which sets out the need for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The National Policy Statement for National Networks sets out the Government's vision and strategic objectives for national networks, including improving overall quality of life, journey quality, reliability and safety and linking up communities.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic and environmental factors that influence human health status, such as neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation, and physical activity.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAC-R	Land ownership; Road layout; Stakeholder engagement	<p>My client's architects have now overlaid the road proposals over our client's site boundaries and the existing development, which has helped understand some of the potential implications of the proposed access and egress arrangements. There are some concerns, including the loss of offside access (no proximity to a roundabout) and the remote access in view of the slip road – some good advanced warning signage will certainly be needed. This will obviously become a left-in/left-out service area and, to that extent, if there is the possibility of some additional land to facilitate customer and HGV parking, that would be helpful.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme would alter the existing access to the Consultee's business with only A46 northbound traffic being able to access the business as part of the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee to discuss the issues raised including access and egress to their business.</p> <p>With regards to the comment from the Consultee relating to advanced warning signage, the final signing strategy for the Scheme would be produced in the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed the request regarding additional land with the Consultee and has confirmed that the land discussed has been included within the Scheme design for landscape mitigation.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWUK-M	Land ownership; Road layout	<p>On behalf of Newark Branch Line co.ltd I acknowledge your letter of 18th October but must confess I don't understand the reference to red line. You have shown part in blue but the red line seems to incorporate more than you need. Can you email please where you expect the road and land take to sit? There are two hatched areas. Please treat this as an objection pending further info</p> <p>1.Do you rights to go under the bridge? 2.If you do, that is tight for lorries. Is there to be a before and after survey for damage?</p>	N/A	N	<p>The red line indicates the Order Limits of the Scheme. The land within the Order Limits contains both the permanent and temporary works that are part of the construction phase. The design and construction strategy have been developed to minimise land take across the Scheme. The General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> provide further information.</p> <p>The Applicant will be seeking temporary rights to use the existing access track between the Kings Marina and the hydro-electric power station on the south bank of the River Trent, to the east of Nether Lock. This track would be used during the pre-commencement phase of the Scheme to undertake works such as utility diversions and protection, site clearance and the construction of the west abutment for the temporary bridge. The temporary bridge over the River Trent would be used as the main construction access over the river for the widening of the Nether Lock Viaduct.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the access constraints through the bridge and further detail is provided in Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> for the Scheme. The construction plant and equipment used for the pre-commencement works would be sized such that they are able to access under the bridge. The Applicant would undertake pre-commencement condition inspections of the structure before and after the construction works. Height restriction barriers would be installed either side of the bridge.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3Y-Z; ANON-559H-RWVS-W	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment; Population and human health	<p>My entire property known as [redacted] has been identified (Red Lined) for potential flood compensation area - other nearby land owned by others was not considered even though ground levels and hydraulic connectivity to the River Trent lend themselves to consideration.</p> <p>This is a very unfair burden to impose on a small business and homeowner and, if implemented as currently proposed, will result in business extinction and loss of amenity value of my residential property and airfield.</p> <p>National Highways agents have identified land currently in use as an airfield (with full planning permission and safeguarded for such use) for use as flood alleviation land - if this land is taken it will make the runway unusable, hences significantly reducing the value of the airfield and house at [redacted].</p> <p>I have been in negotiation with [redacted] (Skanska) and [redacted] from National Highways for some months and have proposed several areas of land within the Red Line (and several parcels of other land nearby) as alternatives that could be suitable for flood alleviation works whilst leaving land immediate adjacent the house and runway intact to minimise disruption to the airfield, flying club and aircraft maintenance business that operates from here.</p> <p>If National Highways pursue their intent to use land currently used as an airfield and immediately adjacent my house (current boundary for land lowering is only some 20-25m from the house) for flood alleviation works I will contest this as an unfair burden upon a landowner who has demonstrated willingness to negotiate and offer alternative areas.</p> <p>Red Line encompassing my entire property has put all business development and personal financial retirement planning on hold for my business as I am unable to borrow against or even sell my property with a NH red line around it.</p> <p>As a consequence I am unable to progress business or personal plans and request that red line is removed at the earliest opportunity from all but absolutely essential land.</p> <p>I will be reserving the right to seek compensation (and costs for preparing such claim) for any adverse effect upon my business and amenity value of property.</p>	2G	Y	<p>The Applicant notes comments on how the consultation process has been carried out and has engaged further with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised.</p> <p>The initial Order Limits for the Scheme were established prior to the preferred route announcement in February 2022. Following this, the Applicant has worked closely with the Consultee to discuss the impact of the Scheme proposals on their business operations and property.</p> <p>As a result of the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with the Consultee, the Order Limits were amended. Updated Order Limits were presented as part of a targeted non-statutory consultation that took place between March and April 2023. Further information relating to the targeted consultation is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The updated Order Limits as part of the targeted consultation introduced land parcels offered by the Consultee as an alternative to land within the original Order Limits presented at the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Consultee provided further feedback to the targeted consultation which resulted in updated Order Limits being developed, which reduced the impact of the Scheme on the Consultee's business operations and property. Further detail relating to the updated Order Limits for the Scheme can be found in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: 'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVH-J	Land ownership; Road drainage and the water environment; Population and human health;	<p>Our home and all of our farmland at [redacted], Averham has been identified by National Highways as a potential area for the flood compensation Scheme. We only found out about this when the information was released into the public domain in August 2022 although we were later told that this decision had been taken in February and a "Red Line" drawn around the area. There is other suitable land, owned by others, which has not been considered.</p> <p>The decimation of the farmland would completely devalue the value of that farmland, the value and use of the airfield (which has full planning permission and safeguarding) and the value of the farmhouse itself. For this we would receive no compensation and we would be</p>	2G	Y	<p>The Applicant notes comments on how the consultation process has been carried out and has engaged further with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that negotiations on the topics discussed in relation to use of the Consultee's land for floodplain compensation have been emotive. The Applicant has endeavoured to deliver all engagement in a sympathetic manner, taking into account the opinions of the Consultee and their land agent representation.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Stakeholder engagement	<p>living with the noise and, let's face it, the destruction of everything that we have worked for.</p> <p>We have been in negotiation with National Highways, though I use the term loosely, as we feel that the "negotiating" is nothing but a meaningless process to them, merely to demonstrate that they have followed the procedure. Our comments and requests are brushed aside or met with antagonistic replies and bullying.</p> <p>The red line that encompasses [redacted] is quite obviously an unreasonable and unfair approach by a large organisation to try and force a small landowner to acquiesce to their demands without thought or consideration of the consequences to the land and homeowner.</p> <p>As an example, one of our neighbouring landowners had a small area of land within the red line but we were told by National Highways that they were not interested in negotiating and so they have not considered that land further. Why not? The adjoining landowner has land within the red line and the work involved would have been far less of an intrusion. It certainly would not have decimated their business or home life.</p> <p>Clearly this is not as transparent a project as National Highways would have us believe.</p>			<p>The Applicant has worked with the Consultee to reach a solution for the Scheme that limits impacts for the Consultee as much as possible.</p> <p>The alternative area of land referred to by the Consultee was assessed for potential use as part of the floodplain compensation area for the Scheme, however, was subsequently found to be unsuitable.</p> <p>The initial Order Limits for the Scheme were established prior to the preferred route announcement in February 2022. Following this, the Applicant has worked closely with the Consultee to discuss the impact of the Scheme proposals on their business operations and property.</p> <p>As a result of the statutory consultation and ongoing engagement with the Consultee, the Order Limits were amended. Updated Order Limits were presented as part of a targeted non-statutory consultation that took place between March and April 2023. Further information relating to the targeted consultation is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The updated Order Limits as part of the targeted consultation introduced land parcels offered by the Consultee as an alternative to land within the original Order Limits presented at the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Consultee provided further feedback to the targeted consultation which resulted in updated Order Limits being developed, which reduced the impact of the Scheme on the Consultee's business operations and property. Further detail relating to the updated Order Limits for the Scheme can be found in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVX-2	Land ownership; Overall scheme	<p>The trustees unanimously accept the need for this project to be implemented and are pleased to see that National Highways have taken on board many comments from the earlier, non-statutory consultation. In particular the proposals put forward by the local Think Again group have received widespread support from the local community and the trustees have interacted with and support that groups' work on a regular basis.</p> <p>The trustees acknowledge the significant impact that the new road will have on the land owned by the charity and it is a shared view of ourselves and our tenant farmer that the viability of the land remaining with the charity for continued agricultural use is reduced, even though the trustees accept and support the necessary take of land for the tree / shrub planting we requested in our response to Q2d.</p> <p>Should there be any further land take required as a consequence of suggestions put forward by other parties e.g. more footpaths across the charity's land, it could make part or even all of the remaining land virtually unusable for agricultural purposes as currently utilised.</p>	2H	Y	<p>Since the statutory consultation, and following further targeted consultation, feedback received from the Consultee resulted in the combined access track/footway/cycleway, from the A1133 to Hargon Lane being removed from the Scheme design.</p> <p>Further information on the combined access track/footway/cycleway near to Winthorpe village, as well as all walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9H-N	Overall scheme; Stakeholder engagement	<p>We very much support most of the proposals of the Think Again Group and feel they have thought carefully and been as fair as possible in their proposals to NH and we hope many of their suggestions are weaved into NH's plans.</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments in relation to the engagement undertaken with the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. Further information relating to engagement with this group can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>In response to the statutory consultation, the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group have outlined their main concerns surrounding the local impacts of the Scheme including the road layout, safety, environmental impact, and Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Further details of engagement that has taken place with the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Introductory text; Population and human health; Land ownership	<p>Views and opinions expressed by the owners and residents of [redacted] / [redacted] [redacted] which is extremely close to the proposed new Brownhills junction.</p> <p>[Redacted] was purchased with a view that it could be developed into an environment where the owners could live with their dogs where they could run free and express their natural</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding the impact the Scheme has on the Consultee's business operations and residential property. Ongoing engagement and consultation has been carried out with the landowner resulting in changes being made to the Scheme design. The Applicant has addressed the Consultee's concerns within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> Response ID reference ANON-559H-RW7F-H.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>behaviours without the worry of complaints from neighbours. Over 22 years of investment the property has evolved to the purpose-built premises it is today.</p> <p>[Redacted] is a successful show kennel of the highest level, having been Best In Show at Crufts twice, producing Champion dogs and high-quality, sought-after puppies for over 50 years.</p> <p>[Redacted] is a successful and valued 5-star kennelling establishment which is designed to provide a pension income for the owners for the rest of their lives.</p> <p>There are serious concerns on numerous points regarding the impact the Scheme design will have on home life and the businesses during both construction and once in operation.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWDK-3	Stakeholder engagement	<p>We are instructed by [redacted] and are in receipt of a copy of your letter to [redacted] 27 October 2022 and relating to the A46 Newar Bypass –Statutory consultation. We note that it is proposed to widen 6.5km of the A46 existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway, to provide two lanes in each direction between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts near Newark (“the ‘Works’”). It is also noted that you are inviting comments on the proposal by the 12th December. On behalf of [redacted] we make the following comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[Redacted] jointly own land near Newark Showground (‘The Site’), part of which is proposed to be acquired for the Works.</li> <li>The Site is allocated in the adopted Development Plan under reference NUA/MU/1 for mixed-use non-residential purposes and would therefore, when developed, contribute significantly to employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>[Redacted] had prepared plans for the development of the site, commenced marketing, competitively invited and accepted offers via an appointed agent and were aiming to apply for planning permission, however the proposed acquisition of part of the site would affect the number of units that could be developed on the Site, resulting in the loss of at least one unit and the repositioning of others.</li> <li>National Highway’s commitment to reducing the impact of the scheme is noted. [Redacted] has met with National Highways and its representatives to discuss this issue and discussions are ongoing.</li> <li>Unless and until the issue is satisfactorily resolved [redacted] objects to the Works.</li> </ol>	N/A	Y	<p>With regard to points 1 and 2 raised by the Consultee, the Applicant acknowledges the ownership of land and planned development. The Applicant has been working closely with the Consultee to minimise the land required for the Scheme and the impact on the proposed development, to which an agreed solution has been reached. Further detail is outlined below and also within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, the land required by the Applicant has been reduced. This has been done in consultation with the landowner and has been achieved by removing the access into the Shell garage and diverting the walking and cycling route in this area.</p> <p>With regards to points 3, 4, 5, the site is now excluded from the Scheme Order Limits and the Applicant has worked with the Consultee to ensure the site remains viable.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6J-M	Construction; Land ownership	My interest is that you propose to use Malt Kiln Lane to get construction traffic to the storage compound. This means travelling through our land and so you should adopt the lane so you can make good once the work has been completed.	2B	N	Maltkiln Lane will not be adopted as part of the Scheme. A condition survey of the road would be undertaken prior to temporary possession of the road during construction works taking place. Inspection work would then be undertaken upon completion of the construction works at Nether Lock, to determine if damage has been caused by the construction traffic. Repairs would then be undertaken to rectify any damage associated with the construction traffic.
ANON-559H-RW6J-M	Construction; Land ownership	You need to adopt Malt Kiln Lane as will take the construction traffic straight through our land. You can then make good at the end of the project.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Construction; Population and human health	<p>The statutory consultation booklet states there will be a construction compound off A46 at the new Brownhills junction. Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1 states the specific location of construction work areas is still to be confirmed, however with the construction of 4 lanes of raised new section of the A46, a slip road, a roundabout and a connecting road to the existing roundabout it would be sensible to assume one such compound will be at the site of Brownhills junction or if not then considerable works activity will be taking place during a large part of the 3 year construction phase</p> <p>How can this be thought of as not affecting quality of life or business activity as was suggested by the Skanska people that visited to discuss the design?</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised and has discussed mitigation measures relating to the impact of the construction activity on their residential property and business operations.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises the concerns related to accessibility and environmental effects that may occur during construction of the Scheme. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the amenity effects of the Scheme, including the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts on community receptors. There are no significant amenity impacts on this property identified as a result of the Population and Human Health assessment.</p> <p>The Scheme would require a main construction compound and smaller, satellite compounds within the Order Limits to facilitate the main construction works. The locations are presented in Figure 2.4 (Location of Temporary Works Areas Required During Construction) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>With regards to Brownhills Junction, the compound and temporary works area would be located in the field to the east of Winthorpe Road and cited at the location of the new roundabout. To minimise impact, a 2m high fence alongside the existing highway would be installed at the beginning of the construction phase.</p> <p>Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds is detailed within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Further information regarding construction traffic is detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which details how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Construction; Population and human health	<p>The lane that [redacted] sits at the bottom of (Winthorpe Road) is a single-track private lane accessed off the existing A46 (to be developed into the new A46 south slip road) Is this road the access you will be using to develop the fields either side of it?</p> <p>This lane is the only access to [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted]. Whilst there has been small scale drilling in the field opposite the property, adjacent to the A1 there have been several tractors, trailers and smaller vehicles parked in the lane and using the lane as access for the field. This has brought with it considerable dirt, namely mud dragged off the ploughed field and left in clumps on the lane. It also caused disruption to some of the clients bringing and collecting their dogs from the boarding kennels who had to wait whilst vehicles manoeuvred in the lane. This was only a small scale for a short period of time but caused disruption so how can the disruption to the businesses be mitigated for 3 years?</p>	2H	Y	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised and has agreed to improve drainage at the existing A1 underpass so that the Consultee can use this as a second access to their property when required.</p> <p>Following feedback received by the Consultee and in response to the query relating to use of Winthorpe Road for construction purposes, access to the construction site for Brownhills Junction would be from the existing field access on the A46 to the west of Winthorpe Road. A controlled plant crossing would be placed across Winthorpe Road to maintain safe access to the property for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Access the property would be maintained at all times during the construction period. Winthorpe Road would be kept clean at the plant crossing by the use of wheel washing construction plant machinery and/or cleaning of the road.</p> <p>Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Construction; Population and human health	<p>There are several major concerns during the construction phase and once the road is in use of how it will have a negative impact on the boarding kennel business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People like quick access to services, they will not be prepared to sit in roadworks or have their journeys disrupted long term – they will use alternative, more convenient kennels.</li> <li>• Day boarders dropping dogs off before work will not want to risk being late for work by getting caught in traffic queues around the construction site or again when collecting after a day's work – they will use alternative, more convenient kennels.</li> <li>• People going on holiday will not want to risk being delayed getting to the airport from dropping their dog off and becoming stuck in roadwork traffic – they will use alternative, more convenient kennels.</li> <li>• Customers will not want to drive down a lane covered in mud or construction materials deposited by works vehicles, making their own vehicles dirty.</li> <li>• Customers will not want to unload or collect their dogs or leave them to stay where there is an increase in noise from construction traffic, drilling, digging and other works that could potentially frighten their dog.</li> <li>• Customers will not want to leave their dogs in an environment of additional pollution and noise due to construction vehicles and dust.</li> <li>• Customers will not feel confident unloading or collecting or allowing their dogs to stay or be exercised in an area so close to a major construction site from the safety of their dog should they accidentally get free.</li> <li>• Once customers find a new kennels, they are highly unlikely to return after 3 years once construction completed.</li> </ul>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee concerning any specific accommodation works in order to address their concerns about the operation of their business. Any accommodation works will be confirmed during detailed design.</p> <p>Access to the business would be retained at all times during construction works allowing customers to access the property. This is detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation, this Consultee has been engaged with by the Applicant including a face-to-face meeting where their queries and concerns were discussed. As a result of this engagement, issues raised by the Consultee have been addressed.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, businesses, and road users as far as practicable. Prior to the commencement of the authorised development, per Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>, a Traffic Management Plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the local road network. The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Construction; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Population and human health	<p>If the Winthorpe Road is to be used as access for development of the Brownhills junction, what happens to the existing footpath that connects Newark to Winthorpe village via the lane?</p> <p>This route is used frequently by many customers bringing their dogs to the kennels, most of whom will not want to walk past large moving construction vehicles once works start taking place.</p> <p>One member of staff who cannot drive also walks from their house along this route daily to get to work. How will she be affected?</p> <p>"The works to the Brownhills roundabout will potentially impact people's ability to access the businesses at Brownhills junction." Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1 p.383. 13.11.21</p>	2H	N	<p>The existing walking and cycling route along Winthorpe Road would be maintained at all times and segregated from construction traffic. This is detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>As part of the Scheme, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A new signalised crossing would be provided across the exit slip road at the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safer crossing of the carriageway.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme as described above, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7F-H	Construction; Population and human health; Noise and vibration	<p>Several receptors including residential properties and businesses are within or adjacent to the draft Order Limits and will potentially experience considerable adverse effects during construction- Preliminary Environmental Information Vol.1 p.393. 13.13.3</p> <p>[Redacted] has lived and worked at [redacted] for the last 15 years, she has recently completed her 3-year MSc Animal Manipulation (Chiropractic) and is already a qualified dog trainer and dog training instructor. The plan is to develop the business further to include puppy training classes and animal therapy. The construction of the road will be highly detrimental to these additions both during construction and once in use. The constant increase in noise and pollution will mean that the front garden will no longer be usable for the purpose of training people with their young puppies and under the current Scheme our field will also not be usable as it will be floodplain/wetland. Noise and pollution from being surrounded by 9 lanes of traffic and a roundabout is also not conducive for promoting a therapy business as well as all the other negative impacts which apply to the other businesses.</p> <p>To be able to reassure customers,[redacted] would need to have considerable alterations to the entrance and driveway areas to create an environment they would feel provided safety and security for themselves and their dogs. Currently customers park outside the gates at the quiet end of Winthorpe Road to unload and collect their dogs but this area would become very close to major development works for the new road with the noise and movement of industrial vehicles. There would need to be a secure, compound area customers could drive into and secure to offload their dogs. This area would need to be segregated also from the main driveway of the house and kennels to provide safety and security for the boarding and show dogs already on the premises. To create this would require the owner of the business to</p>	2H	Y	<p>The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee in relation to the issues raised. Changes have been made to the Scheme design and mitigation measures have been agreed relating to the impact of the Scheme and the construction activity on the Consultee's residential property and business operations.</p> <p>Design changes have been made to the area of the Consultee's land identified for use as Brownhills borrow pit/floodplain compensation area on the <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation. This area in relation to the Consultee's land has been removed from the Scheme and the Order Limits have been adjusted to account for this. This is presented on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee in relation to any specific accommodation works in order to address their concerns about the operation of their business. Any accommodation works will be confirmed during detailed design.</p> <p>Access to the business would be retained at all times during constructions works allowing customers to access the property. This is detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential amenity impacts on the local community. Amenity is an assessment which takes into account air quality, noise, and landscape and visual impacts. As there are no significant air quality or noise impacts on residential or business properties, it is concluded that there would be no significant amenity impacts as a result of the Scheme at this property.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>financially invest even more and only to mitigate the road development which itself is likely to lead to reduction in financial income and reduction in value of the property.</p> <p>Constant construction noise will concern many customers that it will scare their dogs whilst in boarding close by and would leave them uneasy at the thought of their dog being walked, exercised, and trained in a location so close to large machinery with the additional risk of them being spooked. Many sensitive dogs just will not tolerate this.</p> <p>The area which is available for the boarding and show dogs to be exercised and trained is severely limited by the construction of the new road. Winthorpe Road will no longer be suitable to walk along during construction or after completion. If the field belonging to [redacted] is wet or muddy due to it being floodplain compensation area or no longer in the possession of [redacted] , then this impacts all exercise and training opportunities for all dogs severely.</p> <p>The perimeter fencing for the entire property would need to be upgraded to make security even tighter based on the increased in the noise from machinery and development works more likely to spook the dogs, again which would require financial investment from the owner.</p> <p>[Redacted] pride themselves in rearing healthy, well socialised puppies. In a property so close to major road construction works this will be severely impacted. The loud bangs, drilling, digging and movement of construction vehicles will always be unpredictable which means controlled introduction to such noises will be impossible and has the potential to be severely detrimental to young puppies throughout their growth and fear periods.</p> <p>Living in a rural location, the exposure to continuous loud noises is very low. Whilst all the adult dogs on the premises are well socialised the noise and pollution produced from such large-scale construction works in such proximity to their home will have a severe detrimental effect on their health and wellbeing and their mental state.</p>			<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> also presents an assessment on the impact of the Scheme on access routes of which, there was not found to be any significant impact on the property.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environment Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. A noise barrier at the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction would provide some mitigation of noise levels from the A46 for the property. Furthermore, the A1, which is the major source of noise at this location, is forecasted to experience a negligible change in traffic flows. As such the change in noise impacts on this receptor would also be negligible. As a result, no adverse noise impacts are expected at the property</p> <p>The air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses receptors which are located within 200m of the Scheme's affected road network and where the effects of changes in traffic on air quality are greatest. The assessment has included the property in the operational phase modelling. Pollutant concentrations at the receptor have been predicted under two scenarios, Do Minimum (without the Scheme) and Do Something (with the Scheme). The modelling demonstrated annual mean pollutant concentrations at this location are predicted to be 19.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> in the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) which is well below the air quality objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant. Further to this, the impacts of emissions from construction equipment, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFY-K	Construction	What measures will be put in place to minimise disruption to Winthorpe during the construction phase?	2H	N	<p>During the construction phase, construction traffic would be prohibited from using Gainsborough Road. Access along this road would be restricted to staff cars for personnel undertaking ad-hoc inspections of the electrical equipment at the bottom of the embankment off the A1.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>Where practicable the number of closures has been reduced using offline construction methodologies (for example at the A1/A46 Crossing) to reduce the disruption to the travelling public.</p>
ANON-559H-RWS6-W	Construction	Concerned due to living so close to the A46/A1, construction will disrupt daily routine.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concern expressed by the Consultee. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, businesses, and road users as far as practicable. Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> and the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, would be managed and monitored. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures, and monitoring, and general best practice construction practice.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV5-Y	Construction	Having gone through years of problems with roadworks in and around the town the thought of further disruption is not good. Every effort must be made to minimise inconvenience.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ) would be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and would aim to minimise disruption to the travelling public during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new A1/A46 Crossing. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.
BHLF-559H-RWZS-1	Construction	In peak situations the current road network just about copes. In the event of an incident on any surrounding road, traffic ground to a virtual halt surrounding Newark. I have concerns about the disruption from construction traffic. I suggest you post information about disruption to other traffic users at the appropriate time and detail possible diversion. At pinch points traffic lights to enable a fair flow of traffic may be a consideration.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>Measures that would be taken by the Applicant to reduce and minimise construction disruption include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offline construction of the bridge deck for the new A1/A46 Crossing</li> <li>• Phasing construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Using traffic management to maintain two-way traffic flow during the daytime on the A46</li> <li>• Agreeing diversion routes with the relevant highway authorities and not signing diverted traffic through Newark-on-Trent</li> <li>• Accessing construction sites directly from the existing A46 or from the nearest route from A46 junctions</li> <li>• Keeping overnight closures to a minimum and notifying stakeholders and residents of these in a timely manner</li> </ul> <p>Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Further information regarding construction traffic can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant would provide regular updates on the Scheme throughout the construction period using the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as newsletters and public information events. The aim of this community engagement is to ensure that the Applicant can address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and mitigate impacts related to the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN5-Q	Construction; Land ownership	<p>ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS TO [redacted] DURING CONSTRUCTION INCLUDING OUR SEPTIC TANK</p> <p>It is worth highlighting that the septic tank for [redacted] sits on the land that is currently within the proposed boundary of the road, on farmland opposite our land registry boundaries, over Lowood lane. The legal deeds for the property grant [redacted] and its residents access to this land for maintenance and emptying of the septic tank, which is below ground level. A working septic tank is essential to life at [redacted] and access is necessary 24/7. This facility cannot be blocked off.</p> <p>At the moment it looks like no consideration has been given to this. As impacted landowners we have highlighted this issue to [redacted] - the community liaison officer at Skanska - who asked us to flag this issue here.</p>	2H	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment from the Consultee and the Order Limits have been revised to remove the land with the septic tank as shown in the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ). Access would be available to the septic tank during the construction of the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Construction; Climate	Where will your build material come from? Is it feasible for the borrowpit material to be used to construct the highway? If material is sourced from elsewhere, what will be the carbon mileage?	2C	N	<p>The Applicant has identified suitable locations for borrow pits within the Scheme Order Limits as defined within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. If there is a surplus of materials required following detailed design quantities, then materials and specialist fill would be imported.</p> <p>Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, outlines the broad sources of materials to be used by the Scheme, such as soil (site won material and imported fill), aggregates (sand, gravel and crushed rock) and manufactured products (precast concrete). Further details of the main types and estimated quantities of construction materials required for the delivery of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, assesses greenhouse gas emissions relating to the transport of materials to site. The transport of materials during construction is estimated to contribute 30,001 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, which equates to approximately 21% of the total construction carbon emissions. This follows the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors guidance and assumptions on the transport of materials to site, where actual supplier information may not be known.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNU-Q	Land ownership; Construction	<p>Access. Access to and from [redacted] must remain freely available to us at all times during the construction period. The lane that runs from the rear of our property to the gated entrance on Farndon Road is only means of entry and exit for some of our vehicles. We use this access regularly. This is the lane that runs alongside the Farndon Unit and business park on Farndon Road leading down to the river.</p> <p>This gated entrance and lane is the original access to our mill and amenity land.</p> <p>We intend to lay an electricity cable from our property to the gateway of aforementioned lane on Farndon Road. It was proposed during a meeting with [redacted] that we would be provided with a plan/drawing of where best to lay this cable. We obviously wish to avoid laying the cable only to have it dug up during your construction works.</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and advises that access to this property would be maintained during construction either by an escorted access along the temporary haul road or via existing routes.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue discussions with the Consultee with regards to the alignment of the electricity cable referenced in their response in order to agree a suitable alignment.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW33-T	Construction; Congestion	Once work has commenced, I assume that it will cause some congestion, to Newark in the town, sees a volume of traffic, especially if there is an accident on A1 or A46 and traffic being diverted into Newark on B666 Lincoln Road, this can cause great delays, or at the Cattlemarket Roundabout, plus the railway crossing, which holds up traffic for several minutes, causing chaos in the town.	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>Measures that would be taken by the Applicant to reduce and minimise disruption include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offline construction of the bridge deck for the new A1/A46 Crossing</li> <li>• Phasing construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Using traffic management to maintain two-way traffic flow during the daytime on the A46</li> <li>• Agreeing diversion routes with the relevant highway authorities and not signing diverted traffic through Newark-on-Trent</li> <li>• Accessing construction sites directly from the existing A46 or from the nearest route from A46 junctions</li> <li>• Keeping overnight closures to a minimum and notifying stakeholders and residents of these in a timely manner</li> </ul> <p>Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Further information regarding construction traffic can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWD8-G	Construction	We are very concerned about some aspects of the works to be done with regard to the Windmill Viaduct areas as our property is within 150 yards of the existing bridge.	2B	N	<p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Further information can also be found in the following chapters; Chapter 2 (The Scheme), Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health).</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment would be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Construction noise mitigation would be provided in the form of site hoardings, equipment control, and where necessary adjustment to equipment usage and working hours.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Before construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> a Traffic Management Plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the local road network.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. Further details on the temporary traffic management measures for implementation during construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> and details of the traffic impacts of construction can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW33-T	Construction; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Once work is about to commence on the new road project, you may find that you require further land for parking earth moving equipment, storing materials or further temporary buildings to be erected for use as offices, workers canteens, etc.</p> <p>Please contact me on [redacted] re HMRL Land Title: [redacted] If any part or all of the field may be suitable for your requirements.</p>	2I	N	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges the offer from the Consultee.
BHLF-559H-RWDU-D	Construction; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Large construction vehicles need to be made aware of residents and local car users, especially on Farndon Road and Fosse Road, maybe a 20 mile per hour restriction.</p> <p>Are construction sites situated away from the flood plains?</p> <p>Are flood plains going to be monitored and no sites placed there?</p> <p>Are construction sites to be cleared of all rubble et. and restored to original condition. No bits of plastic, cones and road signs left?</p>	2C	N	<p>Construction traffic would be subject to the requirements of the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> that will be produced in consultation with the local highway authority, in which temporary speed limits would be agreed. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> has identified the local roads which would have permitted, prohibited or restricted access. Construction traffic would not be permitted to use Farndon Road or Fosse Lane, past the Crees Lane junction.</p> <p>The main compound where the offices would be placed is located within the site of the old Nottinghamshire County Council highway depot. The north section is within the floodplain. Much of the work on the Scheme is within the floodplain therefore a Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken to determine the floodplain compensation measures required. The assessment is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which includes information on the mitigation developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Construction	<p>I am also concerned about road closures and how I will be able to get to work and go about my daily life while the road is being constructed. For example, I access the A46 before 6am. Having road closures in place and where the road does not open again until 6am will cause much inconvenience.</p> <p>The fact that this will take 3 years will cause a considerable amount of disruption to residents.</p>	2C	N	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Construction	18. Will key roads in the vicinity be closed before 6am? Given the geographical situation of Winthorpe village, what thought has been given to ensure residents can go about their daily lives and travel in the area without incident? Will it be the case that certain routes will be closed off at certain times?	2C		The Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ) would be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and will aim to minimise disruption to the travelling public during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new bridge crossing the A1. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period and would not require road closures.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNQ-K	Traffic forecasts	7. How much traffic will use Brownhills Junction at opening year? And how much traffic will use it 5, 10, 15 and 20 years after Scheme completion? How much of this traffic will be HGV and heavy goods? Please provide these figures as actual numbers rather than as a percentage.	2B	N	<p>As part of the traffic modelling work carried out on the Scheme, detailed within Chapter 6 (Forecast Network Performance) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, forecasts have been carried out for the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043).</p> <p>Traffic figures were modelled at intervals in alignment with the Department for Transport's guidance. All values are in annual average daily traffic and bidirectional. The results are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the A46 mainline in 2028 leading to Brownhills Roundabout with the Scheme, 5,300 heavy good vehicles annual average daily traffic is forecast. The total vehicles annual average daily traffic for that location is forecast to be 42,000</li> <li>On the A46 mainline in 2043 leading to Brownhills Roundabout with the Scheme, 5,400 heavy good vehicles annual average daily traffic is forecast. The all vehicles annual average daily traffic for that location is forecast to be 49,700</li> </ul> <p>This is in line with the Department for Transport guidance. Further information relating to the use of Brownhills Junction is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> including HGV vehicles.</p>
ANON-559H-RWTX-Z	Congestion	<p>For residents of Newark the traffic situation has gradually deteriorated with hold-ups and longer journey times; especially on a Friday and any weekend in summer!</p> <p>We have been asking for the bottlenecks of the Cattle market and Brownhills roundabouts to be removed for some time</p>	2B	N	<p>The traffic modelling work that has been carried out for the Do Minimum scenario demonstrated that without improvements to the A46, there would still be significant delays on the A46, including at the Brownhills and Cattle Market junctions.</p> <p>When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNT-P	Traffic forecasts	I do not think that the Scheme will have the benefits proposed for the A46 Newark, especially when the additional roundabout junction with the future southern link road is included. Although on day one some benefits may be realised for local routes, the project does not offer network resilience in the area and the benefits are predicated on increased future traffic volumes. This increased traffic may not affect the A46 directly but is likely to have a negative impact on the joining local and national road network. For example, the development of the Newark Showground areas, coupled with increased 'pull' of the A46 is predicted to increase traffic on the A17 substantially. This has not been included into the improvements and is likely to directly impact the Friendly Farmer roundabout, bringing quickly back to the current capacity and affecting the flow of traffic on and off the A1 southbound slip roads.	2H	N	<p>Traffic modelling, detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, shows that the Scheme would reduce the delays on the A46 considerably.</p> <p>At the Friendly Farmer Roundabout, the mainline A46 traffic would be reduced significantly making it easier to access the roundabout from the other arms. There would be an increase in flow along the east to west route of the A17-A46-A617. This is a result of the A46 traffic bypassing this section of the network, resulting in a reduction in opposing traffic and delay for traffic using the A17-A46-A617 corridor.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some reassignment of future traffic flows onto the A17 as a result of segregation of A46 traffic at the Friendly Farmer Roundabout however it is anticipated that this would result in improved journey times. Traffic modelling work carried out as part of the Scheme shows that traffic flow and journey times would be significantly improved at the Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken and the conclusions reached can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Southern Link Road; Traffic forecasts	Southern relief road will lesson traffic anyway.	2C	N	<p>Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasted that in the Do Minimum modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Junction. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Southern Link Road; Traffic forecasts	Wait and see if southern relief road improved traffic flow first.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Newark Castle level crossing	We can see that congestion will be mitigated on the A46 north to south. I will have to turn right into Newark where the railway level crossing is a major source of congestion within the town itself will remain to some extent though may be lessened.	2B		<p>The Scheme would provide a new grade separated junction at Cattle Market Junction, with the widened A46 elevated to pass over the existing Cattle Market Roundabout. The existing roundabout would be enlarged beneath to provide increased capacity.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme includes the Newark Castle level crossing. The traffic modelling indicates an improvement in conditions on Great North Road as a result of the upgrade to the Cattle Market Junction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3V-W	Newark Castle level crossing	The Scheme considered for development and change does not take into account the biggest cause of congestion in the area - the level crossing at Newark Castle. This was highlighted when the barriers were automated and congestion on the A46 and in Newark become several times worse over night.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWWB-D	Newark Castle level crossing	Work with national rail to reduce amount of time barriers are down at castle level crossing, to alleviate congestion.	2D		Further information on forecast modelling is detailed in the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4).  An additional lane would be provided southbound to provide stacking space and prevent the queue that currently extends into the existing Cattle Market Roundabout.  Improving Newark Castle level crossing is not required by the Scheme, as the Scheme would not worsen or change the existing situation in relation to crossing operation and safety. Therefore, the Scheme is not required to mitigate the current delays caused by Newark Castle level crossing. Newark and Sherwood District Council have advised the Applicant that they are discussing improvements to the crossing with Network Rail.
BHLF-559H-RWZY-7	Newark Castle level crossing	If the Cattle market junction (Brownhills) are going to become more popular but the level crossing cannot be altered, there might be congestion through more traffic at both roundabouts.	2H		
ANON-559H-RW8P-V	Newark Castle level crossing	I recognise that his comment is outside the scope of the current project proposal, but the other major contributor to traffic during peak hours is the queue caused by the level crossing near Newark Castle station, as it crosses Great North Road. If National Rail and/or highways could create some kind of bridge such that the road does not close for trains, this would remove further traffic from the town, and the Cattlemarket roundabout.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWN2-M	Congestion; Road layout	I am pleased that you are proposing a flyover at the Cattle Market roundabout to separate the traffic using the A617 and A616 coming into Newark. Also, the traffic will be separated from that using the Brownhills roundabout. This will significantly reduce congestion.	2B	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RW8P-V	Congestion; Road layout	The proposed improvements to the road will be an excellent improvement to the area once completed. Traffic often grinds the whole town, not just the bypass, to a halt. This happens so regularly that many nearby residents regularly avoid Newark town centre during Thursday and Friday afternoons because of the traffic. During morning peak hours, many also choose to drive through the town, rather than around the bypass, as a result of the traffic.  The project will be great for the town as a whole; it will do far more than improving the traffic or the roads. Having a functional bypass that doesn't regularly become a carpark will mean that through-traffic will stick to the bypass, resulting in the town centre being a far better place to be.	2B		

## N.4 – Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 - Community

### N.4.A: Construction

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQU-T	Construction	I have no strong views on these proposals my only serious concern is that the inevitable disruption should be minimised as much as possible and that the work should be completed as rapidly as possible.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>Measures taken by the Applicant to reduce and minimise construction disruption include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offline construction of the bridge deck for the new A1/A46 Crossing</li> <li>• Phasing construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Using traffic management to maintain two-way traffic flow during the daytime on the A46</li> <li>• Agreeing diversion routes with the relevant highway authorities and not signing diverted traffic through Newark-on-Trent</li> <li>• Accessing construction sites directly from the existing A46 or from the nearest route from A46 junctions</li> <li>• Keeping overnight closures to a minimum and notifying stakeholders and residents of these in a timely manner</li> </ul> <p>Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Further information regarding construction traffic can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The construction impacts of the Scheme are assessed on a topic-by-topic basis in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) submitted with the development consent application. The assessment of impacts to the community and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (including the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape, and visual amenity impacts).</p> <p>The human health element of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income, access to green space and recreation. It concluded that there were no impacts on human health, or amenity during construction. However, the diversions put in place during the construction period are likely to have significant adverse impacts on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 for 24 months.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment conducted for the Scheme is provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme to minimise and mitigate the effects of the Scheme, including reducing impacts and effects upon local visual receptors and to aid landscape integration.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme throughout construction using the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as newsletters and public information</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Construction	If this would go ahead, please consider the effects on residents in town. The waterworks was a nightmare for congesting town and deterring people from coming here.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEJ-3	Construction	I think it's a great idea for the roads to go over the roundabout so traffic flows. I didn't see anywhere what the impact on traffic and congestion would be whilst the road was being built and also what types of contingency is in place for road closures?	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWM7-R	Construction	my biggest concern is around the disruption that's inevitable and how long the project will take	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW35-V	Construction	Very unsure about disruption during building period.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Construction	Disruption to town during construction	2B		
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	Construction	Construction always has impact.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWBN-4	Construction	I also worry about what will happen to traffic flow whilst the proposed changes are in construction.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW6A-B	Construction	Town centre Newark will be grid locked once the work starts as people will look for alternative routes to get them onto the A46 at the Farndon roundabout. I certainly go through the middle of Newark when traffic is slow on the A46.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	Construction	My other concerns are to avoid even more serious delays of journeys due to the proposed road works.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWBN-4	Construction	I also worry about what will happen to traffic flow whilst the proposed changes are in construction.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Construction	I also object to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the considerable adverse construction impact on local residents.</li> </ul>	N/A		
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Construction	You are proposing major disruption to the people of Newark during construction and then afterwards by the visual intrusion of the structure, for the benefit of transiting traffic.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWE8-H	Construction	I am sure that the end result will be a great improvement- it will be while the work is being carried out there will be lots of queues and congestion.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWB6-C	Construction	I am concerned that these plans are going to be ongoing for quite a few years. The traffic jams on the A1 and the A46 and then through Newark can be terrible to say the least. What plans have you to mitigate the effect of these on the community?	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWDF-X	Construction	I wish to object to the proposal to change the A46 bypass at Newark. The alterations will create great difficulties for the residents of Newark and the surrounding area for years while this huge project is undertaken. It will not benefit the town either, but just cause huge disruption.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RW6A-B	Construction	As a local resident and big user of the A46 I just hope traffic is going to be allowed to flow at a steady pace when works are ongoing. Be conscious of works elsewhere on surrounding roads to minimise impact with the 3+ years' timeline for this work to be completed. I am not looking forward to the disruption even for the gains the expansion provides.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWE7-G	Construction	The scheme looks good but ANY road works / closures in newark causes great disruption. When the sewer works took place at peak times getting through newark (from the cattle market roundabout to bottom of beacon hill less than 2 miles) would easily added 30 minutes	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		onto my journey. I understand you will want to keep disruption to a minimum but I feel that this will not be possible and it will cause HUGE disruption to the town of newark.			<p>events. The aim of this community engagement is to ensure that the Applicant can address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has and will continue to engage with the local highway authority, Nottinghamshire County Council, so that that any impacts of construction projects in Newark-on-Trent can be coordinated to reduce the impact of roadworks on the local community where possible. This is detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p> <p>In addition, collaborative communications to shared stakeholders would be coordinated by the Applicant and the local highway authority, to reduce confusion and maximise information sharing for the duration of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further information on engagement that has taken place and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment would be managed and monitored. It sets out commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction, including on access to services health and social care; and access to green space and recreation.</p> <p>These measures are secured in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport</p>
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Construction	avoid diverting traffic through town where possible.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWTE-D	Construction	Just be chaos whilst work is carried out. Because of river there is nowhere to divert traffic- so it goes through Newark- *A50A*- lights are always a pinch point at peak times. Road up to castle does not move!	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads through Newark-on-Trent, including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road. More details on the volume of flow decreases are available in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to remove congestion at the junctions of the A46 that link to the local network and the main carriageway. In turn, this would alleviate pressure on Newark-on-Trent and reduce the significant adverse effects on the local network.</p> <p>Improvements for local residents also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, which connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>For an overview of the Scheme design, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAK-Z	Construction	Overall very positive. A swift and very organised site will be required to reduce impact. The impact currently is very damaging to business so speed to start is needed.	2I	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments regarding the positive outcomes presented by the Scheme and the current impact the existing A46 bypass traffic issues have on business in the area.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>As detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, a delivery programme has been developed for the Scheme which anticipates the main construction works to span three and a half years, commencing in 2025, with works being completed and the Scheme being open for traffic in 2028.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, businesses, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> a Traffic Management plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network. The Traffic Management Plan would be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW74-Y	Construction	As a Farndon resident, I am obviously also very concerned about a very long period of disruption while the by-pass project is underway. Farndon is a tricky place from a	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee is concerned about the Scheme and the potential impact it could have on access to Farndon.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>topographical point of view in that the position of the Trent effectively means that there is only one way to get out of the village.</p> <p>Heading south down the Fosse &amp; onto the A46 will not be a problem but for those many journeys (almost all of ours, given that my partner uses the A46 flyover every day for his commute) in the opposite direction, I think the disruption will be pretty horrendous.</p> <p>Yes, there is a rat-run through Hawton &amp; into town/&amp; potentially onto the North or to Lincoln that way, but the dog-lend bend on a tiny historic bridge which barely takes 2 car-widths is far from ideal &amp; would probably require traffic lights, thus creating more queues &amp; daily delays. I have thus gone from being broadly in support of the project to my current position, which is that I am far from sure that it is worth the cost &amp; disruption. I cannot see that anything could be put in place to mitigate the disruption for Farndon residents who need to use that stretch of road every day to get to work, etc.</p>			<p>All existing accesses into and out of Farndon would be retained during construction and operation of the Scheme, including the Farndon Road and Fosse Way access onto Farndon Roundabout, access onto the A46 at Syerston and access to the existing local roads (Lodge Lane, Hawton Lane and Moor Lane).</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>The traffic management measures would maintain the two-way traffic, during the daytime, on the A46 as well as using a phased approach to the construction of the new junctions to maintain the existing traffic movements.</p> <p>Overnight closures would be required on the A46 to undertake works such as pavement tie-ins and bridge beam installation, however these would be kept to a minimum. The dates of the closures and details of the diversion routes would be notified to stakeholders and residents in a timely manner, as detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>). The Applicant would seek to minimise the number of full closures required.</p> <p>Construction traffic would not be permitted to travel along the Fosse Way, past the turning into Crees Lane and therefore it is not anticipated for there to be any disruption on this route heading south and onto the A46.</p> <p>A temporary construction vehicle holding area would be provided as identified in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) and Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) such that deliveries to the Windmill Viaduct (identified on Work No. 4, Work No. 5 and Work No. 7 as shown on the Works Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.3</b>)) do not cause queuing traffic along Cree's Lane and back onto the Fosse Way.</p> <p>Hawton Lane is not a designated construction traffic route and is not included within the Order Limits of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and further mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Construction	<p>Very worried about the noise and dust during the construction of the roadworks. At the moment we can hear a constant thumping thudding noise coming from the cattle market area, and we are in Winthorpe. I believe they are pile driving?</p> <p>If we can hear that much noise from so far away, what is it going to be like when it is so near?</p> <p>Also worried about access to and from the village during the building of these roads and flyovers.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee. The thumping noise referred to is believed to be related to the precast concrete pile driving that was taking place at the site of the development for the new Air and Space Institute building, south of Cattle Market Roundabout on the Great North Road in October and November 2022.</p> <p>During construction of the Scheme, noise mitigation would be provided including site hoardings and construction plant usage measures. These mitigation measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. With mitigation in place, there are no significant adverse effects for construction anticipated in Winthorpe.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills northbound exit slip road through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means, such as dampening down surfaces in dry conditions, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. There are not expected to be significant air quality effects at nearby receptors during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>During the construction phase, construction traffic would be prohibited from using Gainsborough Road. Access along this road would be restricted to staff cars for personnel undertaking ad-hoc inspections of the electrical equipment at the bottom of the embankment off the A1.</p> <p>Where practicable the number of closures has been reduced through use of offline construction methodologies (for example at the A1/A46 Crossing) to reduce the disruption to the traveling public.</p> <p>Overnight road closures of the A1133 would be required to complete the pavement tie-in works at the Winthorpe Roundabout, however these would be kept to a minimum. Advance notice of these closures will be made including details of the diversion routes.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and further mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Land ownership; Population and human health	The disruption to the villagers of Winthorpe will be immense. I believe compensation for house price devaluation. The lack of access to and from village, and noise pollution and dust should be considered and also rates reduction for living on a noisy building site while work is being carried out. I doubt any of this will be done and we will just have to suffer!	21	N	Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Population and human health	I only hope the Scheme will be as presented and not have too major an impact on Winthorpe village.	21	N	The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to their concerns in the vicinity of Winthorpe village. Environmental proposals required to mitigate the Scheme are a commitment within the development consent application and therefore have to be implemented to ensure the Scheme complies with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. In order to mitigate the effects to Winthorpe village, permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form of noise barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means, such as dampening down wet surfaces. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). There are not expected to be significant air quality effects at nearby receptors during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>Where practicable the number of closures has been reduced through the use of offline construction methodologies (for example at the A1/A46 Crossing) to reduce the disruption to the travelling public.</p> <p>Overnight road closures of the A1133 would be required to complete the pavement tie-in works at the Winthorpe Roundabout, however these would be kept to a minimum. Advance notice of these closures would be made including details of the diversion routes.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3M-M	Construction	I am concerned about traffic problems congestion etc while work is being carried out. Also concerned about noise and problems from construction traffic near my home – of [redacted] Handley court off Bargate/ Northgate	2B	N	<p>The Applicant's intended construction traffic route for construction vehicles accessing the Nether Lock Viaduct would be via Lincoln Road and Trent Lane. Construction traffic would not access the viaduct via Bar Gate and North Gate. This is detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) and Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The construction phase will be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) a Traffic Management plan will be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network. The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) submitted with the application. Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) and details of the traffic impacts of construction can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), specifically, Chapter 2 (The Scheme), Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health).</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The Population section of the assessment assessed land requirements; changes in access to private property and housing, businesses, community assets, farms, and walking, cycling and horse-riding assets; and amenity impacts. There was found to be no significant adverse impacts on access to private property, businesses, or community receptors during</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>construction and operation. It considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>The human health aspect of the assessment also assessed the impact on the Scheme on access to local services, changes in the provision of green space and recreation, social cohesion, and employment and income. It concluded that there were no significant impacts on human health either during construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No adverse effects for noise are predicted at Handley Court as a result of that assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7K-P	Construction	Three years of noise, dust, disruption, negative impact on the environment, spiralling costs will not be minimised by additional measures. It will be a nightmare	2D	N	<p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The construction phase will be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> a Traffic Management plan will be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> submitted with the application. Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> and details of the traffic impacts of construction can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, specifically, Chapter 2 (The Scheme), Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health).</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The Population section of the assessment assessed land requirements; changes in access to private property and housing, businesses, community assets, farms, and walking, cycling and horse-riding assets; and amenity impacts.</p> <p>The human health aspect of the assessment also assessed the impact of the Scheme on access to local services, changes in the provision of green space and recreation, social cohesion, and employment and income. It concluded that there were no significant impacts on human health either during construction or operation of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNJ-C	Construction	The health and environmental impact on Newark residents during construction will be high.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEP-9	Construction	Have a 24/7 workforce to complete the job quicker.	2D	N	Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides details on the construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Construction	<p>We hope that if planning is agreed the actual building of the road is given great consideration, and not just the end product.</p> <p>Things like working patterns so weekend and evening are not filled with noise, dust will be suppressed and access routes are kept open. There are a large number of residents who will be impacted by the road build, we need to be able to live with it not just afterwards but during the build too please. Our homes are our places of escape and should not become places of despair.</p>	2B		<p>Works will be largely undertaken during daylight hours with core construction working hours being from 07:00 to 18:00 on weekdays and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Exceptions to these hours may be required to accommodate activities such as installation and removal of traffic management, installation of bridge beams, abnormal load deliveries, such as bridge beams or large items of plant.</p> <p>Any work required to be undertaken outside of core hours (not including the exceptions, repairs or maintenance) would be agreed with the relevant local authority prior to undertaking the works.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Construction	what will working hours be and what days will construction take place?	2H		
ANON-559H-RWE8-H	Construction	<p>Will the work be carried out 24 hours a day?</p> <p>Newark is such a hub of activity any disruption on any of the roads leading up to the Cattle market roundabout causes chaos and long tail backs, night time working would reduce some of that.</p>	2D		<p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information on construction methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable and the existing lane provisions and junction connections would be retained throughout the construction period. Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> and details of the traffic impacts of construction can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme. Noise mitigation including site hoardings and construction plant usage measures would be in operation during the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means, such as dampening down surfaces in dry conditions. The mitigation measures relating to dust are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. With these measures in place there are not expected to be significant air quality effects at nearby receptors during the construction phase. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWTE-D	Construction	<p>Only congested at certain points in the day</p> <p>Main concern</p> <p>5 years to complete!</p> <p>nowhere to divert traffic to whilst works take place!</p> <p>Farndon island- improvements took lengthy time- have achieved nothing! Roads were closed every night for months- unacceptable. Will be a nightmare for 5 years.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, a delivery programme has been developed for the Scheme which assumes the main construction works would commence in 2025, with works being completed and the Scheme being open for traffic in 2028. These dates represent the key milestone dates for the Scheme.</p> <p>To minimise the disruption caused by construction of the Scheme, the Applicant expects that certain works (referred to as advanced and pre-commencement works) would need to be undertaken ahead of the main construction works to allow these works to proceed, and to optimise the overall delivery programme for the Scheme. Advanced works would primarily comprise archaeological investigations, diversions of statutory undertaker's plant and demolition of buildings, as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The advanced, pre-commencement and main construction works is anticipated to last 3.5 years.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>A phased approach to construction of some sections of the Scheme, particularly at the new and modified junctions, would be adopted, with phasing determined by the requirements for temporary traffic management on existing routes and the need to minimise disruption to the travelling public, residents, and businesses.</p> <p>In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>Construction methodology was a key consideration in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the A1/A46 Crossing. Construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBA-Q	Construction	If the company who constructed the duelling of the A46 from Newark to the M1, Balfour Beatty, are chosen as contractors, there should be no major problems associated with the construction with regards to site establishments or dirt creation or unnecessary hold ups with regards to traffic management, it all seemed to work out on the contract as named above.	2C	N	Comments noted by the Applicant. Skanska was announced as the contractor for the Scheme in August 2022.
BHLF-559H-RWFT-E	Construction	Disruption is going to happen; I would suggest southern Newark relief road needs to be tied in prior to construction works begin.	2D	N	<p>The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road into consideration in traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme, where the Southern Link Road is included in 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after opening). Where the Southern Link Road is proposed to join the A46 south of Farndon, the modelling has shown that an additional lane is required on the new Southern Link Road roundabout to account for potential A46 traffic growth in 2043. Through statutory consultation with Newark and Sherwood District Council, they have agreed to place this additional lane on the roundabout as part of the Southern Link Road implementation. Information on the traffic modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9Z-7	Construction	What is the timescale? When does serious physical work commence?	2H	N	Table 2-3 within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> sets out an indicative construction programme scheduling timing of works. Subject to the receipt of development consent for the Scheme, advanced works are due to commence in October 2024, enabling works would commence in January 2025 and main construction works are due to commence in the summer of 2025. The year the Scheme is open to traffic is expected to be 2028.
ANON-559H-RWSB-9	Construction	<p>The last time there was works there was no signs saying that Farndon road was closed. This is my route home so I would never know if they are working or not until I get there.</p> <p>It would be helpful to have signs up the A1 around a mile out to let people know what is closed and when.</p> <p>I did contact the highways agency about this but no change happened. It would also be good to have a good alternative route if you are working in the day or try to work mostly at night time to minimise delays.</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> details how closures will be communicated to people and businesses impacted by the Scheme. Signage notifying road users of upcoming closures will be used well in advance and on connecting roads as far as possible, to enable drivers to make informed decisions or follow the proposed diversion route.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Construction	<p>Ensure that construction negative effects are kept to an absolute minimum. As villagers we are going to have our lives disrupted which noise, dust, change and traffic flow.</p> <p>where will construction village be sited? who can we contact if we have issues during the construction period?</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>The Scheme requires a main construction compound and smaller, satellite compounds within the Order Limits prior to, and to facilitate, the main construction works. The proposed locations are shown on Figure 2.4 (Location of Temporary Works Areas Required During Construction) contained within the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main compound would be established at the site of the old Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Maintenance Depot site.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan prior to construction as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to ensure that anyone who is interested in the Scheme is fully informed on its development, especially prior to and throughout the construction process. The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and further mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has a dedicated Customer Contact Centre, available 24/7, that can be contacted via telephone (0300 123 500) and email (A46NewarkBypass@nationalhighways.co.uk) for any queries or issues relating to the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	Construction	I regularly travel early mornings (2-3am) and late at nights on these roads to get to work in Nottingham, I'm worried that the roads will close when I need to use them for shift work.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>Closures of the A46 would be undertaken at night between the hours of 21:00 and 05:00. Signed diversion routes would be in place during these closures and the proposed routes are indicated in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>. The closures will be communicated via the National Highways website in advance supported with advance notification signs on affected routes.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Construction	Please provide more information about the impact of the construction work on the Kelham Road area.	2H	N	<p>Kelham Road would be a restricted access route during the construction period and would remain open for residents and businesses.</p> <p>Access to the site compound at the old Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Depot along Kelham Road would be for pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers only. During the pre-commencement works stage, vans and small plant would use Kelham Road to access the field access track at the end of the driveway between Number 35 and 39 Kelham Road.</p> <p>There would be construction activities on the Great North Road between the Kelham Road junction and the Cattle Market Junction to deliver the widening works to the Great North Road.</p>
ANON-559H-RWS1-R	Construction	<p>I live in Averham and at a recent consultation at the Fox in Kelham we were advised about the scheme to extract aggregate from around Kelham and Averham to use in the construction of the new road.</p> <p>My concern is regarding the increased traffic of heavy lorries having to use the bridge on the A617 at Kelham. This bridge is very narrow and there are frequent hold ups when two HGV's</p>	2D	N	<p>As part of the Applicant's application for development consent, it is proposed to lower the ground in locations within the fields to the north of the A617 between the villages of Kelham and Averham to create floodplain compensation areas for the Scheme, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The excavated material from these areas would be transported to the soil stockpile areas on the northern end of the Scheme between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		try to cross on the bridge. Also the bridge has been damaged on a number of occasions resulting in traffic having to be diverted onto the A616 causing extensive congestion. As you will need to cross this bridge whilst transporting the aggregate is there a way of making the bridge easier to negotiate?			The need for specific interventions, such as temporary signal control, would be assessed and reviewed with the local highway authority during the development of the Traffic Management Plan for the Scheme in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR0100765/APP/3.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Construction	The Fleet is an attractive stream which runs through the village, how will this be saved and protected from construction. Small minnows help feed the egrets and kingfisher.	2C	N	<p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has assessed the Scheme's impacts to The Fleet in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Appendix 8.8 (Invertebrate (Aquatic) Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> details desk study data of notable species recorded in The Fleet within the survey area. The Fleet is hydrologically linked downstream of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the implementation of embedded mitigation detailed within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, no impacts are anticipated on The Fleet (including The Fleet, Winthorpe Local Wildlife Site and The Fleet, South Muskham Local Wildlife Site. Both Local Wildlife Site designations have been scoped out of further assessment and are only detailed as the desk study in the baseline section of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Protected species surveys have been undertaken along all accessible water courses within the survey area and are detailed in the appendices of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The Scheme would result in the unavoidable widening of the existing culvert of a small length of a tributary of The Fleet, adjacent to the northbound A46 carriageway and service stations. The impacts to protected species (including fish, egrets and kingfisher) and mitigation are detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> with further information of survey results detailed in Appendices 8.1-8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. This includes standard pollution prevention measures (dust and noise management, air pollution control measures), soil management and general construction best practice, resulting in a negligible impact on the watercourse. Appendix 13.4 (The Drainage Strategy) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> would result in the Scheme having no operational impact on the watercourse quality.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD5-D	Construction	<p>Logistics UK welcomes and fully supports the A46 Newark Bypass scheme proposal to widen 6.5km of the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway and provide two lanes in each direction between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts near Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>As the only remaining single carriageway section of this key strategic trunk road serving the East Coast ports, road freight operators will welcome the improved journey time reliability the bypass will provide for efficient logistics operations in this area of the A46 corridor.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the A46 and A1 will remain open during daytime hours, and whilst we recognise the need for occasional overnight closures, it is vital that all overnight closures are well publicised and that suitable diversion routes able to accommodate the largest heavy goods vehicles are put in place. Information about the diversion must be made available online and to commercial satellite navigation systems supported with clear roadside signage, and this information must be made available as soon as possible to ensure freight operators have sufficient time to plan alternative routes to minimise adverse operational impacts.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of its development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>A phased approach to construction of some sections of the Scheme, particularly at the new and modified junctions, would be adopted, with phasing determined by the requirements for temporary traffic management on existing routes and the need to minimise disruption to the travelling public, residents, and businesses.</p> <p>In accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will, in consultation with the local highway authority, be developed into a Traffic Management Plan to</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>About Logistics UK</p> <p>Logistics UK is one of Britain's largest business groups and the only one providing a voice for the entirety of the UK's logistics sector. Our role, on behalf of over 20,000 members, is to enhance the safety, efficiency and sustainability of freight movement throughout the supply chain, across all transport modes. Logistics UK members operate over 200,000 goods vehicles - almost half the UK fleet - and some one million liveried vans. In addition, they consign over 90 per cent of the freight moved by rail and over 70 per cent of sea and air freight</p>			<p>be approved by the Secretary of State for Transport with the aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction.</p> <p>The traffic management measures would maintain the two-way traffic, during the daytime, on the A46 as well as undertaking a phased construction approach for the new junctions to maintain existing traffic movements.</p> <p>Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the A1/A46 Crossing. Construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>Overnight closures would be required on the A46 to undertake works such as pavement tie-ins and bridge beam installation, however these would be kept to a minimum. The dates of the closures and details of the diversion routes would be notified to the stakeholders and residents in a timely manner.</p> <p>Works would be largely undertaken during daylight hours with core construction working hours being from 07:00 to 18:00 on weekdays and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Exceptions to these hours may be required to accommodate activities such as installation and removal of traffic management, installation of bridge beams, abnormal load deliveries, such as bridge beams or large items of plant. Any work required to be undertaken outside of core hours (not including exceptions, repairs or maintenance) would be agreed with the relevant local authority prior to undertaking the works.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to ensure that anyone who is interested in the Scheme is fully informed on its development, especially prior to and throughout the construction process. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and further mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has and will continue to engage with the local highway's authority, Nottinghamshire County Council, so that any impacts of construction projects can be coordinated to reduce the impact of roadworks on the local community where possible.</p> <p>In addition, collaborative communications to shared stakeholders will be coordinated by the Applicant and the local highway authority, to reduce confusion and maximise information sharing for the duration of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further information on engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3B-9	Construction	The proposed construction access via Trent Lane off Northgate needs to be via traffic lights at the junction. Already this is a difficult and dangerous junction and adding construction traffic can only increase the danger.	2H	N	<p>Access to the land parcels to the southern side of the River Trent at Nether Lock is currently limited and restricted. Currently, access to the land between the Nottingham to Lincoln railway line and the A46 carriageway is via a narrow stone track between the Kings Marina and the hydroelectric power station at Nether Weir. This track is unsuitable for large construction plant as there are several constraints including low bridges and access through an operating marina.</p> <p>A temporary bridge would be constructed over the River Trent to provide a suitable construction access route. Access to the temporary bridge crossing would be via Trent Lane, Maltkins Lane and through the temporary compound area to the southern side of the River Trent. The existing access track between the Kings Marina and the hydroelectric power</p>
BHLF-559H-RW7H-K	Construction	Access to the site and compounds at neither lock will severely affect traffic at the Northgate/Trent Lane Junction. This is already a problem. Traffic lights should be installed.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWAP-5	Construction	How will traffic accessing the proposed compound at Nether Lock? Access to Trent Lane from Northgate is already problematic. How will local residents' safety be assured? Will deliveries be limited to daytime Mon-Fri only?	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Construction	None, however for the people who live on the estate...	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Access for construction of the new bridge and road building will probably be made from Lincoln Bridge Road, Trent Lane, Malt kiln Lane and then private sections of Malt Kiln Lane and Trent Lane, and probably also from Kings Marina northwards towards Elbow Bridge along the west side riverbank walk.</p> <p>This will mean traffic congestion at the Trent Lane/Lindon Bridge Road junction (do we need traffic lights?) and dust dirt noise disruption and perhaps loss of footpath access for all of us for about 3 to 5 years. This will particularly affect the houses on Kings Sconce Avenue that back onto Hoval, and Rearview/water's edge houses that back onto the river.</p>			<p>station would need to be utilised in the pre-commencement works phases to facilitate the construction of the west abutment of the temporary bridge.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that using Trent Lane off Northgate for access is an area of concern by some stakeholders when construction of the Scheme begins. As detailed in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>, appropriate mitigation measures would be in place, such as restricted delivery times for large plant, so that construction activities do not impact peak hour traffic.</p> <p>While it is not currently possible to specify precisely what traffic control measures would be implemented in this location, under Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>, a Traffic Management Plan will be produced in consultation with the local highway authorities and stakeholders such as emergency services, with an aim of minimising disruption to the travelling public during construction. This will consider the safety of other road users and pedestrians alongside the routes and where necessary segregated routes and traffic signals would be used to separate construction traffic from walkers and cyclists and also manage the flows through junctions to prevent congestion.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be produced must be in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>. As such, this plan will build on and comply with the commitments made in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice and safety.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme. Works would be largely undertaken during daylight hours with core construction working hours being from 07:00 to 18:00 on weekdays and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Exceptions to these hours may be required to accommodate activities such as installation and removal of traffic management, installation of bridge beams, abnormal load deliveries, such as bridge beams or large items of plant.</p> <p>Any work required to be undertaken outside of core hours (not including the exceptions, repairs or maintenance) would be agreed with the relevant local authority prior to undertaking the works.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to ensure that anyone who is interested in the Scheme is fully informed on its development, especially prior to and throughout the construction process. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on Population and Human Health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts).</p> <p>The assessment considered access impacts to private property and housing during construction and operation of the Scheme. No significant population or human health effects to any private property or housing, including at Kings Sconce Avenue were identified. Access would be maintained throughout the construction period.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					The assessment assessed access impacts to walking and cycling routes during construction and operation. No significant access impacts were identified for users of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes Newark Bridleway BW5 and Newark Bridleway BW6.

N.4.B: Design

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	A17	I am concerned of the A17 link does not appear as a major link road junction (still). It is a main east coast road junction. It does not appear to flow. There should be far better adjoining links without stopping (too many roundabouts). Can't the A17 flow straight onto A1 and A17?  I currently would join using Coddington. And looking at plan would continue to. There is no A17 improvement.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee and confirms that the traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing is forecast to reduce the amount of traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout thereby improving traffic flows. For this reason, the existing road layout at these roundabouts has been retained.  Access to the A1 northbound or southbound from the A17 (via the Friendly Farmer Roundabout) would be made easier as a result of the Scheme therefore improvements to the A17 are not required. The traffic modelling undertaken shows that even though traffic flows are likely to increase on the A17, driver delay is expected to decrease with the Scheme, with the most significant decrease occurring on the A17 northbound approach of Friendly Farmer Roundabout.
BHLF-559H-RW9G-M	Road layout	I felt that a direct connection/ slip road into A1 would have been a good idea rather than have to go through roundabouts	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee and confirms that the traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing (to accommodate the new A46 alignment, bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) is forecast to reduce the amount of traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout thereby improving traffic flows. For this reason, the existing road layout at these roundabouts has been retained.
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	A17/A46	Flyover / Sliproad from A46 to A17	2D	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee and confirms that the traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing is forecast to reduce the amount of traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout thereby improving traffic flows. For this reason, the existing road layout at these roundabouts has been retained.  There is no requirement for grade separation or a slip road from the A46 to the A17. The traffic modelling undertaken shows that even though traffic flows are likely to increase on the A17, driver delay is expected to decrease with the Scheme, with the most significant decrease occurring on the A17 northbound approach of Friendly Farmer Roundabout.  Access to the A1 northbound or southbound from the A17 (via the Friendly Farmer Roundabout) would be made easier as a result of the Scheme therefore improvements to the A17 are not required.
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	A17/A46/A1	This scheme should not be looked isolation whilst looking at the traffic flow around Newark, it should be reviewed along with the A1 and A17 and A46. The excuse that it can't be because each road has a separate budgets is ludicrous, this scheme needs a far more joined up approach.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees. Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.  The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	A17/A46/A1	The proposed scheme completely ignore the junctions with the A1 and the A17, and will be doomed to failure because of this.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWXN-T	A17/A46/A1	The proposal will not help traffic joining A46/A1 from A17 - in fact it will make it worse, as junction will be even more complex - This is a major pinch point.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	A17/A46/A1	Proposed A46 to A1 North Junction looks more complicated than needed, with added roundabouts. Why not use opportunity to sort out the whole A4/a17/a1 junction, which is an accident waiting to happen at every rush hour, with queueing traffic, particularly on the A1, both north and south.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWSZ-1	A1/A46	The route from travelling north on the bypass to the A1 south looks very convoluted. That is a route I use quite a lot.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the most significant decrease occurring on the A17 northbound approach of Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Access to the A1 northbound or southbound from the A17, which connects to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout, would therefore be made easier. Improvements to the A17 are therefore not required as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Traffic modelling assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic (2043).</p> <p>Accessing the A1 both northbound and southbound from the northbound A46 involves one extra roundabout at the new Brownhills Junction. This new roundabout at Brownhills Junction would provide safe access to the adjacent property and removes the need for the Brownhills Junction slip road to pass underneath the A46 at an acute angle. Signage would be installed, and road markings improved as part of the Scheme to assist drivers to understand the new road layout at junctions. Further details can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6A-B	A1/A46; Brownhills Junction	unsure why the slip road at Brownhills roundabout goes to a new roundabout. The majority of traffic looking to get on the A1 North are going to have to navigate around this roundabout and then still try and merge onto the A1 through the always busy Brownhills roundabout. I think the slip road at Brownhills should allow for traffic to merge into the A1 North sooner rather than adding an extra roundabout into the equation.	2B	N	<p>The new A46 exit slip road at Brownhills Junction would be constructed to link the northbound A46 to the existing Brownhills Roundabout. This slip road would incorporate a new roundabout in order to provide access to the adjacent properties on Winthorpe Road and a link to Brownhills Roundabout.</p>
ANON-559H-RWMN-F	A1/A46	The A46 / A1 roundabout proposals at Brownhills may need to be reconsidered, based on the number of vehicles using this junction to access the A1. Instead of using 2 roundabouts currently, this will now require 3 roundabouts to be used, and the roads proposed do not seem to be of sufficient magnitude to accommodate the vehicles wishing to access the A1, both north and south. Could there be a slip road considered off the A46 improvements to directly access the A1?	2B		<p>A slip road from the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction was considered when developing this area but was discounted as the existing slip road has sufficient capacity and a new slip road would move traffic closer to the adjacent farm, require the underpass to be widened and remove a 200m section of existing vegetation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSH-F	A1/A46	The A46/A1 junction's only benefit is the A46 flyover over the A1, the rest of the junction's turning movements are extremely poor. The A46 Northbound to A1 Northbound movement should be free-flow, instead an extra roundabout has been added meaning two roundabouts and a tight slip road must be negotiated for this movement and vice-verse for the southbound.	2B		<p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> shows that the new A1/A46 Crossing would reduce traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and improve traffic flows.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	A1/A46	Proper sliproad access from A46 to the A1 - northbound in particular	2D		<p>Modelling also shows that the majority of traffic looking to access the A1 north continues to travel up Great North Road to join the A1 at North Muskham. A slip road being introduced directly onto the A1 from the new A46 exit slip road at Brownhills Junction would impact the landowners on Winthorpe Road.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWGS-E	A1/A46	The junctions of the A46 and A17, also linked to an Industrial estate and close to the A1 (North and South) and to the a46 Newark Bypass have always to my mind (as a former Coddington resident) been badly planned from the outset. Even with the addition of a new link to the A46, it is still complicated and will probably cause more confusion to out of area motorists who are travelling to the East Coast of Lincolnshire for business or recreation. I'm still of the opinion that a link to the A1 (North) needs to be made from the bypass to the A1(N) as indicated by the broken line (image in Freepost Response form 97).	2H		<p>Improving the A1 southbound entry slip road would require additional land acquisition as well as the removal of existing established vegetation, which would have a negative environmental impact. Due to the additional land requirements, environmental impact and cost, the existing road layout (that requires road users to access the A1 northbound from the Brownhills Roundabout and A1 southbound from the Friendly Farmer Roundabout) has been retained.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBY-F	A1/A46	Not sure of design of A46 offslip arrangements, and then roundabout, for traffic joining A1 North. Surely this can be better designed to create a smoother A46/A1 North interchange rather than having 2 roundabouts and then using existing A1 on slip?	2B		<p>Introducing a slip road off the A1 southbound prior to the new bridge A1/A46 Crossing would have an adverse environmental impact on Winthorpe village due to potentially increased noise and vibration and the removal of established woodland. It would also potentially require the demolition of the existing Esso Service Station.</p>
ANON-559H-RWET-D	A1/A46	I believe in general the plan looks good and is positive, but I do believe you need to again at the brownhills A1 windthorpe roundabout area again to see if a better solution is available. In particular the south bound traffic on the A1 accessing the A46 would it not be possible to have a slip road off the A1 prior to the newly proposed A46 flyover so to merge traffic heading to Lincoln diverting it away from the roundabout (existing) this is just one issue I see here. There are multiple issues with this area, this is just one. I don't expect a reply but take it from me who travels this road regularly that I don't see the problem with southbound problems at this area going away	2B		
ANON-559H-RWMQ-J	A1/A46	There has been no consideration for improving the A1 access/exit areas, which are often insufficient and cause extensive tailbacks on the A1. Is it assumed that removing A46 through traffic from Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts is going to solve the A1 problems? It is also regrettable that these 2 roundabouts are being retained in their present form.	2B	N	<p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme, prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme..</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	A1/A46	There is another element of the Newark bypass that does not seem to have been considered: The existing junction from the A1  Because of the design layout there are regular queues and hold ups on the A1. This is dangerous. The short term solution is simple, add another lane to the left of the existing where there is the space.	2B		<p>The existing road layout, that requires road users to access the A1 northbound from the Brownhills Roundabout, has been retained as well as the road layout at the A1 southbound exit slip road onto Friendly Farmer Roundabout. The reasons for this are explained further below.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWEG-Z	A1/A46	The second is the junctions onto and from the A1 - these are already the cause of frequent accidents and delays and it is not clear that this A46 scheme provides for significant improvements to all 4 on and off ramps to and from the A1, This really needs to be reconsidered.	2B		<p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing, there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions to understand how the new flows and turning movements at these junctions would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts to optimise their operation, such as changes to signing and road markings.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on the A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.</p> <p>Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	A1/A46	*Lack of joined up thinking*	2B		
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	A1/A46; Friendly Farmer Roundabout; Congestion	The main issue creating congestion on the Friendly Farmer roundabout is the fact that we have A1 slip roads both north and south bound that are not long enough to hold any decent amount of queuing traffic and as we know this has resulted in serious accidents. This roundabout is also very poorly marked out and again not fit for purpose as anyone who doesn't know the area finds it difficult to follow the lanes due to poor road signs.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWW2-W	A1/A46	Accessing the south bound A1 from the A46 coming north is going to be pretty complex, now involving 3 extra roundabouts – and is accessing the north-bound A1 from the Winthorpe direction. As an older driver I would view using either of these accesses as dauntingly challenging for a driver unfamiliar with the layout. However, one appreciates the complexity of the situation and the improvements which the scheme offers.	2B	N	<p>Accessing the southbound A1 from the A46 involves one extra roundabout at the new Brownhills Junction.</p> <p>Accessing the A1 northbound from Winthorpe would require using the newly designed Winthorpe Roundabout and single carriageway link to Friendly Farmer Roundabout (Friendly Farmer Link Road), then the existing slip road to the A1 north from Brownhills Roundabout.</p> <p>Signage would be installed, and road markings improved as part of the Scheme to assist drivers to understand the new road layout at junctions. Further details can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	A1/A46	why is traffic to the A1 North directed to the Brownhills roundabout instead of being directed along the A616?	2H	N	<p>The signage strategy for the Scheme has been discussed and agreed in principle between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council, as the local highway authority. It is agreed that traffic signing would remain as existing to encourage users to utilise the strategic road network and not divert along local roads. This design has been created in accordance with The <i>Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions</i> design standards for which all signs on within the United Kingdom are designed to on public highways.</p>
ANON-559H-RW67-1	A1/A46	<p>The proposed provision for traffic leaving the northbound A1 to head towards Lincoln on the A46 is seriously inadequate. It involves negotiating the existing tight turn-off from the A1, joining the Brownhills roundabout, driving up the existing road to the Friendly Farmer roundabout, then up a new single carriageway road to the Winthorpe roundabout, where it will have to give way to traffic from both north and south before actually joining the A46.</p> <p>This route is used by numerous HCVs, other business users and leisure users like myself who need to access the growing south-western part of Lincoln or continue up the A46.</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) shows that the new A1/A46 Crossing is forecast to reduce traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and improve traffic flows. Therefore, the existing road layout that requires road users to exit the A1 northbound and enter the Brownhills Roundabout has been retained.</p> <p>Traffic modelling assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years post opening (2043) and forecasts that the single carriageway (Friendly Farmer Link Road) would not experience significant delays and therefore no capacity issues are anticipated for normal operation of the road as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Traffic flow forecasts for HGVs at Friendly Farmer Roundabout are expected to decrease as a result of the Scheme. The forecast also shows that a decrease in HGV traffic is expected on the A46 between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout in 2028 and 2043.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.  The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both the opening year of the Scheme (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043). Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	A1/A46 Crossing; Brownhills Junction; Noise and vibration	The bridge over the A1 is raised higher than it needs to be as is the new Brownhills roundabout. If both these are lowered they will have less impact on the environment. Noise levels experienced should be reduced.	2B	N	The A1/A46 Crossing is set at the minimum height that is allowed for the structure. The clearance beneath the new bridge over the A1 is very similar to the existing crossing, however due to the large span across the A1, the depth is much greater, which raises the road alignment crossing the A1.  The elevation of the A46 at Friendly Farmer Roundabout cannot be lowered due to the required height of the new A1/A46 Crossing.  Since the preferred route announcement, the location of the A1/A46 Crossing has been optimised with the revised alignment of the A46 dual carriageway, to move it further away from Winthorpe village as part of the ongoing development of the Scheme design.  This has reduced the impact of the crossing on the Winthorpe estate and Winthorpe village in terms of noise, air pollution and visual impact.  The potential impacts upon the Winthorpe Open Break have been assessed as part of the broader Landscape Character Assessment of Winthorpe village and farmlands, which is considered to have a large adverse effect during construction and Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic), reducing to a moderate adverse effect by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening).  Mitigation to reduce any adverse visual and cultural heritage effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west between Lowwood area and the A1, in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. As a result of this planting, any views of the new bridge should be reduced to glimpse views over time. In addition, noise barriers and bunds would be provided to mitigate noise from the A46 and yield no adverse effects for noise in Winthorpe.  Further details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents further details on the assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes).  Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> details the landscape proposals for the Scheme, including the location of landscape bunds and noise barriers.
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	A1/A46 Crossing	Lower the road at the Friendly Farmer	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW6K-N	A1/A46 Crossing; Noise and vibration	The scheme design in general looks good to me. My only concern is with the new bridge crossing the A1 near Winthorpe (letter O). There is no mention of how high or noisy this will be, or what noise mitigation could be used. Additionally, this construction is significantly closer to the village than any other or existing roads. I would have preferred the bridge to be further south and further away from the end of the Spinney.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	A1/A46 Crossing	* Winthorpe Open Break* The A46 -A1 flyover would take up a large amount of land and would be contrary to the Open Break designation in the NSDC Local Plan. A recent review of the Winthorpe Open Break confirmed they serve a good purpose and should be maintained. The new A1 flyover system would entail impinging on the Open Break.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	A1/A46 Crossing; Landscape and visual effects	We are very concerned about the planned new bridge which will cross the A1. It seems far too high and far too close to Winthorpe. There is an open field which should be wooded to buffer Winthorpe from the road. There appear to be no screens to block the site of this hugely tall bridge from the village. We are worried about noise pollution which is already very bad from the A1. We are worried we will see this bridge from our house windows. We are worried that it will ruin the village feeling of the village.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	A1/A46 Crossing; Noise and vibration; Air quality	My concerns to the proposed preliminary design are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed elevation and bridge over the elevation are too high. The bridge height should not exceed the height of the existing bridge due to excessive road noise and pollution.</li> </ul>	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWZ8-6	A1; Winthorpe Roundabout	We fell the entire eastern A1 section needs a redesign or some improvement as it is already unfit for purpose.  We are also deeply concerned with the Winthorpe roundabout in particular not only in regards to the roundabouts general layout, but also with it passing through the centre of the existing roundabout, especially as this is currently home to a very old rookery.  We would rather see the roundabout relocated or redesigned with this in mind.	2B	N	With regards to the eastern A1 section of the Scheme design, the current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> , forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing, there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.  The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both the opening year of the Scheme (2028) and 15 years on (2043). Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As the latest Winthorpe Roundabout design has evolved, it has also minimised impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained.</p> <p>There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season. The availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland (once established) would support the rookery, details of which can be seen in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWMQ-J	Brownhills Junction	<p>I was very satisfied with the option 2 proposals previously published. The latest document now includes an extra roundabout to provide access to properties north of Brownhills, and it is looking awfully like a last minute solution to an earlier oversight.</p> <p>Of course these properties do need access, but putting an extra roundabout for the A46 to A1 traffic is not a sensible solution considering the high levels of HGV traffic and the necessary hard right turn this roundabout will demand.</p> <p>Please restore the earlier proposal of a smooth link to Brownhills under the new carriageway. Access to the properties north of Brownhills could be better achieved through a link running parallel to the new road joining Brownhills roundabout, or perhaps to the A1 access road. The traffic involved is almost certainly light, and would not seriously inconvenience either of these positions.</p>	2B	N	<p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is needed in order to retain access into the properties on Winthorpe Road. The roundabout has been designed to cater for use by HGVs.</p> <p>The previous smooth link exit slip road design from the A46 to Brownhills Roundabout referred to by the Consultee, was presented as Option 2 at an earlier iteration of the Scheme design during the options consultation.</p> <p>This provided a direct link to Brownhills Roundabout and had a tight curve which passed beneath the new A46 carriageway. This was approximately 300m further west compared to the current roundabout design and required a high embankment alongside it which would have had more of an environmental impact on Winthorpe estate and Winthorpe village.</p> <p>In the previous design iteration, the access to the properties on Winthorpe Road was from Winthorpe estate within subways beneath the new A46 and slip roads.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3C-A	Brownhills Junction	<p>I was one of those who suggested that the plan should be a mixture of the two proposals. I thought that the extra mini roundabout was an unwarranted complication and that the road should be as far away from Winthorpe as possible.</p>	2B	N	<p>Introducing the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction into the Scheme design has removed the need for these subways and reduced the height of the A46 embankment and provided a safer alignment for the slip road by removing the tight curve.</p> <p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction has been designed to allow HGV vehicles to manoeuvre it easily, albeit at lower speed which reduces the noise impact on adjacent properties and Winthorpe. Various alternative options were considered during initial stages of the Scheme design, however the layout at Brownhills Junction has been included within the Scheme due to the reasons set out above.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVG-H	Brownhills Junction	<p>Re. the sliproad onto the A46 from Brownhills roundabout (M) - I was told at the National Highways presentation that this would be a single carriageway. What's going to happen to the rest of the width of the current road, given that it's roughly wide enough to carry three lanes? Could this not be better utilised somehow?</p>	2B	N	<p>The A46 entry slip road at Brownhills Junction would utilise the existing A46 carriageway, retaining the full paved width, which is currently two lanes wide. The new slip road would be a single carriageway, with the remaining paved width providing a hard shoulder as per the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> design standards and specifications document, which is the national standard for road design.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6D-E	Brownhills Junction; Congestion	<p>Point N. I think the introduction of a roundabout would cause more congestion, could you not introduce a slip road to the [redacted] - Winthorpe road, they currently have access to the farm via Winthorpe so would it not be logical to leave it that way? The introduction of a roundabout on a sliproad there would cause a back up of traffic, which would result in the same kind of carnage that is currently there. Other than that point (N), the plans seem splendid.</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling assessed current and future traffic flows on the Scheme. Modelling included the opening year (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043).</p> <p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity.</p> <p>As part of the design refinement, the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction was included within the modelling and this shows that queues would not develop on the new roundabout due to the low number of vehicles accessing Winthorpe Road. Traffic modelling shows that queues at Brownhills Roundabout would decrease in length with the Scheme in place.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction would improve the alignment of the Brownhills Junction exit slip road and lowered the A46 embankment at this location for a length of around 300m compared to the previous preferred route announcement design.</p> <p>A slip road to Winthorpe Road from the A46 carriageway would not provide the required access needed to the residential and business properties in this area.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Brownhills Junction; Landscape and visual effect	<p>The newly proposed Brownhills Junction roundabout is described in the documentation as a 'small' roundabout but is shown on the General Arrangement drawings as about 50m in diameter. This is bigger than any of the existing Brownhills, Friendly Farmer or Winthorpe roundabouts. Why does it have to be so big? Indeed why does it have a standard circular form when 99.9 % of the traffic on it will be from the slip road to Brownhills roundabout? The only traffic on the southern sector will be visitors to the [redacted].</p> <p>This roundabout and connector to Brownhills Roundabout is shown elevated about 2m above the existing ground level, presumably because of the flood risk. This has raised the level of the main route embankment to a height of 8m at the slip road overbridge and 10m at the A1 bridge. This produces a significant visual impact in the area, notably the new A1 bridge will be 2m higher than the existing crossing. Why?</p>	2B	Y	<p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is needed in order to retain access into the properties on Winthorpe Road. The roundabout has been designed to cater for the use of HGVs. The roundabout would reduce the speed of traffic leaving the A46 and introduce a safer right turn underneath the new A46 to Brownhills Roundabout compared to a slip road. With regards to the roundabout size and shape, this has been designed in accordance with design standards and specifications of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 – Geometric design of roundabouts</i>.</p> <p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) is one of the factors that has informed design decisions. The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction was included within the modelling and forecasts that queues would not develop at this location due to the low number of vehicles accessing Winthorpe Road.</p> <p>The A1/A46 Crossing is set at the minimum height that is allowed for the structure. The clearance beneath the bridge is very similar to the existing crossing, however due to the large span across the A1, the depth is much greater, which in turn raises the road alignment crossing the A1.</p> <p>Following the preferred route announcement, the proposed location of the A1/A46 Crossing has been optimised with the revised alignment of the A46 to move it further away from Winthorpe. This has reduced the impact of the crossing on the Winthorpe estate and Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. The results have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. The assessment is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) which includes information on the mitigation developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The level of the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction accounts for flood risk requirements, and has been lowered following positive results of flood modelling to minimise environmental impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects of the A1/A46 Crossing would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, between Lowwood area and the A1 in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. As a result of this planting, any views of the new bridge should be reduced to glimpse views. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Brownhills Junction	<p>My concerns to the proposed preliminary design are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new east bound A46 slip road to the new [redacted] roundabout needs to be revised.</li> <li>The roundabout can certainly be reduced in diameter size and built at ground level and not the proposed 2M elevation.</li> </ul>	2B	Y	<p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is needed in order to retain access into the properties on Winthorpe Road. The roundabout has been designed to cater for the use of HGVs.</p> <p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is designed to reduce traffic speed leaving the A46 and introduce a safer right turn underneath the new A46 to Brownhills Roundabout compared to a slip road. The roundabout size and shape has been designed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> design standards and specifications document.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. The</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					assessment is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> , which includes information on the mitigation developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.  The level of the roundabout accounts for flood risk requirements and has been lowered following positive results of flood modelling to minimise environmental impacts.
ANON-559H-RWBT-A	Traffic lights/signals; Road layout	Pedestrian traffic lights near the A1 a17 A46 are totally unnecessary	2B	N	Traffic signals, used as part of pedestrian crossings, are required to provide a safe crossing point for all user groups due to the high levels of traffic on them. These signals are required to provide a safe crossing point on the dual carriageway between the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts for walking and cycling user groups.
BHLF-559H-RWF2-C	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction	Cattlemarket roundabout could be sunk to minimise visibility of flyover.	2D	N	The Cattle Market Roundabout needs to remain at the existing level as this forms part of the flood defences for Newark-on-Trent, which is discussed in the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .  Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> is one of the factors amongst others that informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout. These queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes were made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling.  Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including that associated with the Cattle Market Roundabout are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .  The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Biodiversity; Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction	The roundabout (cattle market) leading to the Great North Road has a number of trees growing on it, but are plagued by ivy. They need a knowledgeable person with experience to remove this ivy and deal with the roots of it as well.	2E/2F	N	The existing trees and ivy would be removed at Cattle Market Junction to form the new central island beneath the elevated A46. These would be replaced with a larger area of mixed trees and shrubs to provide replacement habitats and screening to the grade separated junction. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWBN-4	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Traffic lights/signals	I think that something needs to be done in the short term to improve traffic flow. It would be so easy to put traffic lights on the A46 roundabout near the old cattle market/ sugar beet factory, since there is power there already for the pedestrian crossing. This would help significantly with traffic flow (some routes struggle to get on the roundabout at busy times) and traffic speed (traffic often goes too fast, I have seen numerous incidents there, some attended by police and my son had an incident there in July 2022 which was not attended by police).	2D/2H	N	The current layout of Cattle Market Roundabout does not have sufficient space to safely queue vehicles around the roundabout if traffic signals were installed. Therefore, installing traffic signals would cause further congestion at the roundabout than currently exists. The Scheme would remove the amount of through traffic at Cattle Market Roundabout due to the new A46 grade separation. Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> shows the impact of the new A46 alignment on the road network.  An accident assessment has been undertaken and this shows that a decrease in the predicted number of accidents and casualties over a 60-year assessment period. This indicates that there are forecast to be around 494 fewer accidents and 685 fewer casualties a result of the Scheme over the 60-year period. A Road Safety Audit has also been carried out for the Scheme and is summarised in Chapter 4 (Road Safety) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Landscape and visual effects	As I said earlier don't build it or you will be forever guilty of creating an absolute horrific blot on the landscape that future generations and now will loath you for I don't care that myself and other drivers can shave a few mins off there journey time I dont want this blight to go ahead plus I dont think it will encourage more people into the town as they would come anyway in fact the enterance to the town side would be so ugly it would put me off coming in as instaad of looking like a gateway to an histyoric mkt town it will look like a motorway fly over a nasty industrial city .	2H	N	Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> is one of the factors amongst others that informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes were made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues identified by the traffic modelling.
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction;	Unsightly flyover near historic castle.	2H	N	Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including that associated with the Cattle Market Roundabout are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Landscape and visual effects				<p>The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure, wherever possible. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Cattle Market Roundabout would continue to serve as an important entrance to the town. The tree-lined avenue on the approach to Newark Castle station would not be impacted by the Scheme. Newark Castle is visible once south of the roundabout at present and views of the castle would not be impacted. Newark Castle has not been assessed as having a significant effect, as a result of the Scheme, as assessed in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction	Obviously something needs doing - it's horrendous, especially on a Friday! I really like the flyover aspect - very well designed. I travel to Stevenage a lot and go over the black cat roundabout and what a disaster that extension was as they widened the road, but there's more and more cars, resulting in nothing; thus the flyover is excellent.	2B	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Landscape and visual effects; Construction; Population and human health	Flyover over the old cattle market roundabout will be an eyesore and it's construction time will adversely effect local businesses in Newark.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> is one of the factors amongst others that informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes were made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> as part of the development consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme. The construction phase will be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will be developed into a Traffic Management Plan which will be consulted on with Nottinghamshire County Council, the local highway authority, and will aim to minimise the disruption to the traveling public during construction by retaining all current lane provisions during peak periods and minimising the changes to temporary junction layouts within the construction phasing. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new A1/A46 Crossing. Construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout have been phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on Population Human Health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The assessment concludes that there are no access, land take, or amenity impacts on residential properties or businesses (bar agricultural). Construction would have significant adverse impacts on users of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 due to the temporary diversion that would be put in place for 24 months to enable the construction to take place.</p> <p>No human health impacts are predicted during construction or operation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before, during and after construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ). Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including that associated with the Cattle Market Roundabout are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ). The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ).
ANON-559H-RW7X-3	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Southern Link Road; Landscape and visual effects	Very concerned about the flyover. Newark's congestion problems are not in dispute but a flyover is surely not the answer. No doubt the southern relief road will reduce a lot of traffic just passing through Newark negating the need for a horrendous flyover which will scar our town. An alternative must be considered urgently.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) is one of the factors amongst others that informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes were made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling. The grade separation would remove the A46 through traffic from the roundabout and therefore reduce delays significantly at the roundabout.</p> <p>The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). The Cattle Market Roundabout would continue to serve as an important entrance to the town. The tree-lined avenue on the approach to Newark Castle station would not be impacted by the Scheme. The grade separated junction would provide views across Newark-on-Trent that are not currently seen by traffic using the existing A46 single carriageway as views of Newark-on-Trent are largely screened by trees. The castle is visible once south of the roundabout at present and views of the castle would not be impacted, details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's reference to the Southern Link Road, this being delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council and will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected in 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road scheme into consideration in the development consent application. Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasts that in the Do Minimum modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Road layout	What kind of central reservation barriers are going to be used? The solid ones used on the existing bypass between Farndon and Nottingham have caused a lot of wildlife deaths due to roadkill. As the wildlife cannot 'run through', therefore, have to run back or are killed by the solid barrier.	2B	N	<p>The central reservation would consist of concrete barriers as this requires limited maintenance and is safer for road users as cross-over accidents are very rare when compared to a steel system.</p> <p>Directional planting detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway. Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole and any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water voles. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7Y-4	Southern Link Road; Traffic forecasts;	Please please re think this and provide an alternative for the traffic congestion. The southern relief road is being built which will take a lot of the through traffic away from Newark therefore easing traffic problems and surely negating the need for an ugly, town landscape ruining flyover.	2B	N	<p>Various alternative options were considered at the initial stages of the Scheme design. Further information can be found in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Landscape and visual effects				<p>The Southern Link Road on its own would not deliver the Scheme objectives as it does not provide connectivity and capacity through to the A46 and A17, to the east of the A1, and does not remove congestion at the existing Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road into consideration in traffic modelling, where the Southern Link Road is included in the 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening) scenarios. The Southern Link Road does relieve some traffic, however, in the Do Minimum scenario (with the Southern Link Road included but not the Scheme) there were still long delays along the Scheme section and therefore the Scheme is still required.</p> <p>Further details of the traffic modelling undertaken can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including that associated with the Cattle Market Junction are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Further information on the landscape proposals is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Southern Link Road	<p>Not building it at all!</p> <p>Dual the southern relief road instead, this will save the building of 2 new bridges over the river Trent, 1 over the river Fleet, 2 over the Nottingham to Lincoln train line and another over the East Coast Mainline train tracks.</p>	2D	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road is being delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>As it falls within 2km of the Scheme, the Southern Link Road is considered by the Applicant within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road into consideration in traffic modelling, where the Southern Link Road is included in the 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening) scenarios. The Southern Link Road does relieve some traffic however in the Do Minimum scenario (with the Southern Link Road included but not the Scheme) there were still long delays along the Scheme section and therefore the introduction of the Scheme reduced the delays along the A46 significantly. This was especially evident at the Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW66-Z	Southern Link Road	Has any thought been put into creating a link road between the a46 and the a1 south of Newark which would reduce traffic at the a17/a1/a46 roundabouts as well as providing a good transport link for the new Middlebeck estate?	2H	N	<p>The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>As the Southern Link Road project falls within 2km of the Scheme, it is considered by the Applicant within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road alignment was shown within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> produced for the statutory consultation to provide context only.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road into consideration in traffic modelling, where the Southern Link Road is included in the 2028 (the year the Scheme is</p>
ANON-559H-RWSN-N	Southern Link Road	Put a road from Farndon roundabout to Balderton.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW89-5	Southern Link Road	An alternative option to provide a new southern link road to Newark should be fully investigated. The potential to divert A1(N) - A46 (S) and A17 - A46(S) needs to be assessed by area wide traffic modelling. Such an option would provide opportunity for a new growth zone south of Newark.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWB8-E	Southern Link Road	Southern bypass probably easier to achieve and arguably better results. A46 bypass would be much less busy if there was a satisfactory alternative route between A46 and A1	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW65-Y	Southern Link Road	Get the southern relief road up and running before A46 works.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW3H-F	Southern Link Road	Why do we need an expensive scheme? I understand the need to keep traffic flowing on the A46. but surely a simple remedy would be to run a relief road from Farndon straight across to the A1 at Balderton.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		This would take a lot of the heavy traffic off the bypass (which is not that old) and negate the need for all those flyovers.			open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening) scenarios. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ). The Southern Link Road does relieve some traffic however in the Do Minimum scenario (with the Southern Link Road included but not the Scheme) there were still long delays along the Scheme section and therefore the introduction of the Scheme reduced the delays along the A46 significantly. This was especially evident at the Cattle Market Roundabout.
ANON-559H-RWB9-F	Southern Link Road	Will the 'Southern Relief Road' be completed before work commences, as this will ease congestion during the upgrade.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8K-Q	Southern Link Road	The scheme design is good for improving this route however I have always favoured a bypass to the South and East of Newark linking up the A46 and the A1 as a more sensible route for a road	2B		
ANON-559H-RW74-Y	Southern Link Road	I would favour waiting for the A1/A46 link road, then assessing its impact on current levels of traffic congestion. If this improves it, then I think there are environmental advantages to cancelling the A46 dualling/flyover project.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWNY-U	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout; Congestion; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Farndon junction, will also become a problem when the southern link road is built with the roundabout for this road only half a mile away, In the near future at cost again to the public purse this set up will have to be looked at again. The close proximity of these two roundabouts will cause hold ups, bad driving practices, noise and pollution will increase for the residents of Farndon.	2B	N	<p>The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road into consideration in traffic modelling for the Scheme, where the Southern Link Road is included in the 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after opening) scenarios. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Southern Link Road does relieve some traffic however in the Do Minimum scenario (with the Southern Link Road included but not the Scheme) there were still long delays along the Scheme section. The introduction of the Scheme would reduce the delays along the A46 significantly. This is especially evident at the Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road roundabout will join the A46 to the south of Farndon Roundabout. The traffic modelling shows that the two roundabouts operate well and the A46 arms of the two roundabouts did not have any delay over 30 seconds in 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic). Therefore, the two roundabouts being so close together would not affect the operation of the road.</p> <p>Farndon Roundabout does not have enough capacity for traffic in its current design to include an extra link for the Southern Link Road. There would also be an impact on existing residential properties near the roundabout.</p> <p>Hawton Road would not connect into Farndon, it is linked to the A46 by the new Southern Link Road.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Solid parapets and a low noise running surface would mitigate noise in Farndon such that it would yield no adverse noise effects in this area.</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion model takes into account the effects of additional emissions generated by standing traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals. The modelling demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors in the vicinity of all of the roundabouts within the Scheme study area are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective in the opening year of the Scheme. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBD-T	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	I am concerned that the Southern Link Road appears to be joining A46 at another point (the logical place would be at the Farndon roundabout) & have heard this will be another roundabout, not a slip road & bridge, due to the extra cost. This seems VERY shortsighted and will cause significant congestion for traffic heading away from Newark, as a lot of traffic heading from Nottingham direction will be turning right across the flow of traffic, towards Middlebeck & A1.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW6C-D	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	The new Newark Southern Link Road will also have a profound on your scheme as this new inadequate single carriageway will jam the A46 at a new roundabout near Farndon. I can envisage transport joining this road to eventually jam the A1 near Farndon and causing chaos at the southern end of London Road in Balderton in their attempt to do new construction and later.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWA8-D	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout; congestion	The Farndon roundabout should also be used for the 'Southern relief road' for Newark instead of a further new junction / roundabout just along the A46 towards Leicester. But planners never think ahead.  The volume of traffic will of course increase consistently and an extra roundabout or junction will cause further hold-ups.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWQY-X	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	My only concern is the Farndon traffic island, there is no provision for the 'new' road across the Hauton Road.  What are you going to do about it??? Don't leave it and have it come back 10 years later!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQB-7	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	The only thing we want to know is when the road from middle beck houses to Farndon roundabout is going to be built is not on your plans.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNP-J	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	Adding an extra roundabout south of Farndon. For the a1 link road sees short sighted. Also that it will only be a single Carriageway that will be difficult to upgrade in the future. I realise that this would require an extended roundabout to incorporate at Farndon but would see preferable than creating a new bottleneck.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-S	Southern Link Road; Farndon Roundabout	Will the proposed traffic lights at the Farndon roundabout affect the proposed roundabout for the southern link road at peak times	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEK-4	Southern Link Road; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion; Farndon Roundabout	Farndon roundabout proposed traffic lights. I think this will still cause traffic congestion instead of free flowing traffic.  You have to consider the A1 to A46 Southern relief road also under planning for construction.  Traffic lights could cause a build up, effecting the new roundabout planned for this new route	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQ4-S	Traffic lights/signals; A1	<p>It is the 'pinch points' that are the key to solving standard traffic. 'Signalised'? does that mean traffic lights? ARE YOU MAD? the last thing needed is stopping the flow</p> <p>1 - need a flyover at Farndon roundabout bearing in mind there is a proposed new road by connecting the A1 south soon ]</p> <p>2 - Brownhills Island causes a standing traffic on the A1 trying to exit. there is one slip road with vehicles waiting for four separate exists - Newark town - A1 - A46 - Lincoln and A17 This should be the main area to address as queuing on A46, all the way back to Farndon beings here there could be even a case for not dualling if just more lanes are seen to these 'pinch points'. I cannot see any improved-on Brownhills that will make a difference.</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).</p> <p>Traffic modelling shows that grade separation is not needed at Farndon Roundabout, however additional measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps (gaps in between the stages of signals where neither arm controlled by the signals are moving) for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.</p> <p>Traffic modelling shows that the A1/A46 Crossing is forecast to reduce traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and improve traffic flows. As a result of this, Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts are predicted to see less traffic flow and no significant delays. This includes delays seen on the A1 slip roads. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW8A-D	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Permanent traffic lights on Farndon Roundabout to allow safe access to Farndon by its resident.	2D	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).</p> <p>Traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout.</p> <p>Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon. This removes the need for yellow box areas as queues would not form around the roundabout.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW34-U	Farndon Roundabout	We have trouble exiting the Fosse Road from Farndon onto the roundabout because of congestion. Hopefully the scheme will alleviate this and particularly the implementation of traffic lights going onto the Farndon roundabout. There should also be boxed areas to be kept clear so that traffic wanting to go into town (on the Farndon road) can access the inner lane and not be held up by cars queuing to get onto the bypass.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8A-D	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Need full time traffic control on Farndon Roundabout instead of Partial traffic lights. Traffic already pulls out onto the roundabout from the A 46 without slowing down nearly hitting cars coming to and from farndon to Newark. This will be even more likely to happen when the A46 is a dual carriageway. Also often stuck trying to pull onto the roundabout to get out of Farndon, (at all times of the day, not just at peak time.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWWD-F	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The roundabout at Farndon is insanelly busy and difficult to access, particularly when traffic congestion builds up at Cattlemarket roundabout. Traffic lights at Farndon will be more welcome.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWA8-D	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	It is a great scheme (and route) that ... recent expensive work on the Farndon roundabout achieving what I do not know, but the traffic lights could have been put in there and then. These are needed at peak times now and every time there is a hold up on the 'bypass'. Friday afternoon is always blocked.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWB9-F	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The flyover at the Cattle market roundabout is essential for traffic flow. Not sure about the traffic lights at Farndon roundabout, as these could cause as many problems as they solve.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQM-J	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	not sure that traffic lights at Farndon roundabout are necessary	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWGR-D	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The only thing I don't understand is the need for traffic lights at Farndon roundabout. surely that will cause more of teh horrendous queues that occur frequently at the moment.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW7S-X	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	I question the need for permanent traffic lights at the Farndon Roundabout	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV9-3	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The Traffic lights at Farndon Roundabout, they must only be on during peak hours, and not at any other time of the traffic flow on the A46 will not improve significantly.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW35-V	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Unsure about traffic lights at Farndon Roundabout.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW6X-2	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	The proposal for traffic lights on the Farndon roundabout need clarifying.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWTW-Y	Farndon Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Why restrict access to the Farndon roundabout by considering traffic lights? I don't find it to be a problem getting onto the roundabout presently, unless the traffic is congested. If the idea of the plan is to ease congestion, then the Farndon roundabout should not clog up with traffic. The Farndon roundabout will now be the bottleneck on the whole new route, or it is the only bit without an overpass, why cause further problems there, by slowing the traffic down?	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVK-N	Traffic lights/signals	Whether timing of traffic lights on north gate and lincoln road need to be adjusted to take account of any additional traffic going through the centre of town to / from the A1 junction and if traffic lights should be added to the junctions out of the north gate retail park	2D	N	These roads are the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council as the highway authority.
ANON-559H-RWE6-F	Farndon Roundabout	Further improvement to Farndon roundabout beyond those proposed.	2D	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).</p> <p>Traffic modelling shows that a grade separation junction or a through-about is not needed at Farndon Roundabout, however measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design to increase capacity and improve safety. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.</p> <p>This also negates the need for local or A46 traffic to go through the centre of the roundabout.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBK-1	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Congestion	More needs to be done to ease congestion at the Farndon Roundabout. It needs a similar intervention to the ones proposed at the other 2 sites. The Farndon roundabout is dangerous and really congested, especially with so many lorries continuing straight on the A46. The excellent interventions at the other 2 roundabouts will be pointless if it isn't happening at the Farndon roundabout too!!!	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBK-1	Farndon Roundabout	Please consider doing more to improve the Farndon roundabout, it is dangerous, over used and needs a proper revision to make sure this whole Bypass project is successful!	2H		
ANON-559H-RWE6-F	Farndon Roundabout; Congestion	I believe an improvement to Farndon Roundabout beyond those proposed are required. Traffic will backup down the A46 towards Nottingham during peak times and an Overpass or similar would stop this from occurring.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWWV-1	Farndon Roundabout	Satisfied with the exception of Farndon roundabout	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEU-E	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	One of the major issues with the current layout is the roundabouts on the A46. .By maintaining the roundabout at Farndon, even if it is enlarged, simply does not make sense. I realise the overhead power pylon is an issue, but surely there must be a way of creating a straight through road similar to the proposal at the cattle market roundabout or moving the A46 away from the pylon altogether.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWT1-S	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	Agree with the proposals except the Farndon roundabout. Couldn't the scheme be extended to allow throughput of traffic on A46 in place of the roundabout? or a throughput roundabout instead? I believe the congestion will simply move to this roundabout if left largely untouched	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWFT-E	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	I would have a flyover at the Farndon roundabout as well, to alleviate any build up of traffic caused by the signals.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-M	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	Farndon roundabout has been a massive congestion area and will be far worse without an underpass or flyover to more traffic away from Farndon and surrounding areas.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWW2-W	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	I would prefer a flyover at Farndon roundabout, especially with the addition soon of another roundabout/junction nearby to the sun for the proposed southern bypass. We are still likely to face queuing at busy times.	2B		
	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	I do think that an extra flyover at Farndon should have been included in the plans.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8Y-5	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	Local traffic at Farndon roundabout could do with been separated from bypass.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-M	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Congestion	The issue of the Farndon roundabout has NOT been addressed. The current roundabout is a MASSIVE congestion area NOW. when the proposed route is put in place the Farndon roundabout will BECOME a severe hold up and the current problems WILL get far worse.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		A flyover or an underpass is required to take the pressure off this Farndon area and village which will suffer terribly without either.			
BHLF-559H-RWTC-B	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	A- consideration for a flyover at Farndon roundabout to prevent traffic being held up?	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-M	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	PUT IN AN UNDERPASS OR FLYOVER AT FARNDON ROUNDABOUT	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-M	Farndon roundabout; Road layout	The issue of Farndon roundabout ahs been ignored! Bypass or flyover at farndon is required	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWA5-A	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	I reside in Balderton and regularly travel to Nottingham for hospital appointments.  In general, I think that the Newark bypass proposal is good. However, I feel that the Farndon roundabout proposal is short sighted. The lack of an elevated ""pass through"" of the type proposed for the cattle market junction would be a better long-term solution. I appreciate the complication caused by the overhead electricity service, but this is minor compared with the inevitable bottleneck caused by a roundabout to be used by all traffic.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWAZ-F	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	believe it would be better to have a flyover near Farndon rather than a roundabout as this would be safer and keep traffic flowing.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSP-Q	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	Farndon roundabout is a cop out. You are supposed to be making improvements. This should be grade separated. By adding traffic lights you are making stop-start traffic which is slow. What about night time when it's quiet? People will be stopping at a red light for no reason, whereas as it is now you just drive straight across when it's clear.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEG-Z	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	The first of these is the proposed traffic signal controls at the Farndon Roundabout - I'm afraid this will prove completely inadequate and inappropriate - the A46 should pass elevate over the roundabout as is proposed for the cattle Market roundabout.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBA-Q	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Change the footprint for Farndon Roundabout by expanding the existing pedestrian and cycle facilities to include road under pass for vehicles travelling from villages to Newark, including double deck bus service to the schools from surrounding villages. Replace existing Farndon Roundabout with through dual carriageway and slip roads. At peak times the present roundabout presents a bottleneck for vehicles, with some long tailbacks for the main road through traffic, if the roundabout remains so too will the tailbacks occur.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWWV-1	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	The main omission in this scheme is the non-provision of a flyover at Farndon roundabout. When the A46 was duelled from Wimderpool to Farndon it was specifically stated at the time that Farndon roundabout was designed and constructed in readiness for a flyover for when the A46 was eventually duelled around Newark. It was considered to be necessary then so why is it not now. The scheme eliminates the roundabouts at Winthorpe provides for through traffic on the A46. The one exception is Farndon where the roundabout will continue with traffic lights which will interrupt the throughflow on the A46. There are regular holdups on the A46, particularly from the south, which traffic lights are unlikely to eliminate, whereas there would be continual throughflow with a flyover. The cost of a flyover at Farndon where there is already provision. At the existing roundabout would be relatively small in comparison with the cost of additional bridges over the River Trent (twice). The Nottingham to Lincoln railway line (twice), east coast main line and A1 and a new roundabout and flyover at Cattle market. If you are insistent on not providing a flyover at Farndon then the roundabout should be provided with through flow in the same way as at Winthorpe so as to provide a virtual continual through flow along with the whole scheme. The present proposed scheme for Farndon appears to be a cost saving exercise which will need to be addressed in the future when traffic increases.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWWY-4	Farndon Roundabout; Road layout	Farndon roundabout should be painted with yellow box's now because it is sometimes impossible to get out of Farndon exit when the exit is blocked by vehicles coming off the dual carriageway from Birmingham. Farndon roundabout should be a flyover.	2B	N	Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).  Traffic modelling shows that yellow box areas are not required as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout due to the fact that there are no queues predicted on the roundabout.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					However, measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWBW-D	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	I don't see the need for traffic lights at the show ground end surely this will disrupt the flow of traffic and the very next roundabout at witham st Hugh's has no such traffic lights yet traffic flows freely.	2B	N	The Applicant notes the comments with regards to the layout and operation of Winthorpe Roundabout as part of the Scheme design.
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	The proposed new roundabout layout for Winthorpe looks excessively complicated and I think that it will cause more problems that you are hoping to solve. As a resident of Winthorpe we already experience congestion whenever there is an event on at the showground. If the roundabout was given another lane at the roundabout approaching from Winthorpe so we have a left lane, straight on lane and a right turn lane I think that would free up congestion.	2B		The through-about design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.  The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023.
BHLF-559H-RWQ5-T	Winthorpe Roundabout; Congestion	problems still possible with long tailbacks to showground entrance at opening times	2B		The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> . In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. The design performs well in both the opening year of the Scheme (2028) and 15 years on (2043). Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	I don't think that the arrangements between Winthorpe and Newark will help residents of Winthorpe village to better access Newark, particularly when there is showground traffic tailback on the road towards Collingham.	2B		Other options for the Winthorpe Roundabout design were explored during the development of the Scheme including an enlarged roundabout with five lanes and signalised crossroads however were not considered viable as the five lane roundabout would not comply with design standards and would need 30% more land. The crossroads did not have sufficient capacity and large queues would form at peak times.
ANON-559H-RW3X-Y	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; road layout; Newark Showground	Winthorpe roundabout has been totally underestimated, the idea of traffic lights interrupting the flow of the A46 through traffic is ridiculous. Every time a vehicle from the A1133 or Drove Lane wishes to enter the proposed new junction the flow of the A46 will be disrupted. There will be traffic chaos with tailbacks when events are at the Newark Showground. The A46 Winthorpe junction needs either an underpass or flyover otherwise you are failing to improve the traffic flow and congestion.	2B		Traffic signals at Winthorpe Roundabout are required to help manage the flow of traffic at the junction, especially from the new Friendly Farmer Link Road. Traffic modelling shows signals are not required at the Drove Lane and A1133 arms, as this traffic enters the roundabout when other traffic has been stopped from entering the roundabout by signals.
BHLF-559H-RWZD-J	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	The road layout that is proposed for the Winthorpe layout is absurd. I don't think the through-about layout is going to alleviate the traffic issue we have in the mornings everyday, evenings and weekends (especially on showground days). I believe the traffic priority to the traffic going north/ south on the A46 through-about is going to be worse. I appreciate that it will be traffic light controlled but traffic for locals is going to be worse. There will still be tail backs going through Winthorpe to Newark on the roundabout. A proper solution is to have a flyover or underpass for local/ showground traffic. Also I can foresee that through-about a hot spot for accidents (car) with people jumping the lights.	2B		The Scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit, including the interrogation of personal injury accident data, to consider whether there are any potential safety risks in the areas where the Scheme is forecast to increase traffic levels. The analysis has concluded that the Scheme would improve road safety for users, including at Winthorpe Roundabout. The Road Safety Audit is summarised in Chapter 4 (Road Safety) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWSY-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	I think upgrading the Winthorpe junction at grade is a massive missed opportunity. This will not alleviate the congestion in that area and will lead to long queues on the a46 and other feeder roads.  I feel that the A46 should go in to a fly under at this junction to allow the A46 traffic to not have to stop.	2B		A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and included on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b> . The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.
ANON-559H-RWBT-A	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Road layout	Traffic lights on the A46 dual carriageway at Winthorpe roundabout are a non starter Make the a 46 a flyover.	2B		The Winthorpe Roundabout design alleviates traffic until 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation. Due to the size of the roundabout, however, the layout would not prohibit future grade separation if required.
BHLF-559H-RWQ5-T	Winthorpe Roundabout	Winthorpe 'through about' better than present (flyover best but costly)	2B		
ANON-559H-RWN7-S	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Flyover at winthorpe	2D		
ANON-559H-RWBZ-G	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Roundabout at showground could do with a flyover like the one at Kelham, it gets very congested when the showground is in use.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBV-C	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Have concerns that the 'though-about' at the Winthorpe end appears to be a poor mans bodge. Whilst agreed it will most likely be an improvement, could not a proper, grade separated, junction be built, as with other junctions along the A46?	2B		The through-about design is used throughout the strategic road network and generally works like a standard roundabout. Signing would be used within the roundabout to guide



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWBW-D	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	If traffic from the grainborough a1133 road is expected to be a problem then surely another fly over roundabout would future proof the project and prevent the need of further expensive schemes in the future while improving trade connections with Lincoln.	2B		<p>southbound traffic down to the A1 and Newark-on-Trent or to continue on the A46. The design of all the Scheme roundabouts can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5).</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be utilised to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Newark Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Newark Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Newark Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWTF-E	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Build an elevated A46 at Winthorpe junction	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV6-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	I think the hamburger roundabouts may turn out to be slightly optimistic. What we have here is the potential for a stretch of dual carriageway around Newark with a full stop at each end. A flyover to permit constant traffic flow would seem the obvious answer.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3T-U	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Disappointed that budget didn't allow flyover at Winthorpe	2B		
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Newark Showground	I feel that a better option for Winthorpe roundabout needs to be drawn up to aid traffic flow. The current revised traffic light scheme will improve things moderately on an average day but I feel little consideration has been made for the sheer amount of traffic during the numerous events at Newark Showground. I feel a fly over or underpass is truly the only answer and anything bar that is a cost cutting exercise opposed to one using the facts.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEU-E	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	The second issue is the proposal at the winthorpe roundabout. This also needs a straight through road without being impeded by a roundabout or traffic lights.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	A flyover at Winthorpe should be in the scheme.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWNY-U	Winthorpe Roundabout; Congestion; Road layout; Newark Showground	I think that your design of the Winthorpe junction is wrong ,At peak times plus Events at the showground and holiday,s it will become a bottle neck . causing traffic jams and accidents. This will make traffic pollution and noise to increase inn this area	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Drove Lane; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground	will there be traffic lights at Drove Lane? (when showground traffic is leaving an event this could be very busy)	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWQJ-F	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	putting traffic lights at the Winthorpe roundabout would defeat the whole idea of the project. Approaching them at 70mph not knowing when they will change is also a bad idea. if a flyover is not affordable, then it would be better left as it is	2B		
ANON-559H-RWS8-Y	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion; Road layout	I travel through the area so am not qualified to comment on the proposed route and the local effects. The proposed traffic control on the roundabout at Newark show ground has potential for congestion. Similar junction at Chowns Mill on A45/A6. Joining roads layout very confusing and cars don't keep to lanes due to severity of curves. Flyover or underpass would be better and prevent further re engineering in the future.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWSX-Y	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	I am generally satisfied with the proposed plan, however i feel that it could be improved by putting in a flyover at the winthorpe/showground round about. I feel that the traffic light controlled roundabout will cause unnecessary congestion and safety issues. I feel this junction would be more appropriate being the same as the proposed cattle market junction. For instance the style of junction works well at the Saxondale junction of the A46.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBS-9	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	You're doing it on the cheap, the roundabout at Drove Lane should also be grade separated, I can see confusion and potential for a fatal high speed accident through a46 users not stopping for the lights, either not expecting such a stop on a fast dual carriageway or jumping the lights.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	The proposed through design of the new showground roundabout looks like a deathtrap. Traffic traveling along at speed (50mph limit will not prevent traffic entering the junction at excessive speed ) from both directions stopped by traffic lights? Drivers will miss these and plough through - only a matter of time before someone going round the roundabout is hit.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWFQ-B	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion	The A46 route for automotive is very good, except the show ground round about where a flyover is badly needed - the proposed solution seems a big compromise and will likely cause more delay to traffic from A1133 and A46 outside of peak times due to the lights.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWS1-R	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	Changing the Winthorpe roundabout to a flyover (like the Cattle Market roundabout) instead of lights on the roundabout would keep traffic flow going on the A46.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWE1-A	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	I am not happy with signals affecting the mainline of the A46 at the A1133 roundabout			
ANON-559H-RW85-1	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Road layout	Not sure about the through flow & traffic lights at Winthorpe roundabout; otherwise OK	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Winthorpe roundabout. Please no traffic lights. That will be a disaster, total and utter carnage. It'll be an accident waiting to happen and completely defeat the object of the road improvements.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSP-Q	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Road layout	Winthorpe again is rubbish. Cheap at-grade 'upgrade' with traffic lights. It will make hardly any improvement and traffic will just be queued up at red lights. Not exactly an expressway. Apart from these two roundabouts, the rest is pretty good.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWFZ-M	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion	'S' winthorpe roundabout stupid idea of traffic lights. will cause accidents, back up of traffic and cause a bottle neck of traffic. The traffic from Lincoln to Newark will be queued up to the north of Newark. You will make all the other good work a waste of money and time.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWE1-A	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground; Congestion; Road layout	There are regular queues at the A1133 roundabout as a large amount of traffic enters the A46 from the A1133, the traffic signals approach will still mean queues. We are in the position now (having to dual the Newark by-pass) because of not thinking about the long term view and not building it as a dual carriageway originally. Also there are lots of events at the Newark Showground that often back up onto the A46 which would cause problems if it is a signalised junction rather than grade separated	2D/2H		
ANON-559H-RW66-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground; Congestion; Road layout	I travel from Collingham to Mansfield every weekday. The cattle market roundabout and the majority of the scheme looks fairly straight forward and will make a difference to journey times when complete. However, the showground roundabout is a mess. In the morning there is regularly a queue trying to join the a46 from the a1133, including lots of lorries. From the images it is not clear how the a1133 traffic will join the a46 (Newark bound). Also partial signal control of the road you are trying to remove congestion from seems non sensical. In addition, the times that the Showground is 'emptying out' will cause issues on this roundabout for anyone trying to get Newark bound on the A46. Is there scope to create a flyover at the showground.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Road layout	Winthorpe is somewhat 'boxed in' by definition e.g. Trent, A1 and A46. The new Showground through-about needs to work sympathetically for traffic joining from the A1133 to prevent backing-up. Heaven forbid we return to the days of the LAMMA events at the Showground!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWTG-F	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	Concern over signalisation of Winthorpe Roundabout and delays to traffic from A1133	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWW7-2	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Newark Showground; Congestion	Little confused as to how the proposed Winthorpe round-about will work. I assumed it would have been a proper inter-section. I am concerned about traffic from fairly regular large scalements at Newark showground. Otherwise can see project working very well.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWXX-4	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Congestion	Re the island at Winthorpe. I feel that it is rather complicated, traffic travelling east from Newark to the showground will (or could) cause a long tail back on the road. At present the queue is in the off side line, with the new system they will have to come off on the near side land or completely navigate the island.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	The Winthorpe roundabout does not need to look like Spaghetti junction and become the size of the plans. The A46 as is just needs a slip road to turn off to Winthorpe at the roundabout and not a whole new lane that if people get in by mistake will cause problems and maybe accidents.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWE4-D	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Hamburger roundabout looks like it needs further development but concept appears sound given demands and balance of cost vs grade separation as elsewhere.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWN7-S	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Newark Showground	My only problem is that the winthorpe roundabout not being a fly over and with the amount of traffic from the A46 & Showground will make it impossible to get out of my business.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	My concerns to the proposed preliminary design are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed new Winthorpe roundabout. The substantial enlargement of this roundabout needs to be carefully looked at. Can this not be reduced in diameter size and moved over towards Drove lane.</li> <li>Using the old course of the A1133 to the existing Winthorpe roundabout as a new slip road for traffic wishing to travel A46 east bound towards Lincoln.</li> </ul>	2B		
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Road layout	A flyover should also be included at Witham St Hughes to prevent that roundabout becoming the new bottleneck.	2D	N	Witham St Hughes is outside of the Order Limits of the Scheme. Whilst the Applicant has assessed issues that might affect Witham St Hughes and has developed options to mitigate them, the Scheme's primary objective is the last section of the A46 needing to be dualled.
ANON-559H-RWS3-T	Winthorpe Roundabout; Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Road layout; Newark Showground; Congestion	However, I think the Winthorpe junction proposal needs tweaking. I don't think it needs an extra arm for the A1/A17 link road. It would probably be more effective to have a slip road off the A46 further down nearer to the Friendly Farmer roundabout and the Winthorpe junction grade separated for through traffic to pass over the roundabout particularly when there are events at the Newark showground to separate the traffic otherwise congestion is likely to affect through traffic passing with its current proposed design.	2B	N	<p>A slip road directly to Friendly Farmer Roundabout off the new A46 dual carriageway was considered during an earlier stage, however this option was discounted due to the unacceptable queuing that occurred. Option 2 Modified was selected as the preferred route as it did not cause additional queues. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043).</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held from 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout included as part of the Scheme design alleviates traffic until 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation. Due to the size of the roundabout, however, the layout would not prohibit future grade separation at Winthorpe Roundabout if it was to be required.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Newark Showground	with greater use of the show ground are you confident that increased volume of traffic will be catered for?	2B	N	The varying nature and timing of events at Newark Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Newark Showground	No idea of managing traffic on showground days.	2B		<p>measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network. Further information on the traffic modelling, can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would not be able to resolve all current issues that arise when there is an event at Newark Showground.</p> <p>The following measures could be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at Newark Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Newark Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Newark Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Newark Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWGS-E	Newark Showground	Given your visualisation of Winthorpe roundabout and as your engagement team may remind you there are always large attendances at the Newark and Notts showground and at other venues on/near the site.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane	will there be improved access to showground from roundabout onto single carriageway of Drove lane?	2H		
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane; Congestion	Concerns remain about the proposed Winthorpe showground roundabout. We feel it is highly likely significant congestion will still occur particularly at peak times and on event days. As part of the overall scheme, we think much better access to the Showground should be provided by way of a widened Drove Lane, bigger entrances to the showground and some form of traffic management at the A17 end of Drove Lane e.g a traffic island and or lights.			
BHLF-559H-RWGS-E	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane	When I left the air museum the Showground Car Park was full (29 Oct). All traffic leaving uses Drove Lane to access A46, A1133 and A17. Will there be sufficient access, and safety considerations if this change is made?			
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	Newark Showground; Farndon Roundabout; Speed limit; Traffic lights/signals	4. During popular events at Newark showground traffic can queue along the A46. A 50 Mph speed limit and traffic lights at Farndon will cause the traffic to travel closer together and in slugs/ groups. An overhead warning (or speed) sign would be beneficial during those periods only.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground	when the show ground has functions at present traffic stays in the right hand lane but with the new proposal traffic will come of the A46 slip road and have to queue to go round the traffic light controlled roundabout. Will these lights be sensitive to traffic flow?	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEC-V	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion; Road layout	The road layout as described seems to me to have only one major drawback. Adding light controls to the Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts will abort the whole purpose of the scheme, as traffic at peak times will inevitably pile back from the lights and defeat the whole purpose which apparently is to provide continually flowing traffic along the A46. We regularly see 3-4 mile tailbacks at each of the present choke points, (particularly on Fridays) and there seems little point in speeding the traffic along a dual carriageway only to stop the traffic at traffic lights. If an elevated roadway can be constructed at one point, as shown at the Cattle Market junction, one should be constructed at the Farndon and Winthorpe junctions as well. The French do this in all their major cities, with the explicit aim of allowing the major road traffic to speed unhindered by lights or roundabouts.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043).</p> <p>Traffic modelling shows that grade separation is not needed at Farndon Roundabout, however measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSH-F	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe roundabout; Road layout; Traffic forecasts	No grade-segregation of Farndon & Winthorpe roundabouts - both should have the A46 freeflowing through the junction. Farndon should have been grade-separated with the Newark-Widmerpool scheme, this will be the second opportunity this junction will be missed - and it will need to be GSJ'd as the Newark bypass upgrade will encourage more traffic to use the route, along with more local movements when the Newark southern bypass is built, creating more housing + journeys. This has been proven elsewhere on the network many times over, such as the A46 at Coventry having all roundabouts grade-separated, and the A14 at-grade roundabouts at M1 J19, Brampton & Huntingdon all being upgraded in the past decade.	2B		<p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEP-9	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	The design philosophy should be ""Do it once, do it right"".  All the roundabouts need a flyover for the A46. It's a major road. Having large volumes of traffic, that are simply passing by Newark, slowing down and speeding up unnecessarily, is bad for noise, congestion and pollution.  Three roundabouts need three flyovers. Separated grade is an absolute must.	2B		<p>The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held from 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		If you don't, you'll only be back in 10-20 years to dig it up, and do it all again, as per Coventry bypass!  Do it right first time.			<p>Traffic signals at Winthorpe Roundabout are required to help manage the flow of traffic at the junction, especially from the new single carriageway link from Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Traffic modelling shows signals are not required at the Drove Lane and A1133 arms as this traffic enters the roundabout when other traffic entering the roundabout has been stopped by signals. The new access off the Friendly Farmer Link Road would remove a great deal of traffic from Drove Lane and prevent the queues that can currently develop on Drove Lane, further information on the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design to be provided as part of the Scheme would alleviate traffic until 2043, without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken shows that there would be no significant delays at the Farndon or Winthorpe roundabouts following the new grade separation of Cattle Market Junction. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. As previously stated, the traffic simulation has shown that grade separated junctions are not required at Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts, therefore any negligible resultant effect on speed changes would have the same negligible effect on noise. In addition, increasing traffic speeds, and avoiding "slowing down and speeding up" generally increase noise.</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling accounts for the effects of additional emissions generated by standing traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals. The modelling demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors in the vicinity of all of the roundabouts within the Scheme study area are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. In the opening year of the Scheme, the largest annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration is predicted to be 31.9µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme). Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEV-F	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	all junctions should be grade separated	2B		
ANON-559H-RW86-2	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Main improvement would be flyovers at both ends. I understand the cost involved, however, 30 or so years ago when the existing road was planned, the majority of local residents (myself included) said the bypass should have been dualled. Cost, once more, was used as the reason for the single carriageway. Dualling now is going to cost much more than the original costs! Are we making the same mistakes again? Having said all that, I would hate to have the existing plan delayed to get flyovers at both ends.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8M-S	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Very happy with the bridge proposal over the cattle market roundabout but very disappointed you haven't chosen a bridge for farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts. Quite obvious that a bridge is futureproof and the old fashioned roundabouts will be out of date and congested before the project is even completed	2B		
ANON-559H-RWMW-R	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Congestion	the scheme at both ends terminates in roundabouts, so the current congestion is just going to be shuffled along. traffic is not just fly through traffic, so you should build flyover junctions at the start and finish. otherwise you will just be moving the congestion question to a different section. the farndon end will remain congested on the A46 inbound routes at busy times and the scheme retaining the roundabout does not address the problem, placing the scheme in the 'poor' design category and failure at the point before it is even commenced. you must put flyover junctions in place.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQC-8	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	Flyover at roundabouts absolutely essential - not just to ease congestion by hopefully reduce the amount of accidents between farndon roundabout and winthorpe. I witness at least 1 a week.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWFG-1	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	I would have preferred two flyovers so they move	2B		
ANON-559H-RWMV-Q	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Noise and vibration; Air quality	I'm really surprised and rather disappointed at the current plans to retain roundabouts at Farndon and Winthorpe, so punctuating the flow of through-traffic progressing along the A46. The apparent argument is the concern of local noise and air pollution but, surely, the current build-up of traffic would be removed and allowed to progress freely to the next roundabout junctions at Swinderby to the north and Hobby Horse, Leicester to the south? Haven't the lessons of improving flow at Saxondale and Margidunum roundabouts been learned?	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWTN-P	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Congestion	I am concerned that use of the traffic signal controls, at various times, could cause intermittent delays which could cancel out any quality improvements that the current scheme could produce. I cannot see why a good idea could potentially be spoiled by use of 'interference' of flow of traffic occasionally, at either end of the bypass? I can foresee, that putting a temporary stopper, for whatever reasons, at the end of a bypass could cause blockage of traffic and defeat the whole process. The risk of temporary stoppage will be there at all times, at any time. 'idiots' that drive these days, have their accidents and crashes.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWB8-E	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	In my opinion this stretch of road does NOT need to be dual. I agree that Cattle Market roundabout and A1 need flyovers. But all this proposal will achieve is to get traffic to Farndon roundabout and Winthorpe roundabouts quicker. This will not solve congestion, merely move it slightly.	2B	N	

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		Keep it single carriageway and spend that money instead on an unbroken through route from North of Winthorpe and South of Farndon roundabout. Those sites must have flyovers as well.			<p>Traffic modelling shows that grade separation is not needed at Farndon Roundabout, however measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon. Further details can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design to be provided as part of the Scheme alleviates traffic until 2043 without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation. Due to the size of the roundabout, however, the layout would not prohibit future grade separation at Winthorpe Roundabout if it was to be required. Further details can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7A-C	Farndon Roundabout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Speed limit; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground	<p>Fail to see how traffic lights at Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts will help to avoid traffic tailing back.</p> <p>It appears that no account has been taken of the massively increased traffic flow entering or leaving the Showground site.</p> <p>Traffic will not stick to 50mph speed limit.</p> <p>Extremely dangerous to have drive through roundabout with traffic lights at Winthorpe and will definitely be 'accidents waiting to happen'. There will always be people jumping lights, blocking the freeflow of traffic and not slowing down in time.</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).</p> <p>Measures such as traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon, further details can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken shows that there would be no significant delays at the Farndon or Winthorpe roundabouts following the new grade separation of Cattle Market Junction. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network, further details on the modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The following measures could be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Newark Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Newark Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Newark Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Newark Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVG-H	Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Newark Showground	Re. the Winthorpe "throughabout" - what happens when the traffic lights fail? Would there be enough room between the two "through" carriageways for traffic on the "roundabout" part to cross both, carefully, one at a time, with a refuge in between, and get over the problem that way, or would the whole thing become inaccessible to anything other than through traffic? Or would joining traffic be expected to make long detours to get onto the A46 a different way? What happens when the showground traffic queues block the roundabout? They will, including the hatched areas - don't be under any illusion that it won't happen just because there are some yellow lines on the tarmac. Why couldn't this just be an ordinary roundabout with traffic lights as per the original plan?	2B	N	<p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Other options were explored (an enlarged roundabout with five lanes and signalised crossroads), but were not considered viable as the five lane roundabout would not comply with design standards and would need 30% more land. Further, the crossroads did not have sufficient capacity and large queues would form at peak times, and as such this has informed the current design choices. Further information on the modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>In addition to scheduled maintenance a battery back-up would be provided to minimise the risk of signal failure occurring at the roundabout. If they did fail it would be possible for cones to be deployed quickly to remove the 'through' facility with sufficient space being retained to allow it to operate as a traditional roundabout which would cause localised congestion whilst repairs were completed.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Traffic lights/signals	<p>Although we have been informally told that the phasing of traffic light control on the Winthorpe Through About would expedite the movement of show day traffic from the A46 into the Showground, we have not seen any evidence that such technological control would work. Show day traffic has been a significant contributor to journey time delays on the A46 and feeder roads in the past. Any incident or blockage on the unfamiliar ThroughAbout could cause a complete seizure in the locality.</p> <p>We also have concerns around the safety of road users if there is a power failure or computer malfunction which affects the traffic lights on the junction. Unlike a normal gyratory roundabout, where drivers can revert to the normal priority rules, it is difficult to see how a ThroughAbout can function without control. Is there a failsafe mode?</p>	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Winthorpe Roundabout; A1/A46 Crossing; Road layout	Although the new proposed route towards the Brownhills roundabout and the Winthorpe Roundabouts has been amended, there are still some details which have not been fully addressed. The new proposal has dual carriageways passing through the middle of the roundabout at the showground, with traffic signals around the roundabout. The Roundabout at the showground seems to have been significantly enlarged although, no exact measurement has been provided. It seems excessive; we have a dual carriageway section already. Majority of the time there are no issues, its only if there is a major event at the showground there can be tail-backs, however this can be reduced by using the A17. Also, there are not any details regarding the actual height of the new section with the bridge at Winthorpe. (A1 Crossing)	2B	N	<p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, predicts an increase of traffic on the A46. In the Do Minimum scenario, the Transport Assessment concludes that the higher demand would result in long queues forming. The design of the Scheme would improve traffic flow through the road network and assist with the higher demand.</p> <p>At the new A1/A46 Crossing, the clearance beneath the new bridge is very similar to the existing crossing, however due to the large span across the A1 the depth is much greater which raises the road alignment crossing the A1. The height from the A1 road surface to the A46 road surface is around 8.9m.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7A-C	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout	<p>Re the Winthorpe Roundabout The road from Coddington and the road from Winthorpe/Collingham should feed underneath the planned new A46 with access to the A46 being given by sliproads from either direction.</p> <p>This could be achieved by a simple 'scrape' (lowering of the road) allowing traffic to flow underneath the A46 without the new A46 having a significant rise in height. This would be helped by the fact that the existing A46 from Lincoln is at a higher level than the existing roundabout.</p>	2H	N	<p>Various alternative design options were considered at the initial stages of the Scheme design. Further information can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the suggestion from the Consultee to lower the A1133 and Drove Lane to go underneath Winthorpe Roundabout, the Winthorpe Roundabout design alleviates traffic until 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opens to traffic), without the same visual, cost and carbon impact of grade separation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Winthorpe Roundabout; Biodiversity	For me, the jury is still out on the Showground through-about, the required attenuation and habit preservation/improvement measures.	2I	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comment relating to the required attenuation and habitat preservation linked to the Winthorpe Roundabout design, the impact on the existing rookery at Winthorpe Roundabout has been reduced and is deemed not to be significant. In addition, some of the existing copse near the Esso Service Station have been retained, however this will result in the loss of the rookery by Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, the loss of this rookery is considered not to be significant. Further information regarding this can be found within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Also, the land required between Winthorpe Roundabout and the Friendly Farmer Roundabout, for attenuation and landscaping, has been reduced by around 30% since statutory consultation. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Winthorpe Roundabout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane	<p>Winthorpe roundabout.</p> <p>How long does it take for someone approaching the roundabout from Winthorpe to get onto the roundabout now.</p> <p>How long will it take in the future?</p> <p>What will be done to slow the a46 traffic approaching from Newark direction eg variable speed monitors etc.</p> <p>What assumptions have been made about lorries using this junction to use Drove Lane as a rat run to the A17?</p> <p>What assumptions have been made about Showground traffic?</p>	2B	N	<p>The Winthorpe Roundabout design has been tested within a microsimulation model as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout. The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both modelling years 2028 and 2043. Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Other options were explored (an enlarged roundabout with five lanes and signalised crossroads) but were not considered viable as the five lane roundabout would not comply with design standards and would need 30% more land. Further, the crossroads did not have sufficient capacity and large queues would form at peak times, and as such this has informed the current design choices. Further information on the modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>In addition to scheduled maintenance a battery back-up would be provided to minimise the risk of signal failure occurring at the roundabout. If they did fail it would be possible for traffic management measures to be deployed quickly to remove the 'through' facility with sufficient space being retained to allow it to operate as a traditional roundabout, which would cause localised congestion whilst repairs were completed.</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.</p> <p>The following measures could be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul> <p>The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMH-9	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Newark Castle level crossing	Like the provision of grade-separated junctions. This applies particularly at 'cattle market' where railway crossing delays can back up to affect the A46. Like the route flowing past Brownhills and Friendly Farmer.	2B	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RWNN-G	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction	We proved flyovers work on the A1 I welcome their addition here.	2B	N	
ANON-559H-RW61-U	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; A1/A46 Crossing; Winthorpe Roundabout	The arrangement of grade separated junctions is strongly supported.  The new bridge and stretch of new road will ease the concerns around earlier proposals for improvements at the Winthorpe island.	2H	N	
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; A1/A46 Crossing	What will be the height of the overpass ?	2B	N	The clearance beneath the A1/A46 Crossing would be very similar to the existing crossing, however due to the large span across the A1 the depth is much greater which raises the road alignment crossing the A1. The height from the A1 road surface to the A46 road surface is around 8.9m.
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; A1/A46 Crossing	We are particular concerned about the following: Height of the bypass surrounding the Village.	2B		Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, between Lowwood area and the A1 to extend the parkland and woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and provide a strong visual buffer in this location. As a result of this planting, any views of the A1/A46 Crossing should be reduced to glimpse views.
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; A1/A46 Crossing	Height of road – needs lowering.	2B		It is recognised that Cattle Market Junction would have adverse landscape and visual effects upon a small number of nearby receptors, namely those within the immediate vicinity with a high sensitivity to change. The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).
BHLF-559H-RWA3-8	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; A1/A46 Crossing	I have recently read, with concern, about some of the details of the proposed A46 bypass around Newark. I was horrified to read that flyovers of 8 metres high are included in the proposal.	N/A		<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme from nearby visual receptors.</p> <p>Planting would be provided around Cattle Market Junction as well as around the A1/A46 Crossing. Mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, is one of the factors amongst others that informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes are made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling. The carriageway at Cattle Market Junction would be around 7m above existing ground level.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ1-Y	Road layout	I would have preferred a flyover between Brownhills roundabout and Indian restaurant.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043).</p> <p>Traffic modelling also shows that the new A1/A46 Crossing would reduce traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and improve traffic flows.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Road layout	Where is the 'Windmill viaduct?'	2B	N	<p>The Windmill Viaduct is the structure just north of Farndon, crossing the River Trent. The Scheme would create a new structure parallel to the existing Windmill Viaduct to accommodate the widening of the A46.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Route corridor	Have other options been thoroughly scrutinised (e.g., create an additional highway branch where there is less significant environmental impact).	2B	N	<p>As set out in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. This included consultation on the proposed options, which was held between December 2020 and February 2021. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022, following consideration of comments received during the options consultation. Information relating to the options consultation and preferred route announcement can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> gives an overview of the analysis undertaken by the Applicant on the option selection process, including comments and views expressed during the options consultation, to recommend a preferred option for the Scheme.</p> <p>In the period between the preferred route announcement and the statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with a range of stakeholders with regards to the design of the Scheme. Further details can be found within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b>, and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFU-F	Route corridor	The information clearly shows many many negatives. The route from Motorways could run further North	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWWJ-N	Traffic lights/signals	Add traffic lights on roundabouts so its easy flowing on the traffic	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling was completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. This modelling assessed current and future traffic flows and included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043). Traffic signals have only been added to the roundabouts where they are required to cater for predicted traffic flows in 2043.</p> <p>Traffic lights and additional lanes have been included as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout. Signals are full time on the A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. This slows traffic, allowing for flows to be consistently controlled both through and into the roundabout. This would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3N-N	Traffic lights/signals	I think signalization of the roundabouts is a definite must and will also help improve safety on the existing roundabouts (with no signalization) by taking a lot of the traffic away e.g. Brownhills roundabout	2B		
ANON-559H-RWB6-C	Traffic lights/signals	I hope I have understood the plans correctly but I think (and hope) there are going to be traffic lights on the new roundabouts and signalisation on the approach lanes. It might make them much safer as people tend to drive too quickly onto the roundabouts and sometimes use the wrong lanes.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Traffic lights/signals	Not sure of need for traffic lights on roundabouts.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Traffic lights/signals; Air quality	Reduce use of traffic lights. Only leads to increased air pollution from standing traffic.	2D		<p>Traffic signals at Winthorpe Roundabout are required to help manage the flow of traffic at the junction, especially from the Friendly Farmer Link Road. Traffic modelling shows signals are not required at the Drove Lane and A1133 arms as this traffic enters the roundabout when other traffic entering the roundabout has been stopped by signals.</p> <p>Traffic signals reduce the risk to road users and also control traffic flows. The Scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit including the interrogation of personal injury accident data to consider whether there are any potential safety risks in the areas where the Scheme would increase traffic levels. The analysis has concluded that the Scheme would have a positive impact on road safety. The Road Safety Audit is summarised in Chapter 4 (Road Safety) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling takes into account the effects of additional emissions generated by standing traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals. The modelling demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors in the vicinity of the roundabouts within the Scheme study area are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. In the opening year of the Scheme, the largest annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration is predicted to be 31.9µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme). Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality guidance</i>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Traffic lights/signals	Traffic lights are really bad idea on the main carriageway	2H		
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Traffic lights/signals; Congestion	Traffic flows around the A1 – A46 interchange are congested but could be better regulated by traffic control at much lower cost.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Traffic lights/signals; Speed limit	Residents of Winthorpe need to know much more details about:  Whether traffic lights are being considered for the Gainsborough Road T junction to turn right towards Winthorpe roundabout and whether there is the possibility of a speed limit on this section of the road towards the new roundabout.	2D	N	Nottinghamshire County Council is responsible for this section of road as the local highway authority. The turning for Gainsborough Road, as well as the speed limit along the A1133, are not impacted by the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWSH-F	Traffic lights/signals	Although it's not clear from the plans, the A46 should be built to expressway standard including strategic VMS signs on approaches to the A1 and queue protection technology / detectors / signals.	2B	N	The A46 corridor is not designated as an expressway by the Applicant as this was not a requirement by the Department for Transport. The existing variable message sign on the existing southbound carriageway between Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer would be relocated to the existing A46 southbound approaching Winthorpe Roundabout from Lincoln, to provide users ample warning to change their route if required.
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Cattle Market Roundabout/ Junction; Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	No flyover at Cattle Market Roundabout. Traffic lights at Cattle Market Roundabout and existing Winthorpe Roundabout.	2D	N	<p>Traffic modelling was completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). This modelling assessed current and future traffic flows and included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043). Traffic modelling shows that adding traffic lights only at Cattle Market and Winthorpe roundabouts is not sufficient to manage the predicted increase in traffic flows at these junctions.</p> <p>It is recognised that Cattle Market Junction would have adverse landscape and visual effects upon a small number of nearby receptors, namely those within the immediate vicinity with a high sensitivity to change. The Applicant would implement mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme is set out in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) is one of the factors amongst others informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes are made at the junction. The current design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSH-F	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and	A46 southbound from Lincoln to A1 southbound ideally should also be freeflow - having traffic come off at Winthorpe and use a short stretch of single-carriageway will be consistently queuing in rush-hours. This is a very poor design choice.	2B	N	Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ), assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043) and showed that the single carriageway would have no significant delays and therefore no capacity issues for normal operation of the road.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Winthorpe roundabouts				The traffic modelling shows that removal of the A46 traffic from the Friendly Farmer Roundabout would free up capacity in this location to allow traffic to flow easy with acceptable queue lengths. A signal control has been added to the link between Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout to provide gaps in traffic heading eastbound to the A17, therefore allowing traffic to enter the roundabout from Lincoln.
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts	At present there seems no account being taken of the possible problems that arise from Showground traffic access, and possible queueing on both the A46 and the new link road proposed between the Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Link road carriageway lane heading towards Lincoln could become blocked with traffic.	2B		Signing would be used within the roundabout to guide southbound traffic down to the Friendly Farmer Link Road or to continue on the A46. The design of all the Scheme roundabouts can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWMW-R	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts	the majority of inbound winthorpe roundabout to Newark traffic is not flow through it is for the A1 south or Newark central and London commuters. You are making the congestion worse by removing the dual carriageway and replacing with a single track road. The proposed single track road at the winthorpe end to access the A1 south and Newark North Gate mainline stations should remain dual carriageway. this will remain extremely congested with commuters and by reducing to single track you are not fully addressing the congestion currently. worst case make it a 2 lane towards one away from Newark or a 3 lane switchable flow section.	2B		Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network.
ANON-559H-RWN3-N	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts	I feel that the single lane section of the Lincoln - Newark A46 will cause confusion and will be very intricate to negotiate on the approach to the A1 junction.			The following measures could be used to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> <li>• An additional access into the Showground provided off the Friendly Farmer Link Road</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RWBV-C	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts	Also the road leading back into Newark, A17, A1 seems a bit weedy at just a single carriageway.	2B		The capacity of the Friendly Farmer Link Road has been assessed for general Showground traffic as it is not possible to model these significantly variable situations. The measures highlighted above would significantly improve management of Showground traffic when compared to the existing situation.  The Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. The protocol for the timing changes and when this occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage of the Scheme between the Applicant, Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Existing A46; Congestion	Currently the road is a danger to users and always causing upset and gridlock to Newark and surrounding residents.	2B	N	The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and would encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent, further details can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .  A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified. The proposed speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b> . The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.
ANON-559H-RWTY-1	Existing A46	I witnessed a fatal accident on this single carriageway road which occurred right in front of me. Only by taking avoiding action prevented me from being involved. It was caused by a motorist overtaking down the middle of the carriageway. The decision by the original designers to have an extra wide carriageway similar to the 33 foot three lanes of the 1950's was in my mind and that of my colleagues incompressible. The sooner this is rectified so much the better.	2H	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RWSJ-H	Road layout	What's the point of making the road a dual carriageway if every junction along it is going to be sub-standard? It will just create a new traffic jam.	2B	N	Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> is one of the factors amongst others which informed design decisions. Modelling included the year

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWEU-E	Road layout	Roundabouts needs to be removed in their entirety, just as they have been between Leicester and Farndon.	2H		the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and fifteen years on (2043). The junctions performed well for both scenarios and are a standard solution for the modelled traffic flows.
ANON-559H-RWGE-Z	Road layout	You need to ensure that the project is built to the layout as formulated in the original proposal document	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the local community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through engagement, options consultation and statutory consultation activities.</p> <p>The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation and its compliance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 is described within the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>. As a result of the stakeholder engagement and consultation that has taken place, the highway design and construction strategy has developed over the life of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVK-N	Road layout	Pleased the widening of the road will take place furthest away from the river rather than next to it	2B	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Winthorpe village	I am pleased that National Highways have moved a fair way from their original plan options to accommodate concerns expressed by the Winthorpe Village community, specifically by planning to use the existing A46 roadway and locating the additional access road to the south of the A46.	2B	N	
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Winthorpe village; Population and human health	I am pleased that the proposed route has moved as far away from the village of Winthorpe as possible and no properties will be demolished.	2B		<p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for the corridor and route that was chosen. Route Corridor C was taken forward as it was the most direct route, and scored better than corridors A, B, D and E for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups and environment.</p> <p>Following this sifting process, four options were evaluated against the engineering, traffic and economic, environmental, social and safety, operation, technology and maintenance assessments. Option 2 was chosen over Option 1 primarily because it minimised land take. In turn, this option is less likely to have significant adverse effects on landscape, townscape and visual receptors, water, mineral resources, waste generation, and materials asset use.</p> <p>Two existing structures would require demolition to allow for the Scheme, including the Mint Leaf Restaurant and old maintenance shed to the south-west quadrant of the existing Cattle Market Roundabout.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQW-V	Winthorpe village	Providing - the A46 section passing winthorpe will be extended only on the showground side... and not closer to our village	2B	N	The Scheme design has been developed so that the section of A46 dual carriageway crossing the A1 would be aligned to merge into the existing A46 carriageway adjacent to the Esso Service Station, retaining a section of the existing dual carriageway up to Winthorpe Roundabout This has allowed for the Scheme to make use of the existing A46 carriageway and not move the carriageway closer to Winthorpe village.
ANON-559H-RWVR-V	Existing A46; Southern Link Road	<p>I agree that Newark needs relief of some kind.</p> <p>I have previously suggested the current bypass from Farndon to the Cattle Market roundabout has a third lane marked out with the speed reduced to 50/40 mph with 2 lanes going towards Lincoln and 1 lane heading towards Nottingham this cheaply increasing capacity and flow.</p> <p>Or use the southern link from the Farndon roundabout to the A1 which is almost finished but which (I think) is up to the house builder to finish upon completion of new houses.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the suggestion for marking out two lanes going towards Lincoln and one lane heading towards Nottingham on the section of the A46 between Farndon Roundabout and Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has been completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Traffic modelling indicates that even by introducing a third lane, the junctions at Farndon, Cattle Market, Brownhills and Winthorpe, would still need upgrading, therefore the Consultee's suggestions would not be an adequate solution.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVR-V	Existing A46; Southern Link Road	As I suggested earlier. Save a fortune and remark the current road into 3 lanes or link up the road to the south which is partially built already.	2D	N	The Applicant has taken the Southern Link Road scheme into consideration in the development consent application. Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasts that in the Do Minimum scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	Winthorpe village; Landscape and visual effects; Road layout	Build a tunnel instead if you have any thoughts for local residents instead of worrying about your project cost. Densely wood any open areas so the increased noise won't travel to Winthorpe.	2D	N	Various alternative options were considered during an earlier design stage. The inclusion of an underpass (tunnel) was considered but was ruled out due to the cost of construction and maintenance. Further information can be found in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, resulting in no residual significant effects in the Winthorpe area, with these mitigation measures in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration during both construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFH-2	Road layout	The plans don't initially appear to retain the existing laybys on the A46 between Farndon Roundabout and the A1 crossing. These are well-used, especially by hauliers. Can you confirm you intend to reinstate the laybys?	2H	N	<p>The decision not to have lay-bys along the A46 northbound carriageway was made in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 169 - The design of lay-bys, maintenance hardstanding's, rest areas, service areas and observation platforms</i>. Due to the distance between junctions, the design standards only require one layby on the southbound carriageway between Winthorpe Roundabout and Cattle Market Junction. This has been included within the design.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Road layout	It is vital that the works do not prevent a future Kelham bypass and new river crossing from being constructed. This is a safeguarded project by Notts County Council. The potential flood alleviation areas around Kelham could conflict with the safeguarded route. Details of the flood alleviation areas are however sparse.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has consulted with Nottinghamshire County Council and continues to engage with them regarding the Scheme on an ongoing basis. The Scheme does not impact on the opportunity for a future Kelham bypass.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. These locations are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWW1-V	Road layout	I was wondering how easy it will be to access the new scheme when I am going back to Farndon from Newark.	2B	N	<p>When travelling back to Farndon from Newark-on Trent the new A46 dual carriageway can be accessed at Brownhills Roundabout or Cattle Market Roundabout. Alternatively, Farndon Roundabout would be signalised, stopping the A46 mainline and allowing local traffic from Newark-on-Trent to go around the roundabout, further information can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	Winthorpe Roundabout; Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects; Newark Showground	I live near to the proposed new Winthorpe Roundabout, which will bring both the A46 and A1133 nearer to my property. I am not convinced that adequate shielding by means of a mound and tree planting is included in the plans. a significant and some mature trees are needed to mitigate the extra noise.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, these would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise during construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/AP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>With mitigation in place, no significant effects are predicted with respect for noise and vibration at any receptors, including at Winthorpe, during operation of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVU-Y	Road layout; Noise and vibration	We hope that quiet tarmac will be used. We missed the consultation with residents, so we don't know if this was mentioned.	2B	N	<p>The Scheme assessed within the Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes the use of low noise surfacing on all dual carriageway elements.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise, including the use of low noise surfacing, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Material assets and waste	Need to ensure all good quality topsoil, and subsoil, is appropriately lifted, stored and reused.	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the waste hierarchy and circular economy, the Applicant would reuse excavated soils that includes stored topsoil on site in the landscaping features of the Scheme or in floodplain compensation areas. Any surplus soils would be offered to developments near the Scheme for reuse on land, whenever possible.</p> <p>The Outline Materials and Soils Management Plans are detailed in Appendix B.2 (Outline Materials Management Plan) and Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, which will include a Soil Management Plan, to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Further information on the assessments undertaken can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Dredging of the River Trent is not proposed as a part of the Scheme, the existing river channel and its flow would not be constrained by the Scheme. Bridge piers (pillars) would not be built within the river, as they are on the same offset to the riverbank as the existing bridge piers.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBY-F	Material assets and waste	Ensure all topsoil and subsoil arising from the construction is reused appropriately with no soil disposal. Dredge and tidy up River Trent around bridge building activities to alleviate changes in flow caused by new pillars to carry bypass.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Air quality	negative effect on air quality	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the impact on air quality as a result of the Scheme. The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>To assess the operational phase effects, human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. This includes worst-case human health receptors on the outskirts of Farndon along the A46 and in the vicinity of Farndon Roundabout, which are likely to experience higher pollutant concentrations than human health receptors in the village located further away from the main roads. Further to this, the assessment accounts for the effects of emissions generated by slow moving traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Air quality	Air quality reduced by car pollution and dust from Construction	2C		
BHLF-559H-RW98-5	Air quality	Concerns about air quality	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWMS-M	Air quality	without an underpass or flyover at Farndon roundabout the air quality will be horrendous in the village of Farndon and surrounding area due to the massive increase in standing traffic	2C		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Air quality	I would add, the town of Newark is in a broad river valley....given the increase in existing traffic volumes due to the recent and significant expansion of new housing estates, the towns low lying nature, and the existence of a sugar beet processing factory, it is questionable, even before work on the proposed road begins, that the air is fit to breathe,..- and this can only worsen with a considerable increase in additional pollution from heavy goods vehicles driving faster around the perimeter on the way to Ports.	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised by the Consultee. With regards to the air quality, a Scheme specific diffusion tube monitoring survey for NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations has been undertaken to support the air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The monitoring survey commenced in May 2022 and was completed in November 2022. This survey updated the Applicant's monitoring survey that had been undertaken previously in 2016 and supplements the local authority NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring undertaken within the area as there is minimal local authority monitoring along the A46. Monitoring was undertaken at 27 locations along the Scheme alignment and surrounding areas, including Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The results from the monitoring study shows that NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the study area are well below the annual mean objective, with the highest concentration in Newark-on-Trent recorded being 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This indicates that PM concentrations in the study area are also well below the annual mean objectives, given that PM emissions from road traffic are an order of magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub> (nitrogen oxides), which is primarily made up of NO (nitric oxide) and NO<sub>2</sub>. Background NO<sub>2</sub> and PM concentrations available from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs are also low.</p> <p>Further to this, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle movements (expressed as annual average daily traffic) and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust will be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The traffic data used for the assessment of the operational phase includes traffic generated by other developments, including proposed housing developments within Newark-on-Trent, to account for cumulative effects. Further detail on the traffic data can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. A human health receptor on Newark Road has been included in the assessment, which is within 200m of the affected road network and where the proposed housing development at Land South of Newark will be located. At this human health receptor, an annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration of 14.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> is predicted in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme), compared to an annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>Non-road traffic related emission sources, such as industrial emissions, for example, the sugar beet processing factory, are accounted for through the use of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs background concentration maps which have been used within the assessment to assign appropriate background concentrations to modelled receptor locations.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAM-2	Air quality	Air pollution in Newark and the extra air pollution this will cause is an extra concern.	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's concerns regarding air pollution in Newark-on-Trent. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) details how impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAV-B	Air quality	<p>The scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increase air pollution, especially in the village of Winthorpe</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to air pollution, and in particular in the village of Winthorpe. The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle movements (expressed as annual average daily traffic) and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment.</p> <p>The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Air quality	With regard to air monitoring, at what point will action be taken to reduce the impact the A46 will have on air quality? What is the threshold for action to be taken and the measurement of success?	2C	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on air quality. The relevant air quality thresholds which must be met are set out in Table 5-1 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> to consider the following pollutants: NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and oxides of nitrogen. During construction and operation, the concentrations of the above pollutants across the human health receptors are assessed to be below the air quality objective thresholds outlined in Table 5-1. During construction, mitigation measures would be in place to ensure the air quality thresholds are not exceeded, as outlined below.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The construction mitigation measures proposed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>• Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>• Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or cover, seed or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>• Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>• Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washes</li> <li>• Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>• Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>• Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>• All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>• High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for ensuring the above mitigation is adhered to through daily inspections across the construction site.</p> <p>The predicted effects from operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are concluded to be not significant, as such no mitigation measures are required during the operation of the Scheme in order to prevent significant adverse effects in relation to human health receptors. Similarly, no operational monitoring is required as operation of the Scheme is compliant with air quality objective thresholds. The Scheme does not affect the UK's reported ability to comply with the Air Quality Directive.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWM8-S	Air quality	Sadly, unimproved road links are necessary. In a way if traffic can be kept moving then this will be safer for the air quality as opposed to the current frequency of stationary/ queuing traffic.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments raised by the Consultee with regards to air quality. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has assessed the effects of the Scheme based on outputs of the Scheme's traffic model which includes information on speed changes.</p> <p>The results of the air quality assessment demonstrate that there are no predicted exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE6-F	Air quality	Air quality around the Newark Bypass will greatly improve as cars will no longer be stationary for long periods.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment received by the Consultee with regards to air quality and welcomes the support for the Scheme. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has assessed the effects of the Scheme based on outputs of the Scheme's traffic model which includes information on speed changes. The results of the air quality assessment demonstrate that there are no predicted exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWF4-E	Air quality	reduce pollution is welcomes from less standing traffic	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment received by the Consultee and welcomes the support for the Scheme. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has assessed the effects of the Scheme based on outputs of the Scheme's traffic model which includes information on speed changes. The results of the air quality assessment demonstrate that there are no predicted exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme and changes in air quality are</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					also concluded to be not significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO <sub>2</sub> , the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Air quality	I am concerned that National Highways do not appear to have considered fine particulate air pollution as a health impact for the people of Newark. This is the most damaging type of air pollution contributing to excess death figures in the UK. I will like to know whether work has been done on the likely interaction between increased fine particulate air pollution and the release of ammonia from nearby animal agriculture.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns by the Consultee. Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides detail on how PM<sub>2.5</sub> has been considered within the local air quality assessment.</p> <p>In summary, the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) air quality thresholds and modelling of coarse particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. For this assessment, when the maximum modelled road contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> of 4.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> from existing traffic in the base year at modelled receptors is combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded.</p> <p>Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>. Further to this, the greatest change in annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations at modelled receptors in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 3.9µg/m<sup>3</sup> between the Do Minimum scenario (without the Scheme) and Do Something scenario (with the Scheme). Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> would therefore be even lower in the opening year of the Scheme, as PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are an order of magnitude lower than nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions, which are primarily made up of nitric oxide (NO) and NO<sub>2</sub>. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that the current and future PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are lower than the current target value of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> and the Scheme would not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold at any of the human health receptors considered and no further assessment is required.</p> <p>The likely interaction between PM and the release of ammonia from nearby animal agriculture does not form part of the requirements for a <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> compliant air quality assessment and therefore has not been considered further.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Air quality	<p>The analysis of air quality remains incomplete. It is disappointing that this data is not available for consultation.</p> <p>Although there is a view to scope out smaller particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) as initial analysis suggests that the larger PM<sub>10</sub> particles are unlikely to exceed threshold levels, we support the view of the Scoping Opinion for A46 Newark Bypass and in particular the response from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA). The Environmental Statement should demonstrate in more detail how this approach will ensure the objective is not exceeded by the Development and that greater analysis of all pollutant effects are considered, even when below the thresholds described in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA105. As stated by the UKHSA “pollutants associated with road traffic or combustion, particularly particulate matter and oxides of nitrogen are non-threshold; i.e. an exposed population is likely to be subject to potential harm at any level...” Any negative effects on air quality irrespective of magnitude and threshold levels are not acceptable and further details of mitigation would be welcomed as part of the ES.</p>	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. This includes the results of monitoring undertaken between May 2022 and November 2022, presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p><i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds and modelling of PM<sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. This is an appropriate approach and method of assessment, given that PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future and PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, which means that vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>a significant effect in air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>There are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction.</p>
ANON-559H-RW74-Y	Air quality	From an air quality point of view, I think it would be worth hiving off lorries heading up or down the A46 onto the A1, which would also play a valuable role in reducing congestion.	2D	N	<p>The aim of the Scheme is to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the existing A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would contribute to the UK's regional and local Government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant and therefore measures such as directing lorries onto the A1 are not required either from an air quality or reducing congestion perspective.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNV-R	Air quality	The area around Trent Lane, Maltkiln Lane at the edge of King's Sconce Avenue. This is currently being used as a scrapyards but has been misused, with frequent illegal fires adversely affecting local air quality. This has been reported and is being investigated by the Environment Agency.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potential available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Population and human health; Air quality	I am also worried about the health impact of the dust corridor and whether mitigation measures will be sufficient during dry and drought conditions.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to the health impact of air quality during construction of the Scheme. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 105 – Air quality. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect in air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. During operation of the scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are concluded to be not significant.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the scheme on the local population and human health receptors. The human health assessment considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Population and human health; Air quality	Airbourne pollutants, due to wind direction these could have a marked adverse effect on the inhabitants of Winthorpe Village. Over a period of time this could cause long term illness and reduce life expectancy.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to air quality. The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion model takes into account the effects of wind direction and speed on an hourly basis for a full calendar year (8,760 hours).</p> <p>The dispersion modelling accounts for all roads within the study area that meet the criteria for assessment. The dispersion modelling to determine the air quality effects includes all roads within 200m of affected roads where they add to total pollution concentrations. Roads modelled within the air quality assessment are presented in Figure 5.4 (Air Quality Affected Road Network) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This includes human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network. These receptors are located closer to the A46 than those in Winthorpe village and as such concentrations at the receptors are likely to be higher.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Noise and vibration; Air quality	sufficient noise and pollution protection measures must be in place though to protect the houses at the end of Winthorpe and those on Winthorpe road.	2B	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect in air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This includes human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network. These receptors are located closer to the A46 than those on Winthorpe Road and as such, concentrations at the receptors are likely to be higher.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These include barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVJ-M	Noise and vibration	The closeness of the flyover to Winthorpe will incur even more noise and pollution to an already unsatisfactory environment.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The Applicant is required to mitigate any likely significant effects arising as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessments have concluded no significant residual effects on Winthorpe with mitigation in place. Permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout to ensure no significant effect would occur as a result of the Scheme. These would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>Air quality modelling accounts for all roads within the study area that meet the criteria for assessment. The dispersion modelling to determine the air quality effects includes all roads within 200m of affected roads where they add to total pollution concentrations. Roads modelled within the air quality assessment are presented in Figure 5.4 (Air Quality Affected Road Network) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The grade separated A1/A46 Crossing is included in the study area. The dispersion modelling demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors in the vicinity of the A1/A46 Crossing are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective in the opening year of the Scheme, with concentrations up to 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> being predicted in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme). Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Biodiversity	Planting of woodlands and creation of areas of net ecological improvements e.g. wetlands, ponds etc.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges concerns raised by the Consultees with regards to wildlife and ecological improvements. New and replacement planting would be provided to increase biodiversity value and reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of woodland, trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration, and over time</p>
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Biodiversity	Loss of Rookery habitat on existing Showground roundabout. The scheme could have other habit benefits if 'designed in' e.g. wetland, tree belts etc.	2C		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW3T-U	Biodiversity	Most of the unused land within scheme could be wilded	2F		<p>provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Off-site enhancement of broadleaved plantation woodland at Doddington Hall would be undertaken to provide added woodland value. Two of the floodplain compensation areas have also been designed to provide new habitats of notable value, including the creation of ponds, large reedbeds and floodplain grazing marsh (a Habitat of Principal Importance). The design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained. Replacement planting would also be provided where required as 'essential' mitigation to reduce visual and biodiversity impacts as a result of the Scheme and to achieve net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including details on the retention of existing vegetation that would be sought wherever possible.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMU-P	Biodiversity	Consider the wildlife more, lots more trees and protection for the creatures which we still have them.	2F		
BHLF-559H-RWAK-Z	Biodiversity	Little information has been provided to aid wildlife. Recommend focus on this and wildflowers to be considered. Tree planting also very important.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RW6W-1	Biodiversity	Maintain/develop verges/meadows for wildlife Ensure wildlife corridors Consider how to reduce wildlife barriers – wildlife crossings	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees with regard to wildlife across the Scheme. A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds and mammals, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. Should potential impacts be anticipated to an ecological receptor, mitigation measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identify actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation. Both construction and operation mitigation measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, such as employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to provide specialist advice and monitor adherence to construction mitigation measures.</p> <p>With regards to the underpass concerns, the existing safe passage under Windmill Viaduct, Nether Lock and access tracks under the existing A46 carriageway (between Windmill Viaduct and the railway line to the north, and access to Severn Water Limited Sewage Treatment Works) would be maintained during operation and construction. This methodology</p>
ANON-559H-RW7X-3	Biodiversity	Safe wildlife crossings and corridors will be needed.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWT9-1	Biodiversity	Please include hedgehog tunnels and other wildlife crossings.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8A-D	Biodiversity	Wildlife corridors / underpasses	2D		
ANON-559H-RW8A-D	Biodiversity	There are no underpasses in the plans to allow for wildlife corridors. With the increased traffic expected, and the loss of habit these should be built into the new design to protect wildlife	2C		
BHLF-559H-RW6W-1	Biodiversity	wildlife fauna passageways, verges Underpass?	2D		
ANON-559H-RWEK-4	Biodiversity	Please consider wildlife that go uninterrupted (traffic permitting) crossing the current bypass. A new dual carriageway with a complete concrete barrier running centrally full length of the road does not allow migration from one side of the highway to the other.  You only have to see the roadkill on the current A46 between Farndon and Syston (Leicestershire). Crash barriers do not allow navigation for Badger, Fox or Deer, They run across road, meet the barrier head on and then turn around and run back to meet oncoming traffic.  Please consider migration passage routes.	2F		
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Biodiversity	In previous reports to National Highways we have commented on the way that Winthorpe is partially isolated from neighbouring areas by virtue of being cut off on three sides by the Trent, the A1 and the A46. We note National Highways' efforts to maintain and enhance our connectivity, especially with the reconnection of our footpaths 2 and 3 and the other NMU routes. However, such routes are essentially designed for human use and not very adaptable as wildlife corridors, especially where road crossings are involved. We would welcome some investigation into the significance of the A46 construction on animal movements.	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Biodiversity	As recommended by the A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. Further consultation with regard to e.g. wildlife corridors should sought from the relevant experts e.g. Wildlife Trust.	2F		is described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do now.
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Biodiversity	What is going to happen to local wildlife? The deers etc that regularly can been seen at the bottom of my garden?	2C		<p>Directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are a protected species, however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Mammal ledges cannot be safely retro fitted to existing culverts, several of which are of a length and diameter that would deter use by water vole and any connectivity the larger culverts provide are between poor or unsuitable habitat for water vole. Water vole surveys have identified a small population outside of the Order Limits and following the implementation of mitigation detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, the Scheme would not adversely impact the local water vole population.</p> <p>Existing community or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures were presented to stakeholders including Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust in June 2023, after incorporating previous comments from each representative. There were no objections to the mitigation, which was well received as it was demonstrated that mitigation measures have been informed by robust survey data and desk study data (roadkill records). With the retention of existing safe passages, provision of the aforementioned planting and adoption of mitigation embedded into the Scheme, no significant impacts are anticipated upon terrestrial wildlife that would commute across the Scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to the low local population size of protected terrestrial species, the impacts to wildlife, residents, road users and secondary impacts on businesses as a result of providing of new underpasses/tunnels is not proportionate to the negligible benefit to wildlife. Planting detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> would provide a commuting corridor parallel to the widened A46 carriageway, connecting existing and newly created habitats and would direct wildlife to existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> also considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on foraging, commuting and migration routes of wildlife recorded in the area. The chapter details appropriate and proportional mitigation informed by robust survey data and desk study records, and an assessment of likely significant effects. The Habitat Regulations Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/6.6)</b> assesses the above on river and sea lamprey in greater detail (qualifying features for the designation of the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar), as the River Trent intersects the Scheme and is a known migratory route for lamprey. No residual significant effects are anticipated on the movement of protected species.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Biodiversity	Protected species would be impacted, if the bypass goes ahead, like otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers, and bats. There are no known proven mitigation measures in regard to bats, so with that in mind there is no way a bat licence should be granted for any project that puts bats or their roosts at risk.	N/A	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees with regards to mitigation of the species mentioned. Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> , and the Habitat Regulations Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/6.6)</b> consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme, including those upon otter, water vole, aquatic invertebrates, barn owl, badger, and bats.
ANON-559H-RWGY-M	Biodiversity	There is no known mitigation for bats.  We cannot continuously argue mitigation. It clearly does not work	2C		Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the bat surveys undertaken for the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In summary, nine confirmed bat roosts have been recorded within the survey area to date, consisting of four trees and five buildings. Categorisation of the rarity of bat species present within the survey area is with reference to <i>Wray et al. (2010) CIEEM's In Practice: Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment</i>. All confirmed roosts in buildings and one confirmed roost in a single tree are of 'common' bat species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat). A Daubenton's bat maternity roost (at least 20 individual bats recorded swarming) and a single unidentified bat (day roost) were recorded in two separate trees outside of the Order Limits in the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas survey area. One Noctule day roost was identified in the fourth tree. The Noctule and Daubenton's bat are considered 'rarer' species. One of the buildings to be demolished to facilitate the Scheme comprises a daytime roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle. An application for a bat mitigation licence would be submitted to Natural England for the destruction of this roost. The impact assessment, including mitigation, is detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>A minimum of eight bat species were recorded foraging and or commuting across the survey area, including one 'rarest' bat species (Barbastelle), four 'rarer' bat species (Leisler's bat, Noctule, Serotine and Nathusius' pipistrelle), and three 'common' bat species (brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle). Unidentified <i>Myotis</i> sp., <i>Nyctalus</i> sp., and <i>Pipistrellus</i> sp. Were also recorded. Barbastelle comprised less than 1% of total bat registrations, at the time of writing. This result is consistent with the low numbers recorded on the bat transect Surveys and the geographical distribution of the species. Survey results are detailed in Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with environmental stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Survey data for bats will inform the content of the bat licence. A condition of the bat licence could be the provision of appropriate replacement of artificial bat roosts to compensate for the loss of a bat roost. The ratio of bat box provision has been presented to Natural England. However, the installation of one bat box would be provided outside of the zone of potential construction disturbance and close to the building to be demolished where a single soprano pipistrelle roost has been recorded. This mitigation measure would provide a safe location for any bats found by the bat licenced ecologist during daytime soft stripping of this building, prior to demolition. Mitigation measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Mitigation for impacts on all protected species are detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>No otter holts or resting sites would be lost as part of the Scheme. No active badger setts have been identified within the survey area. No confirmed barn owl nest sites have been identified within the survey area. Otter, badger and barn owl technical reports are confidential and will not be released into the public domain but will be submitted as part of the development consent application. Due to the length of time between the initial survey completion and receipt of the decision on whether or not a Development Consent Order is granted and as otter, water vole, barn owl, badger and bats are highly mobile, these species would require either pre-construction checks or surveys prior to commencing works likely to impact these species.</p> <p>Pre-construction monitoring surveys would be undertaken on inactive badger setts and large mammal burrows located within 30m of works likely to disturb badgers whilst taking shelter in these structures and works that would damage or destroy badger setts.</p> <p>A licence to 'interfere with (badger) setts for development purposes' would be applied for, if an active badger sett is recorded. A Stage 3 barn owl nest site verification surveys would be</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>undertaken pre-construction. If a confirmed inactive barn owl nest site requires closure (for which a licence would be required from Natural England), provision of two artificial nest boxes would be installed a year before closure. Water vole have been recorded within the survey area, outside of the Order Limits only. Technical Appendix 8.12 (Water Vole Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the water vole surveys undertaken for the Scheme. Current survey data indicates that no direct impacts to water vole are likely and therefore a licence is currently not required. Pre-construction checks for water vole burrows would be undertaken along this watercourse within proximity of works likely to cause disturbance whilst this species takes shelter in the burrow or works likely to damage or destroy water vole burrows. Should burrows be found, an appropriate licence would be applied for from Natural England.</p> <p>The application of any Natural England licences will be secured in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Licence applications will require the production of a Method Statement to evidence that the impact(s) are unavoidable, and that appropriate mitigation would be implemented. Natural England may provide conditions to granting any licences.</p> <p>Following a review of the draft licence application, Natural England would provide a Letter of No Impediment, which the Applicant would submit for as part of its development consent application. Mitigation measures have been developed to prevent killing, injuring (and where relevant) or disturbing protected species which will ensure no significant adverse effects to the conservation status of different protected species during construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Planting detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> would provide a commuting corridor parallel to the A46 carriageway, connecting existing and newly created habitats and would direct wildlife to existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway. Once planting has established, provision of habitats would be measurably greater than pre-construction, as report in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Commitments and actions to reduce impacts on protected species, developed with reference to the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate, and enhance), are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments details the measures to protected habitats and protected species during construction and operation, species-specific mitigation measures and compensation requirements.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9F-K	Biodiversity	A suggestion would be to prepare in advance the new habitat so the existing species can establish their new habitat prior to the commencement of the disruption.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potential available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Opportunities for advanced planting would be explored, however this would be limited to areas of land not impacted during construction of the Scheme. Given the restrained Order Limits, these areas are likely to be few, but where early works can successfully be undertaken without risk of damage, this would be sought. Creation of habitat within the zone of influence of construction would not be undertaken prior to completion of works, to avoid encouraging wildlife into areas where they would be exposed to risk which would result in injury or death.</p> <p>Pre-construction Stage 3 barn owl nest site verification surveys would identify whether the provision of barn owl nest boxes is required as an alternative to compensate for the loss of a confirmed nest site. Access is being secured with landowners outside of the Order Limits, as this is where suitable locations have been identified beyond the zone of influence. These</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					would be installed a year prior to the closure of confirmed inactive barn owl nest sites. A condition of the bat licence could be the provision of appropriate replacement of artificial bat roosts to compensate for the loss of a bat roost. The ratio of bat box provision has been presented to Natural England.
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Biodiversity	Alternative to protect local wildlife. Can they be moved to other location?	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns to the locations of local wildlife. Commitments and actions to reduce impacts on protected species, developed with reference to the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance), are set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). This Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments details the measures to protected habitats and protected species during construction and operation, species-specific mitigation measures and compensation requirements.</p> <p>The survey data has not identified the need to physically trap and relocate any wildlife. Instead, provision of mitigation would include the displacement of wildlife from the works area to connected suitable retained habitat, under supervision of Ecological Clerk of Works. Habitat creation would be undertaken within the works area once construction has been completed to minimise wildlife returning before it is safe to do so.</p> <p>During construction, various mitigation measures would be adhered to, and appropriately timed works would be undertaken, where possible. An Ecological Clerk of Works would also be employed to provide advice and monitor the construction works in adherence with the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). A pre-works search by the Ecological Clerk of Works prior to the removal of vegetation/brush or other notable habitat features to check for protected and notable faunal species such as breeding birds, hedgehog and toad resting places would be undertaken.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWM8-S	Biodiversity	My concerns are always environment and wildlife. Can't be helped that some will be lost. I am sure you are doing all you can to address this.	2C	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. Should potential impacts be anticipated to an ecological receptor, mitigation measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identify actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation. Both construction and operation mitigation measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), such as employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works to provide specialist advice and monitor adherence to construction mitigation measures.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Biodiversity	Interferes too much with wildlife	2B	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is contained within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Biodiversity	We are particular concerned about the following... Wildlife			<p>No likely significant effects upon birds are anticipated as a result-of the Scheme, following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWM8-S	Biodiversity	my main concern is wildlife and the loss of their habitat. Hopefully this will be address adequately.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation clearance undertaken outside of the breeding bird season or sensitive working methods (including ecological supervision) implemented for any clearance required during the breeding bird season</li> <li>Landscape planting incorporating breeding bird habitats and installation of bird boxes in woodland and retained trees and creation of wetland</li> </ul> <p>No likely significant effects upon barn owls are anticipated as a result of the Scheme following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of barn owl nesting boxes</li> <li>Avoiding construction works within an appropriate buffer around any active barn owl nests</li> <li>New habitat creation to promote barn owl foraging and commuting routes</li> <li>Habitat management of roadside hedgerows, tree, and shrubs, to dissuade barn owls from crossing roads at a height where vehicle collisions are a risk</li> </ul> <p>No likely significant effects upon badger are anticipated as a result of the Scheme following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New habitat creation to mitigate for lost foraging habitat</li> <li>Retention of existing A46 underpasses</li> </ul> <p>No likely significant effects upon bats are anticipated as a result of the Scheme following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal inspection by licensed surveyor prior to back-filling accessible crevices on trees and buildings and prior to soft-stripping materials from one building to be demolished</li> <li>Felling of trees with hibernation potential undertaken outside of hibernation period or sensitive working methods implemented within this season (as per mitigation above)</li> <li>Landscape planting and creation of the Farndon East and West wetland area would mitigate for loss of foraging and commuting routes</li> <li>Installation of bat boxes in retained woodland and trees</li> </ul> <p>Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has developed further meaning that no veteran or notable trees are expected to be lost. There would be some impacts on three veteran trees, however no likely significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme, following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree protection measures for all retained trees, including temporary barriers and CellWeb matting</li> <li>Supervision by the Scheme arboriculturist following the installation of protection measures, during construction, and on completion of construction operations</li> <li>Annual inspection to monitor the physiological condition of the three veteran trees for which the root protection areas would be directly impacted and monitor the effectiveness of the permanent ground protection. This would inform whether remedial and compensatory action is required, for example 'veteranisation' of other retained trees</li> </ul> <p>Details of the trees affected as a result of the Scheme can be found in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Biodiversity	It would appear that no consideration has been taken into the fact that for many years birds are nesting in the trees situated on the showground roundabout. If this is destroyed, it will take many years for new trees in the area to become established and nesting restored.			
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Biodiversity	I also object to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the destruction of habitats and the impacts on protected species such as barn owls, badgers and bats, with no evidence of biodiversity net gain</li> <li>the loss of veteran and notable trees</li> </ul>	N/A		
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Biodiversity	Damaging effect on wildlife habitats and settlement at Winthorpe.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Biodiversity	No destruction to wildlife and green space	2C		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible. Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Full details of mitigation measures and how they would be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Specific mitigation measures associated with Winthorpe include the creation of species-rich grassland, waterbodies, reedbeds, marshy/wet grassland, native hedgerows, shrub and tree planting, individual tree planting and the installation of bird boxes. These measures are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Biodiversity	<p>Residents of Winthorpe need to know much more details about:</p> <p>What is going to happen to the established rook/crow colony which at present roosts and nests on Winthorpe roundabout?</p>	2D	N	<p>The latest roundabout design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained, in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season, the availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) would support the rookery.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQX-W	Biodiversity	<p>your proposed mitigation solutions to environmental impacts of the scheme appears to be thought through thoroughly although care and further details analysis is required to study all aspects of wildlife. Ex: a rare bat has been found in the area nearby and is obviously protected.</p>	2C	N	<p>The design has been developed to meet the Scheme objectives whilst also minimising environmental effects wherever practicable. Consequently, the Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 – Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle being to avoid potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Technical Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) presents the results of the bat surveys undertaken for the Scheme.</p> <p>In summary, nine confirmed bat roosts have been recorded within the survey area to date, consisting of four trees and five buildings. Categorisation of the rarity of bat species present within the survey area is with reference to <i>Wray et al. (2010) CIEEM's In Practice: Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment</i>. All confirmed roosts in buildings and one confirmed roost in a single tree are of 'common' bat species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat). A Daubenton's bat maternity roost (at least 20 individual bats recorded) and a single unidentified bat (day roost) were recorded in two separate trees outside of the Order Limits in the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas survey area. One Noctule day roost was identified in the fourth tree. The Noctule and Daubenton's bat are considered 'rarer' species. One of the buildings to be demolished to facilitate the Scheme comprises a daytime roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle. An application for a bat mitigation licence would be submitted to Natural England for the destruction of this roost. The impact assessment, including mitigation, is detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>A minimum of eight bat species were recorded foraging and or commuting across the survey area, including one 'rarest' bat species (Barbastelle), four 'rarer' bat species (Leisler's bat, Noctule, Serotine and Nathusius' pipistrelle), and three 'common' bat species (brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle). Unidentified <i>Myotis</i> sp., <i>Nyctalus</i> sp., and <i>Pipistrellus</i> sp. were also recorded. Barbastelle comprised less than 1% of total bat registrations, at the time of writing. This result is consistent with the low numbers recorded on</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the bat transect surveys and the geographical distribution of the species. Survey results are detailed in Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>It is anticipated that one bat roost (a soprano pipistrelle day roost comprising of one individual) would be lost as a result of the proposed works. This is as a result of a building demolition. No other bat roosts within trees or buildings are anticipated to be lost. Where a bat roost(s) is lost, a bat licence would be required, along with the provision of appropriate replacement bat roosts, the design/specification of which would be approved as by Natural England as part of the licence.</p> <p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> as they are not a protected species by law. However, as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species; however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Existing community or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, which would minimise long-term impacts upon these species. The disturbance from the A46 carriageway, the highways boundary fencing and planting during operation are considered to deter deer from wanting to cross the widened A46 carriageway. There are no existing signs to warn road users of wild animals and there are no current plans to provide such signage on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The widened carriageway would not sever any key commuting routes</li> <li>• There are no high populations of a single species or frequent routes used by multiple species to cross the existing A46 carriageway</li> <li>• The steepness of the embankment and widening of the carriageway are likely to deter wildlife from crossing the carriageway</li> <li>• The planting design would encourage wildlife to commute under the widened A46 carriageway through existing retained passages (where suitable habitat exists on both side of the carriageway)</li> </ul> <p>In addition the Applicant explored whether it is feasible to install badger exclusion fencing in specific locations, informed by roadkill data. Whilst badger exclusion fencing would help to deflect badger away from the widened carriageway towards existing safe underpasses, due to multidisciplinary design constraints, it is not currently deemed feasible to install badger fencing as part of the Scheme. These constraints are detailed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. It is considered that the benefit of installing badger exclusion fencing (reduced badger mortality) is not proportionate to the cumulative adverse impact of installing it. Subsequently, a worst-case scenario of 'no fencing' has been applied within the assessment of likely significant effects of the current design.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Biodiversity	How will deer be protected and guided away from the road? They are often seen in the village. Their route to the village will be severed due to the new road system.	2C	N	<p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) as they are not a protected species by law. However, as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are a protected species; however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Existing community or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), which would minimise long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>The disturbance from the widened A46 carriageway, the highways boundary fencing and established directional planting during operation are considered to deter deer from wanting to cross the widened A46 carriageway. Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do now.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Biodiversity	"The scheme will result in permanent habitat loss..."	2C	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible. Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Following the mitigation hierarchy, the quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland).</p> <p>A bespoke compensation package has been produced for the unavoidable permanent loss of lowland meadow Habitats of Principal Importance, a very high distinctiveness habitat. The Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Sites for which the site was designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. Residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified. Compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Site. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated.</p> <p>The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAV-B	Biodiversity	<p>The scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lead to permanent habitat loss and fragmentation at two wildlife sites, and the loss of veteran trees.</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is contained within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Following the mitigation hierarchy, the quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland). This is to ensure any failure of habitat establishment beyond the control of design and maintenance, would provide habitat for wildlife no less than pre-construction baseline whilst remedial action is taken to rectify any habitat establishment failure. A bespoke compensation package has been produced for the unavoidable permanent loss of lowland meadow Habitats of Principal Importance, a very high distinctiveness habitat.</p> <p>The Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The compensation planting design comprises habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. Residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified. Compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Site. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Whilst Scheme design iterations have resulted in the retention of all veteran trees, there would be an unavoidable permanent adverse impact to three veteran trees due to the direct impact to their root protection areas and the proximity of one of these veteran trees to the Order Limits, which would require a minor crown lift (&lt;0.5m). It is anticipated that, with arboricultural supervision to ensure works are undertaken in line with best practice, the level of disturbance stated above can be tolerated by these trees. It is difficult to predict this with certainty and therefore ongoing monitoring would be undertaken to inform any remedial action.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNV-R	Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects	One measure that would be much welcome by the local community would be that the area of Trent Lane, and Maltkiln Lane, currently being used as a scrapyard, be turned into a nature reserve, or at least used for significant mitigation planting. This would act as a much-needed "barrier" to the increased noise and air pollution and soften the increased visual impact of the project. This would also help to mitigate the adverse biodiversity impact from the project.	2D	N	<p>The scrap yard area on Trent Lane is on privately owned land which is outside of the Order Limits for the Scheme on land that has not been identified for provision of mitigation of likely significant effects. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>Planting on this area would not meet these tests, which would also mean that the necessary land could not be compulsorily acquired to secure landscape provision. Therefore, the Applicant cannot propose planting on this parcel of land as part of the development consent application. Temporary works would take place near to this area for construction access purposes related to the Nether Lock. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMU-P	Biodiversity	My main concern for the wildlife badger setts have already been blocked up. I think there could have been better ways to remove these animals from their homes. Would you like it if your house doors had been blocked off. When the Farndon Windmorpool Road was improved (all) there were badger tunnels included in this work but we still see lots of badgers, deer and foxes killed. Could better means be included for these animals, like better roadside fencing and larger tunnels that deer could go through?	2C	N	<p>No evidence of damage, destruction or obstruction of badger setts have been observed within the survey area. These acts constitute wildlife offences under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), without first obtaining a licence from Natural England. Disused badger setts can naturally become partially or completely blocked, even in the absence of human activity. Based on survey data collected to date (all badger setts observed are inactive), it is considered unlikely that a development licence from Natural England would be required for badger sett closure(s). Inactive badger setts and any large mammal burrows of a suitable size to be used by badger, located within 30m of works likely to result in a wildlife offence, would be monitored prior to its temporary or permanent closure, using a one-way gate. If monitoring surveys confirm the presence of badger, a development licence would be obtained from Natural England to allow for the lawful and humane closure of an active sett, prior to construction works commencing. Further details of these mitigation measures are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species, however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat. The disturbance from the widened A46 carriageway, steepness of the embankments, and established directional planting during operation are considered to deter badgers from wanting to cross the widened A46 carriageway.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ), which would minimise long-term impacts upon these species.
ANON-559H-RWNJ-C	Climate	Again, the negative impact on biodiversity, water and climate is a huge consideration.	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment, including biodiversity, drainage and the water environment and climate, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce potential adverse effects.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity, including designated sites, Habitats of Principal Importance, Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, habitats of ecological value and the protected species they support. This chapter details appropriate and proportional mitigation informed by robust survey data and desk study records. Results of protected species surveys are detailed in Appendices 8.1 to 8.13 and Appendix 8.15 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/6.6</b>) assesses the impacts on river and sea lamprey in greater detail (qualifying features for the designation of the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar), as the River Trent intersects the Scheme and is a known migratory route for lamprey. No residual significant effects are anticipated on the movement of protected species. Once planting has established, provision of habitats would be measurably greater than pre-construction and would enhance connectivity for wildlife (as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the water environment, informed by the below supporting documents of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment)</li> <li>• Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment)</li> <li>• Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment)</li> <li>• Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report)</li> <li>• Appendix 13.5 (Surface Water Quality Monitoring Report)</li> </ul> <p>The drainage strategy addresses surface water quality improvement, by providing above ground drainage features and Sustainable Drainage Systems which attenuate and treat surface water. A treatment train would be provided, made up of multiple blue-green infrastructure components to treat the surface water run-off sufficiently. The <i>Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool</i> has been utilised to assess the water quality impact at each of the drainage outfalls throughout the Scheme. This assessment 'passes' for all outfalls, including those to The Fleet, indicating that the drainage strategy to be provided treats surface water run-off sufficiently to not impact the wider water environment.</p> <p>Details of the Drainage Strategy can be seen in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Details of the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool assessments can be found in Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), sets out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation and specifically considers the greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Scheme as well as the Scheme's</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					vulnerability to climate. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO <sub>2</sub> e) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO <sub>2</sub> e, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO <sub>2</sub> e). Mitigation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ensure the Scheme design is resilient to future change in climate have been embedded into the Scheme design. With this mitigation in place no significant effects on climate are predicted during construction or operation of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Climate	In accord with this evidence, the National Infrastructure Commission has advised that instead of building new roads we should be making best use of the existing roads through maintenance. The Climate Change Committee has stated that 'New roads should only be built if they can be shown not to increase emissions'. The project is predicted to emit 254,536 tCo2e during construction, with a further 2.8MtCO2 in 2028 opening year and 3.2MtCO3 in 2043. In a climate emergency this is completely unacceptable and the road should not be built.	N/A	N	The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (the National Policy Statement for National Network) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b> ), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.  The Scheme is included within the <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.  The assessment includes both construction and operational impacts. Construction impacts include the embodied carbon emissions of materials, transport of materials to site and the use of construction plant. Operational impacts include road user, or tailpipe, emissions, land use change and operational energy. As such, the assessment relies upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Scheme.  Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) reports a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> . No significant effects on climate are anticipated. The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO <sub>2</sub> e in the greenhouse gas emissions as outlined above. However, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant, less than 0.007%, and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.  This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound. The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i> best practice, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the Scheme, for example, the use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.  The assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is undertaken by comparing the emissions from the Scheme against the relevant UK Government carbon budget for that period. The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO <sub>2</sub> e and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO <sub>2</sub> e.  As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> , the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Climate	Please accept this email as my response to the A46 Newark Bypass Consultation. Please acknowledge receipt and acceptance of this response. I strongly oppose to the A46 Newark Bypass project. The climate change Committee have stated that 'New roads should only be built if they can be shown not to increase emissions'. Since the project is predicted to emit 254,536 tCo2e during construction alone, with a further 10,411 tCo2e emissions in the opening year that is reason enough that this project should not be progressed, and that doesn't even include ongoing emissions, which I am unable to locate. We are living in times of climate emergency, that means we need to be acting like its an emergency, not attempting to progress as though it is business as usual.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RWF8-J	Climate	The construction emissions are 254,536 tCo2e. This is disproportionate for a scheme of this size and completely at odds with the climate emergency we are currently in. In the year of opening, the carbon emissions are predicted as 10, 411 tCo2e. There are no published figures for the operational saving of CO2e from the road's use but this would have to be incredibly high to justify such enormous embedded carbon.  There is currently "no credible pathway" for 1.5C according to the UN IPCC. This road is completely unjustified and the money would be better invested in cycling and public transport to help reduce emissions.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Climate	The largest environmental impact is not even mentioned – increased traffic and associated CO2 emissions. The climate impacts given only consider construction impacts – this is very misleading and overlooks the serious problem of climate change. All of these new highway schemes (current highways plan) are problematic in encouraging more traffic and the CO2 impacts need to be assessed. The roadbuilding plans are not consistent with climate change strategies at a national level.	2C		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes no likely significant effect, as the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> document states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'. The assessment has identified that the emissions arising from the Scheme represent less than 0.007% of the total emissions in any five-year United Kingdom legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. And so, the assessment concludes that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the greenhouse gas emissions as outlined above.</p> <p>The <i>National Highways' Net Zero Highways: Our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, include that 'net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary.</p> <p>The improvements to the A46 corridor are detailed within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country. The Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> makes a commitment to create a continuous dual carriageway from Lincoln to Warwick.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAV-B	Climate	<p>I object to the A46 Newark Bypass.</p> <p>The scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase carbon emissions. The construction emissions alone are 254,536 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e, all within the critical fourth carbon budget, taking us further away from reaching our 68% cut by 2030 required under the Paris Agreement. The extra traffic the road will generate would make things worse. In the opening year alone it would increase emissions by an extra 10,350 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, making it harder for us to reduce emissions fast enough in a climate emergency.</li> </ul> <p>(1) We are in a climate emergency, and recent record-breaking global heating and drought in the UK, Europe and around the world demonstrate that it is a crisis of ever-increasing dimensions. The scheme increases carbon emissions, and cannot be justified even within the scope of UK climate legislation, especially when properly contextualised by EIA best practice. No scheme increasing carbon emissions on this scale can be justified within the planning balance.</p> <p>(2) As a scientist in the good company of many others including Professor Sir David King , former UK Government's Chief Scientific Advisor (see his commentary on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 6<sup>th</sup> Assessment report "The final warning bell" at www.ccag.earth), I go further and call out the Government targets, policies including the out-of-date NPSNN as being wholly insufficient to the scale of the crisis. The scheme cannot be justified given the very clear moral grounds of its impacts on future beings.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> the need for the Scheme and how it complies with the relevant planning policy such as the National Policy Statement for National Networks and Environmental Impact Legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017). The specific policy and legislation relevant to the Scheme can be found in Section 14 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. In addition, the Applicant has completed a Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.3)</b>, which has been published in draft in line with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, to demonstrate compliance including Climate.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, this includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and operation.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> reports a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. No significant effects on climate are anticipated. The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the greenhouse gas emissions as outlined above. However, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant (less than 0.007%) and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound. The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i> best practice, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the Scheme, for example, the use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is undertaken by comparing the emissions from the Scheme against the relevant UK Government carbon budget for that period. The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO<sub>2</sub>e and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>A detailed breakdown of the carbon attributed to the construction phase is provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The largest contributor of emissions during construction is the Scheme earthworks (up to 51,404 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). Whilst this is a significant quantity attributed to one item, the earthworks play a wider beneficial role across the Scheme, not only for the overarching design, but also as part of the acoustic mitigation, landscape proposals and visual screening.</p> <p>A construction Carbon Management Plan will be completed in conjunction with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and will include the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement</li> <li>• Materials and resource management on site</li> <li>• Change process for low/zero carbon solutions</li> <li>• Low / zero carbon plant and management</li> <li>• Construction techniques and competency</li> <li>• Training matrix</li> </ul> <p>Operational emissions are provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) for both the year of Scheme opening to traffic (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043).</p> <p>As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), concludes no likely significant effect, as the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> document states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'. The assessment has identified that the emissions arising from the Scheme represent less than 0.007% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. And so, the assessment concludes that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking consent for the Scheme via a Development Consent Order, as such the determining authority is the Secretary of State for Transport, not the Planning Authority. The Planning Authority has been consulted during the Scheme development and their views incorporated into the design where appropriate.</p> <p>The existing stretch of A46 between the Farndon Junction, to the west of Newark-on-Trent and the A1 to the east of Newark-on-Trent, is the last remaining stretch of single carriageway between the M1 and A1 and consequently queuing traffic is a regular occurrence, often impacting journey time reliability. Further detail on the need for the Scheme is contained within the Case for The Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGY-M	Climate	The carbon assessments mean in a climate emergency this should not go ahead	2B	N	<p>The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (National Policy Statement for National Networks) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. In accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document <i>LA 114 – Climate</i>, the Applicant has sought to minimise carbon emissions as far as possible to contribute to the UK's net reduction in carbon emissions.</p> <p>A hierarchical approach to carbon management has been applied, which applies the principles of build nothing, build less, build clever, and build efficiently (as described in <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Climate	<p>We don't need more roads. The government has agreed to achieving net zero, this expansion completely goes against this. We are in a climate emergency, and it's ridiculous that this is being rolled forward.</p> <p>My greatest concern is the carbon footprint</p> <p>I implore anyone involved to do the right thing and scrap this expansion. It's a crime against the planet and everybody on it. It just cannot be communicated in lesser terms. The only way this situation can change is if we all as citizens speak up and say NO.....</p>			

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWET-D	Climate	It's immaterial and to be honest the only consideration is the wild like, carbon neutral with all the concrete used bla is frankly a joke, if you need to get the job done yes, minimise impact but you can't dress it up.	2C		<p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents, including the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) the need for the Scheme and how it complies with the relevant planning policy such as the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The specific policy and legislation in relation to climate which is relevant to the Scheme can be found in Section 14 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO<sub>2</sub>e).</p> <p>This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound. The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i> best practice, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the Scheme, for example, the use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>A detailed breakdown of the carbon attributed to the construction phase is provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The largest contributor of emissions during construction is the Scheme earthworks (up to 51,404 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). Whilst this is a significant quantity attributed to one item, the earthworks play a wider beneficial role across the Scheme, not only for the overarching design, but also as part of the acoustic mitigation, landscape proposals and visual screening.</p> <p>A construction Carbon Management Plan will be completed in conjunction with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and will include the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement</li> <li>• Materials and resource management on site</li> <li>• Change process for low/zero carbon solutions</li> <li>• Low/zero carbon plant and management</li> <li>• Construction techniques and competency</li> <li>• Training matrix</li> </ul> <p>Operational emissions are provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) for both the year of Scheme opening to traffic (2028) and 15 years after Scheme opening (2043).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is undertaken by comparing the emissions from the Scheme against the relevant UK Government carbon budget for that period. The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO<sub>2</sub>e and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), concludes no likely significant effect, as the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> document states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material</p>
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Climate	We are supposed to be achieving Net Zero emissions in the U.K. this road does not comply, it's illegal, and everybody involved, and reading this has a duty of care to oppose this project. Please speak up, and scrap these plans. No carbon footprint			
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Climate	It does seem odd to encourage more road traffic, including more noise, dirt and pollution at a time when government policy is to reduce pollution, as evidenced by 'net zero' policy.	2H		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><i>impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'</i>. The assessment has identified that the emissions arising from the Scheme represent less than 0.007% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. And so, the assessment concludes that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The assessment relies upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation set as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>The <i>National Highways' Net Zero Highways: Our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, include that '<i>net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset</i>' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts on human health from the construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Climate	No proper mitigation for zero carbon transport. Pedestrian and cycles in particular given almost zero thought and definitely a downgrade from the current options.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out the Scheme objectives. The objectives of the Scheme are designed to improve safety, congestion, connectivity to accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent whilst delivering better environmental outcomes and inclusivity to improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected.</p> <p>The Scheme also integrates walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders infrastructure into the Scheme construction strategy, which includes the provision and locations for diversions of existing and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes, new crossings, as well as ensuring access for key walking, cycling and horse-riding routes is maintained.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) will be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>), where information on the provisions and diversions that would be undertaken for Public Rights of Way within the Scheme can be found. A summary of stakeholder engagement can</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>be found in Appendix 4.3 (Record of Environmental Engagement) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Trent Valley Way crosses the Scheme at two locations, Cattle Market Junction and the existing Winthorpe Road. At Cattle Market Junction, new signalised crossings and a shared use path would be provided in the vicinity of the junction. At Winthorpe Road, a new shared-use, at-grade path would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection to Newark-on-Trent, details of which can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Climate	The consultation was fine and well presented. However my discussions with your staff highlighted the limitations of the scheme. Too many constraints have been made by lack of funding and joined up thinking. Climate challenges are going to get worse over the next 30 years and we should be taking every opportunity to reduce the impact. Not to simply not make it any worse.	2I	N	<p>The Applicant is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as the climate emergency declared by Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required under law by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and policy (the National Policy Statement for National Network) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. In accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 114 – <i>Climate</i>, the Applicant has sought to minimise carbon emissions as far as possible in order to contribute to the UK's net reduction in carbon emissions.</p> <p>A hierarchical approach to carbon management has been applied, which applies the principles of build nothing, build less, build clever, and build efficiently (as described in <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i>).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects, and it concludes that the construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, however, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are less than 0.007%, and so the assessment concludes no significant effect and that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Climate	The government's strategy for getting to Net Zero is inadequate and unlawful, the High Court has found, following a successful legal challenge brought by Good Law Project, Client Earth and Friends of the Earth. <a href="https://goodlawproject.org/we-won-net-zero/">https://goodlawproject.org/we-won-net-zero/</a> I believe that a moratorium should immediately be placed on the project until the government produces a lawful plan to reach net zero in line with its Paris I.	2H	N	<p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b> which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Cultural heritage	We are concerned that the proposed route will have a significant impact on the area, including Winthorpe Village which is a conservation village.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant confirms and advises that measures have been adopted through the design and mitigation measures to limit the potential for adverse effects from the construction and operation of the Scheme, as reported in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) and Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The setting of Winthorpe Conservation Area is one of rural, agricultural countryside, bounded by modern road networks to the south and west. Existing views from the conservation area towards the road network are well screened by existing mature vegetation.</p> <p>The addition of the A1/A46 Crossing and road section down to the Winthorpe Junction directly impact only part of the conservation area and part of its setting, and therefore would not amount to substantial harm.</p> <p>The Scheme is expected to yield negligible change in noise at Winthorpe Conservation Area. In general, this is because the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and the traffic on this road has been predicted to have negligible change. Furthermore, the A46, despite being closer than its current position, is mitigated by a low noise running surface and noise barriers. The new A46 earthworks also block noise from the A1.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>These impacts have been assessed as temporary moderate adverse effects during construction and permanent slight adverse effects as a result of construction, taking mitigation into account. This is the assessment for the conservation and Lowwood areas. Lowwood area is assessed as having a permanent slight adverse effect as a result of the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. Any views of the new bridge would be reduced to glimpse views.</p> <p>Noise bunds and low noise road surfacing along the Scheme would also mitigate against noise impacts to the south, and additional planting here would soften the visual impact of these bunds. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. With mitigation in place, it is considered that the permanent impact on Winthorpe Conservation Area would be reduced to moderate or slight. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage), Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate the impacts associated with the Scheme, including the mitigation referred to above. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBY-F	Geology and soils	Needs to make use of poor grade land (i.e. ALC grades 3b, 4 or 5), to protect the UK soil resource, wherever possible	2G	N	<p>An Outline Soil Management Plan is presented in Appendix B.3 (Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which outlines how soils would be managed during construction. The Outline Soil Management Plan incorporates the hierarchical system of avoidance, reduction and remediation, following <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring guidance</i>.</p> <p>The Scheme design has sought to minimise the area of land take of agricultural land, including areas of the best and most versatile land as far as possible. However, as stated in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, given the fixed location of the existing highway infrastructure that represents the start and end points of the Scheme there are no opportunities to deliver the Scheme in a way that avoids the development of any agricultural land. The use of some agricultural land is therefore necessary, as per paragraph 5.168 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks. Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies that there would be significant effects associated with the temporary loss of Agricultural Land Classification grade 2 (considered to be moderate adverse), and permanent loss of Agricultural Land Classification grade 3a (considered to be moderate adverse) and Agricultural Land Classification grade 3b (considered to be moderate adverse) to facilitate the construction of the Scheme. The residual effect of permanent removal of land remains the same throughout the construction and operation phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification surveys carried out in 2021 and 2023 have identified that the Scheme alignment including the Farndon East and West borrow pit/floodplain compensation areas (2021 and 2023 data) predominantly comprises non-best and most versatile and, including Grade 3b (74.2 ha, 49.6% of the area) and Grade 4 (57.5 ha, 38.4%). Further information on this can be found in Appendix 9.3 (Agricultural Land Classification Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQ3-R	Landscape and visual effects	concerns about light pollution which is currently bad and need to be reduced/ minimised.	2C	N	Information regarding lighting proposals is being developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing detailed design stage process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Landscape and visual effects	Residents of Winthorpe need to know much more details about: Light pollution limitation - particularly from raised sections of the roads	2D		<p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme would reflect the level of safety required for road users. Lighting is expected to be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users at locations where significant conflicting traffic flows are anticipated, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout would remain. The single carriageway link (Friendly Farmer Link Road) between the roundabouts is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Landscape and visual effects	As you are concerned about the environment and as part of the route would mean removing trees you can help existing trees by tackling the modern menace of ivy which has reached epidemic proportions with increasing public ignorance about the matter.  You should employ a gang of skilled chainsaw operators who can also use hand tools where necessary to remove this blight from any trees that remain along the route which you have access to and by doing so educate people as to what is needed right now to protect our trees.	2H	N	<p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme. Further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides an assessment of the potential arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme. Measures such as arboricultural supervision and use of ground and barrier protection would be implemented to reduce impacts where construction activities conflict with the root protection area of a veteran tree. With regard to the concerns over ivy, there are no specific proposals to remove ivy as part of the Scheme. Ivy is not an invasive species or species requiring specific control measures which are considered essential to offset the impacts of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Landscape and visual effects	Generally concerned about loss of trees which currently act as a buffer and are only just beginning to be effective.	2B	N	<p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. This is particularly the case on the eastern side of the A46, where the Scheme has been designed for widening to occur on the western side of the A46 (with the exception of some slips roads) in order to retain as much screening vegetation as possible between the A46 and Newark-on-Trent. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting including trees and shrubs would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme over time as it matures. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Landscape and visual effects	More trees please	2C	N	<p>The Applicant presents Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) which provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting including trees and shrubs would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, amendments have been made to the landscape proposals. Additional planting would be provided alongside the A1 east side between the A1 and Winthorpe including additional woodland planting. To the south-west, additional hedgerow with tree planting would also be provided on the boundary of the Scheme, details of which are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Landscape and visual effects	Additional trees to be planted around the roads would be preferable	2C		
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Landscape and visual effects	1. Tree planting Rather than just grassland alongside A1 east side between A46 and Trent Valley way (to reduce noise impact on southern part of Winthorpe village from the new bridge over the A1)	2D		
ANON-559H-RWSV-W	Landscape and visual effects	As long as more trees are going to be planted than taken down then this has to be a good compromise	2C		
ANON-559H-RW7X-3	Landscape and visual effects	Any tree and hedgerow planting in the area would be necessary to negate the removal of well established ones due to the dualling.	2F		
BHLF-559H-RWMM-E	Landscape and visual effects	Tree planting on the Winthorpe side of proposed road	2G		
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Landscape and visual effects	Mature planting rather than sapling planting should be use for faster impact.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees, regarding mature planting. Some mature tree planting would be considered, however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishing more successfully than mature planting. It can also grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, amendments have been made to the landscape proposals. Additional planting would be provided either side of the A1133. On the right-side, linear trees and shrubs would be provided and on the left side, hedgerows with trees would be provided to form the realigned field boundary to the A113 and A46. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Landscape and visual effects	Visual impact needs to be addressed with more planting of mature tree specimens eg. P20 why is there planting on right hand side of A1133 and not on Winthorpe village side on left-hand side of A1133	2B		
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Landscape and visual effects	Residents of Winthorpe need to know much more details about:  Why planting is indicated only on the right hand side of the road (leaving the Winthorpe roundabout and driving towards the village) rather than on both sides.	2D	N	<p>Since statutory consultation, amendments have been made to the landscape proposals. Additional planting would now be provided either side of the A1133. On the right-side, linear trees and shrubs would be provided and on the left side, hedgerows with trees would be provided to form the realigned field boundary with the neighbouring A113 and A46. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVJ-M	Landscape and visual effects	The mitigation solutions relating to the section close to Winthorpe are rather vague and ineffective. For example, any screening by planting will take years to have even minimum effect and even then don't appear adequate.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee regarding planting mitigation, the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>landscape integration and visual screening. For Winthorpe, this would include a series of landscape bunds running alongside the widened A46.</p> <p>Measures such as landscaping bunds do not need to establish and are anticipated to be effective in minimising impacts on sensitive receptors from the point at which the Scheme is operational. These landscape bunds would also be planted to soften the visual appearance of built features, contribute to habitat creation and align with the local landscape character.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Landscape and visual effects	Not local - Tree Nation is a non-profit organisation. You can choose any location to support reforestation projects.	2E/F	N	<p>The Applicant would plant trees in proximity to the works as part of a package of mitigation measures. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the widened A46 including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. The Applicant has worked collaboratively with stakeholders such as Newark and Sherwood District Council and has received consultation feedback from environmental stakeholders such as Forestry England and Natural England to help develop its landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGM-8	Landscape and visual effects	Ensure adequate mitigation to Winthorpe Village by provision of bunds, sound baffles tree screen to include both saplings and mature indigenous tree.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to the mitigation provided in respect to the landscape and visual effects, some mature tree planting would be considered; however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishing more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise mitigation would be provided where necessary across the Scheme, which would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. This would ensure no significant effects at any receptors, including those in Winthorpe, during operation with respect to noise and vibration. Further information is provided in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This would include the use of temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7Y-4	Landscape and visual effects	I am extremely concerned about a fly over. Surely another suitable plan can be put forward to help the congestion than the monstrosity of a flyover. Newark is a beautiful market town in a rural setting. A flyover will ruin our town.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regard to the grade separated junction at Cattle Market. Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout. These queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes are made at the junction. The grade separated design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling by removing the conflict between local and strategic traffic (that which continues along the A46).</p> <p>The A46 passing beneath Cattle Market Roundabout would achieve the same goals from a traffic perspective but would not be possible as the roundabout is situated within a floodplain. It is recognised that the grade separated junction would have adverse landscape and visual effects upon a small number of nearby receptors, namely those within the immediate vicinity with a high sensitivity to change. The Applicant would provide mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Further information is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. For further information on the justifications for the route chosen, please refer to Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> sets out the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact upon of the Scheme. Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG5-G	Landscape and visual effects	it would be appropriate to restore tree planting in mitigation of those removed during the build.	2E/2F	N	<p>Since statutory consultation, the potential loss of existing vegetation has continued to be minimised during the design evolution in line with principles of the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts wherever possible in the first instance. Where vegetation removal is unavoidable, replacement planting would be provided. Further detail of the landscape proposal is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Landscape and visual effects	It is a huge ugly concrete monstrosity and a real eyesore I absolutely hate it.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant understands that the Consultee is referring to the new grade separated junction at the existing Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>The traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> helped to inform design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout. These queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes are made at the junction.</p> <p>The grade separated design was chosen as it proved the most successful in solving the queuing issues in the traffic modelling by removing the conflict between local and strategic traffic (which continues along the A46). The grade separation was needed, as an at grade solution did not have the capacity to allow the high flows to pass across the junction without impacting the mainline flow (this is an existing issue that is worsened with the traffic growth). This is caused by the high flows going from the A46 southbound carriageway to Kelham and the large flow going from A46 northbound, A616 and A616 into Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The A46 passing beneath Cattle Market Roundabout would achieve the same goals from a traffic perspective but would not be possible as the roundabout is situated within a floodplain, further details of the assessment of alternatives can be found within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. It is recognised that the grade separated junction would have adverse landscape and visual effects upon a small number of nearby receptors, namely those within the immediate vicinity with a high sensitivity to change. The Applicant would provide mitigation in the form of tree and shrub planting to assist in screening the structure wherever possible. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Further information on the landscape proposals is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW83-Y	Landscape and visual effects	Also, who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed mitigation sites.	2G	N	<p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will be prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will be developed from the First Iteration Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation. A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be prepared at the end of the construction phase and will cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides details on long-term maintenance responsibilities.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Landscape and visual effects	<p>I also object to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the significant adverse impact on landscape character and the countryside which adversely impacting on amenity and how people enjoy the countryside. 'This may in turn adversely impact wellbeing within local communities'</li> <li>the loss of veteran and notable trees</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This includes impact upon landscape character of the surrounding countryside. The assessment has informed the development of the landscape design in order to minimise and mitigate landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to aid landscape integration and visual screening of the Scheme. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> present an assessment of the potential impacts on amenity on the local community. This takes into consideration amenity effects which include the coexistence of environmental effects such as noise, air quality, and landscape and visual amenity. No significant effects on amenity have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present. All veteran or notable trees within or in close proximity to the Order Limits are to be retained. Further details regarding veteran trees are presented within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> . Mitigation measures to protect veteran trees are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Increasing the density of wooded land along the A46 will also reduce the noise from the bypass and improve air quality, which will significantly deteriorate given the estimated traffic amounts.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments with regard to planting, air quality, and noise.</p> <p>Planting of trees and shrubs would be provided in many places along the length of the route in order to aid visual screening and landscape integration, as well as providing habitat for local wildlife. Details of the landscape proposals can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout to mitigate operational impacts as a result of the Scheme. The noise mitigation measures would vary from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to the impacts on air quality as a result of the Scheme, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation. The assessment concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality. The assessment of the operational phase does not consider tree/vegetation cover and its effects on air quality in any modelled scenario as this is not a requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>, promotes a conservative assessment and quantification of the interaction between air quality and vegetation is still subject to ongoing research. By excluding the effects of vegetation from the Do Something scenario, the assessment predicts a worst-case with Scheme concentrations. As predicted impacts are concluded to be not significant, no mitigation measures are required for impacts on air quality during operation.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAV-B	Landscape and visual effects	<p>The scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have a massive adverse visual impact with a 8 metre high flyover at the town's cattle market, right by people's homes. The A1 flyover would be 10.9 metres high and would impact on the setting of this historic town. At Winthorpe there would be ten lanes of traffic by the village</li> <li>• have a huge impact on landscape character where the scheme crosses a rural landscape. Huge borrow pits for flood mitigation outside the route would also have a large impact on the rural landscape.</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including those associated with the Cattle Market Junction are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable in order to reduce the landscape and visual impact of the Scheme, by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors. Planting would be provided around Cattle Market Junction as well as around the A1 overbridge. Mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme within the setting of Newark Conservation Area and Newark Castle. No significant effects were identified due to the existing road infrastructure and intervening modern development between the Cattle Market Roundabout and the conservation area boundary and Newark Castle. Impacts to the Winthorpe Conservation Area arising from the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Scheme (including the A1/A46 Crossing) have been assessed as permanent slight adverse, as outlined in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>To the south of the village of Winthorpe, there would be two additional lanes carrying A46 traffic along the dual carriageway and two new single lane slip roads taking traffic on and off the A46 at Brownhills. Between the Friendly Farmer Roundabout and the Winthorpe Roundabout there are six lanes of traffic where the two additional lanes were placed on the side of the Newark Showground to minimise the impact on Winthorpe village. The lanes increase to eight at Winthorpe Roundabout to provide space for turning movements.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> would be gently profiled to ensure a softened and more naturalistic landform. Slope profiles would be gentle enough to allow the reinstatement of agricultural land use upon completion of earthworks excavations, and therefore the impact upon local landscape character would be reduced. Farndon West floodplain compensation area would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment.</p> <p>The main habitats within Farndon West would include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. Further detail on landscape and visual effects associated with the borrow pits can be found in Section 7.11 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Details of landscape proposals within the areas of floodplain compensation and borrow pits used during construction are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNV-R	Noise and vibration; Air quality; Biodiversity	I believe that the current A46 bypass and related roundabouts are unsatisfactory and they need to be improved. However, I, and many of my neighbours, and fellow residents of the town, have grave concerns about the impact of the Scheme's design on the local environment - namely increased, noise, air pollution, and effect on local wildlife. It will be these local people who had to live with the effects long after construction has finished.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the observations regarding the existing arrangements on the A46. The assessments presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> consider both construction and operation effects in relation to noise and vibration, air quality and biodiversity. The following provides a summary of the assessed significance of effect for each of the environmental topics mentioned, for further detail see the individual topics chapters as outlined above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Air quality:</b> No significant effects were identified during construction, following the application of mitigation measures as described in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, such as dust suppression techniques, site speed limits and material handling measures. No significant effects were identified during operation of the Scheme on human health receptors and no further mitigation required</li> <li>• <b>Biodiversity:</b> Following the application of mitigation, a significant effect during construction is identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no significant effects identified</li> <li>• <b>Noise and vibration:</b> Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place
ANON-559H-RWNV-R	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Population and human health	<p>I welcome the work done in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report – however, I don't think it has fully considered the impact to the housing estate of King's Sconce Avenue, Water's Edge, and River view, forming around 120 dwellings. I know many of my neighbours feels the same.</p> <p>The viaduct of the A46 bypass passing by this point is already an eye sore, and provides a great deal of noise pollution, and vehicle emissions, and this project is forecast to increase traffic flows significantly – I believe by nearly 50 per cent from what it would have been in 2028.</p> <p>PEI Report doesn't consider that this estate sits at a lower ground level, so this area in effect behaves like a valley basin or "sink" for noise, and air pollution, with little vegetation to mitigate this.</p> <p>It's been well documented by numerous studies that increased traffic, and vehicle emissions affect not only respiratory health but also brain health, and mental health.</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Visual receptors have been grouped, with representative views assessed, including the properties within the area of Kings Sconce Avenue, Water's Edge and River View which have been assessed under Viewpoint 31 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Further information on the baseline and future views from each receptor is detailed in Appendix 7.2 (Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Existing vegetation alongside the A46 would remain in place throughout the works, thereby retaining screening of the A46 in this location. A small number of individual new trees would be provided alongside the River Trent closer to Nether Lock Viaduct. Significant effects are not anticipated from this location from a landscape and visual impact perspective, with the widening works being situated on the far side of the A46.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise model that supports the assessment has taken account of all local ground topographical features. Due to a combination of factors including speed limit enforcement and low noise road surfacing, the impacts on King Sconce Avenue, Waters Edge, and River View would be negligible.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. A human health receptor on River View has been included in the assessment, which is within 200m of the affected road network. The receptor is closer to the A46 than those on Kings Sconce Avenue and Water's Edge and as such is likely to experience higher pollutant concentrations associated with emissions from the A46. At the human health receptor on River View, an annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration of 17.0µg/m<sup>3</sup> is predicted in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme), compared to an annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area. Therefore, changes in air quality are concluded to be not significant and no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The human health section of the assessment draws down on the findings of the air quality and noise Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) chapters which as above have determined that no significant effects are likely at Kings Sconce Avenue, Water's Edge and River View. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. Measures</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>of relevance for King's Sconce Avenue, Water's Edge and River View include but are not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. With these measures in place there would be no significant effects upon human health during the construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3B-9	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	additional tree/ shrub planting along the existing A46 road plus installation of noise baffles to reduce noise pollution to those living adjacent to the scheme. The road (non) surfaces should also be of a type that reduces noise. Consideration be given to noise baffles on the elevated sections. Trapping of small exhaust particulates would benefit those properties adjacent to the road which are already showing signs of blackening after only 9-10 years of being built.	2D	N	<p>Mitigation measures relating to air quality, noise and landscape for the Scheme are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. During construction, this includes but is not limited to dust management (such as locating stockpiles out of the wind, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and switching off vehicle engines when not in use), daily inspections to ensure dust management is effective, noise management (including temporary acoustic barriers where necessary), and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The final version of the Environmental Management Plan, the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan, will be prepared at the end of the construction phase in accordance with Requirement 4 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> and will cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. This Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. A commitment would be made to ensure the successful establishment of the environmental mitigation via the development consent application to ensure that planting matures to meet its intended function.</p> <p>Tree and shrub planting would be implemented along the length of the Scheme in order to provide landscape integration and visual amenity. Further details are presented on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation at sensitive human health receptors and designated habitats within the study area. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> which does not require consideration of the impact of air pollutants on blackening buildings which has therefore not been assessed.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality at any of the sensitive human health receptors and designated habitats. The assessment of the operational phase does not consider tree/vegetation cover and its effects on air quality in any modelled scenario as this is not a requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>, promotes a conservative assessment and quantification of the interaction between air quality and vegetation which is still subject to ongoing research. By excluding the effects of vegetation from the Do Something scenario, the assessment predicts a worst-case with Scheme concentrations. As predicted impacts are concluded to be not significant, no mitigation measures are required for impacts on air quality during operation.</p> <p>Low noise road surfacing has been included in the Scheme design. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. As well as a low noise running surface, permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>The final design of the noise barriers would continue to be developed at the locations specified in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWW-2	Noise and vibration; Air quality; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>being one of the closest houses to the proposed development of the Cattle Market roundabout, I believe it will have a serious negative impact on myself from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased noise levels - both during construction and past construction</li> <li>increased pollution levels - from vehicle emissions</li> <li>increased flood risk - the field behind my house already flood regularly.</li> </ul>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges comments from the Consultee regarding noise, air quality, population and human health, and flooding. With regard to noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Prior to construction, site hoardings would be installed to mitigate noise impacts adjacent to construction activities at Cattle Market Roundabout. In addition, a noise barrier would be installed between the western slip road and the southern approach of Cattle Market Roundabout. Further detail can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. The purpose of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) is to detail how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme as identified within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and to demonstrate compliance with environmental legislation. Such measures would be in place near the Cattle Market Roundabout. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Furthermore, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality during construction or operation. Whilst there are some deteriorations along the A46 due to increased traffic during operation, changes at the human health receptors close to Cattle Market Roundabout are considered imperceptible in accordance with the assessment approach set out in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. In addition, there are improvements in air quality within Newark-on-Trent as a result of the Scheme</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Existing road drainage would be maintained by the Applicant as part of the established maintenance regime.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWW-2	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	<p>while the current plans already show extensive tree and shrub planting, this will not provide an effect barrier to sound increases in the short-term as it will require 10-20 to mature. Also, if this is deciduous planting, then leaf fall during winter will reduce its effectiveness.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Planting is not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise, instead where needed, landscape bunds and noise barriers would be provided. Further detail on the specific measures to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Measures such as landscaping bunds do not need to establish and are anticipated to be effective in minimising impacts on sensitive receptors from the point at which the Scheme is operational. These landscape bunds would also be planted to soften the visual appearance of built features, contribute to habitat creation and align with the local landscape character, further details can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8Y-5	Noise and vibration	Acoustic fencing	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures, as presented within Figure 2.3 Environmental Masterplan of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>, would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination of both depending on the physical constraints along the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>No residual significant adverse effects are predicted with mitigation measures in place. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy (i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects).</p> <p>With regard to the existing vegetation, the Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment can be found in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental</p>
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	Noise and vibration	Acoustic barriers.			
BHLF-559H-RW96-3	Noise and vibration	Fencing to cut down noise			
ANON-559H-RWVC-D	Noise and vibration	I would like to see upgrading of the noise screening for the housing to the East of the route rather relying on existing vegetation.			
BHLF-559H-RWW8-3	Noise and vibration	Sound barriers at the River Trent crossing north of Farndon roundabout			
BHLF-559H-RWQS-R	Noise and vibration	maximum noise mitigation fencing please - prevailing wind carries much noise toward riverside areas of Newark at the current time - this will be worse when carriageway is elevated and dualled. thanks.			
ANON-559H-RWVJ-M	Noise and vibration	Acoustic barriers were mentioned during a recent 'Think Again' meeting, which don't seem to have been considered by Highways.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWTG-F	Noise and vibration	Acoustic barriers in the location of Friendly farmer /Winthorpe roundabout or acoustic bunding.  Acoustic treatment where the new road section passes over the A1 In each of the above to abate noise for Winthorpe residents	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWTG-F	Noise and vibration	Concerns over additional noise from the new scheme specifically relating to the orientation of various properties in Winthorpe relative to the new layout.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWWW-2	Noise and vibration	Acoustic fencing should be erected at the edge of the roads facing residential housing.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWMR-K	Noise and vibration	would it be possible to add noise suppression barriers on A1 over the river Trent as noise travels along the river ?	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFH-2	Noise and vibration	I think where possible, permanent acoustic barriers should be used to mitigate traffic noise near residential settlements, particularly around the A1 crossing and dual carriageway section just west of the A1 crossing/junction, in addition to maintaining the existing vegetation. This would substantially benefit the residents of Robert Dukeson Avenue and surrounding roads.	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, the landscape proposals can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>It is noted that while control of noise levels from the A1 is outside the scope of the Scheme, cumulative noise levels from all highways, including the A1, have been considered as part of the assessment. Any measures identified in the assessment to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme have been provided. Further information can be found in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> present noise levels and noise level change with and without the Scheme for reference.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include the use of temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMMR-K	Noise and vibration	please provide noise suppression	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMMR-K	Noise and vibration	Noise suppression only	2D		<p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures, as presented within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>, would be provided along the Scheme. Suitable noise mitigation measures that would be provided would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination of both depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This would include the use of temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ). Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWQW-V	Noise and vibration	confirmation please that: 1) road surface will be quite! 2) bunds will be tall enough to mitigate noise 3) planting scheme will be in place	2C	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.  The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures, as presented within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ), would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing which would be incorporated throughout the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.  Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li><li>Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li><li>At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li><li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li><li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li></ul> In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.  Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ).  Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ). These measures include the use of temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).  The noise assessment presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) includes consideration for noise insulation measures. No receptors eligible for noise insulation under the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (amended 1988) have been identified.  Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the
ANON-559H-RWVB-C	Noise and vibration	Noise pollution. Reduction at source by the selection of low level road surfaces. Has the road surface been designated and if so what will it be? Has noise containment fencing / barriers been considered? Will the use of berms and raised earthworks be shown in detail and their locations indicated? The use of evergreen woodland and sound absorptive hedgerow requires planting at the outset of the scheme. Will the location details and timing of this process be made available for the public? The last barrier to noise prevention within dwellings is enhanced glazing. Does the scheme make provision for this to residencies that are severely impacted.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Noise and vibration	Residents of Winthorpe need to know much more details about:  Noise mitigation measures - bunding heights, tree planting, noise restrictive fencing etc			



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Scheme. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy, instead noise barriers or bunds are used where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Noise and vibration	We have been informed the new road will be utilising a low noise road surface but that it does wear out more quickly - will this mean continual road repairs? This is already a noisy area from the existing A46, any measure to reduce this would be of great benefit to local residents.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant understands the concerns regarding low noise road surfacing which would be provided throughout the Scheme. The life of low noise road surfacing is typically between 8-12 years depending upon many factors, suggesting continual repairs would not be required.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWV-G	Noise and vibration	If low noise tarmac was used, residents would be less impacted by the constant traffic noise that will only increase once the work is completed.	2D		<p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration, including low noise road surfacing, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Noise and vibration	Screening with trees to keep the noise down.	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> informs potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing, details of which can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy, instead noise barriers or bunds are used where necessary to avoid significant effects. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXZ-6	Noise and vibration	You could plant trees that don't shed leaves to lessen the noise.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Noise and vibration	More foliage and trees to be planted to offset noise	2D		
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Noise and vibration	As road noise is a particular problem to Branston Close, it is good to see that you are proposing noise mitigation measures alongside the existing dual carriageway. This seems to comprise of a low mound of earth upon which trees will be planted. It would seem that for this to be effective, it needs to be minimum 10m wide and up to 30m being preferable. Mixed tree planting is fine up to a point, however in order to block noise from passing below their canopy, dense planting of evergreen shrubs is really needed and /or noise reducing fencing as well. A belt of Cupresses Leylandi is a further option it seems perhaps within the centre of the whole strip.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes with the requirement of noise mitigation including barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. Details of these measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be found in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme is secured by Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration, including low noise road surfacing, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWX6-2	Noise and vibration	I would like some noise management schemes to be put in place.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXX-4	Noise and vibration	Noise reduction methods to be increased	2C		<p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes consideration for noise insulation. No receptors eligible for noise insulation under the <i>Noise Insulation Regulations 1975</i> (amended 1988) have been identified.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE2-B	Noise and vibration	I am very concerned with noise pollution. I can already hear road noise from the a46 and sometimes get woken up by lorries beeping horns. I do not believe enough work has been done to avoid noise during construction and road noise once complete. I am now currently looking into getting triple glazed windows	2C		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration, including low noise road surfacing, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. This would include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWV6-Z	Noise and vibration	I think more detail is needed on how to reduce the impact of noise carrying across the surrounding area. The new by pass will have faster moving traffic on more raised areas. Some very specific investigation by National Highways into various mitigating approaches would have been appreciated. Current information is a little woolly.	2D	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures that would be provided would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Noise and vibration	For sure speed limit nearby residential areas and natural reserves enforced by speed cameras. Noise barrier fencing not mentioned despite being a practical and economical solution.	2D	N	<p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>). The Scheme would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes with the requirement of noise mitigation including barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWF4-E	Noise and vibration	This should be key adjacent to all residential areas to help reduce pollution noise and hide busy roads, necessary to service the areas.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to potentially suitable locations for environmental enhancements. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects where possible. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes with the requirement of noise mitigation including barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW8Y-5	Noise and vibration	Also have concern about the noise from the tyres of traffic, this has got much worse with the dualing of the A46 at our house and will probably get worse again	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at all address base points (including noise important areas) that are relevant to the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area, including the location referred by the Consultee.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Noise and vibration	We are particular concerned about the following: 3. Noise levels	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>The mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8Y-5	Noise and vibration	Noise	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQ3-R	Noise and vibration	concerns about noise pollution which is currently bad and need to be reduced/ minimised .	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>These mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAV-B	Noise and vibration	<p>The scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increase noise pollution, especially in the village of Winthorpe</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>These mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>With mitigation in place no significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted in Winthorpe during operation or construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Noise and vibration	I also object to	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased noise pollution</li> </ul>			<p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>These mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWGS-E	Noise and vibration	Please see pages 10, 12, 13 One can only assume that local communities to the new layout may have additional noise problems	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme.</p> <p>These mitigation measures would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that will be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNP-J	Noise and vibration	This will increase the noise levels for us at around midnight or later from the boy recess who already use it.	2H	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>A speed limit would be allocated to each section of road modified. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b></p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The widened A46 would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>The assessment concluded that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV6-Z	Noise and vibration	I have concerns about the height of the new bridge over the A1. Noise from the A1 towards Winthorpe can already be significant depending on wind direction.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme (the noise assessment has also considered the grade separation and bridge over the A1) and has concluded that with mitigation in place there will be no significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Suitable mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These measures would include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m metres would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Noise and vibration	The introduction of a flyover near Winthorpe will cause problems with noise for the village which already has a lot of noise at the end of the village.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Noise and vibration	Long term noise monitoring stations need to be implemented along the A46 close to residential areas as there are currently none. Noise reduction barriers are essential given the projected increase in traffic amounts along the A46, along with utilising Low Noise Road Surface.	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Noise monitoring was undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment. The noise assessment is nonetheless predominantly based on forecast traffic flows (for the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios) and simulated noise levels for all address base data points. All relevant locations are therefore included in the assessment. No additional noise monitoring is required to facilitate the assessment.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes in the short-term (the year the Scheme is open to traffic, 2028) and long-term (15 years after the Scheme opening, 2043) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>There are no residual significant environmental effects arising from the operational noise impacts of the Scheme. No long-term noise monitoring would be provided for the Scheme. Further information regarding this can be found in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW34-U	Noise and vibration	<p>We have suffered a lot of increased noise since the first lot of works on the bypass. I didn't see any mention of mitigating this or taking account of this in deciding the construction method and materials.</p> <p>I'm sure attention needs to be paid to the type of road surface and the properties of the bridge in amplifying traffic noise. It is all very well saying there will be noise-screening planting but the problem is best tackled at source and then planting as a back-up solution.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant recognises the concerns related to noise as a result of traffic management during and after construction. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy, noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Noise and vibration	<p>Concerning the noise after all is built. I think fences in conjunction with MATURE trees will be needed to reduce some of the noise. From where I live [redacted] there is already a lot of noise from the A1 and A46. It may become intolerable.</p> <p>Average speed cameras to help reduce the speed drivers are travelling over new Winthorpe flyover.</p> <p>Decent tarmac that is noise reducing</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regard to noise as a result of the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. There are no residual significant adverse effects predicted in this location with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme and would include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening, these can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's suggestion of using mature trees as a form of noise mitigation, some mature tree planting would be considered; however, the smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. Planting is typically not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise. Instead, where needed, landscape bunds and noise barriers would be provided. Further detail on the specific measures to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. These speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	All along the side of the road adjacent to Winthorpe village, there could be MATURE trees planted to make a woodland sound barrier in conjunction with the raise land you propose. I think fences also, with planting either side to camouflage the fence.	2E/2F	N	<p>Additional planting has been provided since the statutory consultation and planting would now be provided in the locations suggested by the Consultee including either side of the A1133 alongside the A46 between Winthorpe Roundabout and the A1 and to the south of Winthorpe between the Scheme and Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's suggestion of using mature trees as a form of noise mitigation in Winthorpe, some mature tree planting would be considered; however, the smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. Planting is typically not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise. Instead where needed, landscape bunds and/or acoustic barriers would be provided. Further detail on the specific measures to mitigate noise and vibration can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Landscape bunds alongside the A46 would be planted with trees and shrubs, which over time would further aid screening of the road beyond. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWW8-3	Noise and vibration	I have a concern for sound pollution will increase as a result of your increased traffic flows and higher speeds north of the Farndon Roundabout. Although I am probably 200-300 yards away from the newly widened bypass, there are houses within 50-100 yards. I would be	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme, including in the area north of the Farndon Roundabout.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		interested to hear your plans to deal with this. Your consultation brochure does not refer to this. My area of concern is near the River Trent, north of Farndon roundabout. I can currently hear traffic on the Bypass at the Maltslers			<p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge. In addition, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill to reduce noise. Low noise road surfacing would also be provided along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>No significant effects are predicted to occur in this location, as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration, including temporary noise barriers during construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWW9-4	Noise and vibration	The present A46 from Leicester to Farndon roundabout and on the current raised bypass to the Cattle market roundabout are a source of much noise from motorcycles with ineffective exhausts. They can be heard for minutes as they travel towards Leicester. They can also be heard towards the Farndon roundabout. The noise at weekends is disruptive and is very noticeable in our garden. A lot of noise reduction will be needed. Also the noise rumble from the traffic on the bypass is distinctive.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Modified vehicle types/vehicles with ineffective exhaust systems cannot be explicitly addressed in the assessment as they are atypical and would place unreasonable constraints on the design process.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	<p>I completely understand that construction projects are noisy, and that we can expect noise while the work is taking place.</p> <p>However I am very concerned about increased noise when the dual carriageway is operational. I am pleased that the new lanes will be built on the north side of the existing road, i.e. away from the town. However, not only will there be twice as many lanes of traffic, which will be travelling at a higher speed, but as the carriageway will be raised the noise will carry further.</p> <p>The proposal document does not appear to include any serious proposals to reduce or minimise noise pollution.</p> <p>There is also no mention of light pollution. Does this mean that there will be no lights on the new section of dual carriageway?</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Figures 11.1 to 11.9 within the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> show noise level changes in the short and long-term, both with and without the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals is being developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are described within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWBK-1	Noise and vibration	I often walk under the existing flyover near the Farndon roundabout, it goes over the path which runs alongside the river - it is a popular and well used footpath. Currently the loose panels on the existing flyover hit together as lorries go over it - this creates constant noise which is stressful and scares all forms of wildlife.	2D	N	The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee, however, the existing viaduct near Farndon Roundabout does not form part of the Scheme and the issue raised may be considered as part of the Applicant's future maintenance programme.
BHLF-559H-RWW1-V	Noise and vibration	I have noticed a marked increase of traffic noise over the years I have lived in long have Farndon. And I am hoping that checks will be undertaken and nearest taken accordingly to mitigate these (come and sit in my back garden to see how it really is - You'd be welcome!)	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge. In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWT4-V	Noise and vibration	Living on the edge of the roundabout, closest to Winthorpe my only concern is how close the off slip will be to come off the A46 onto the A1133 and what increase in noise level would there be. Do you intend to put anything in to reduce noise?	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. For this area in particular, noise mitigation would be provided from the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout and would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) presents the positioning of the A46/A1133 slip road in the context of its surroundings.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWVB-C	Noise and vibration	<p>The impact of existing road noise to the residents of dwellings in the proximity of the A46 road bridge over the Newark Dyke near the Farndon roundabout is considerable. There has not been adequate monitoring of existing noise pollution encompassing all homes affected. With the increased traffic this scheme will generate, the level of noise pollution will also increase.</p> <p>The prevailing wind funnels and concentrates road noise along the waterway causing unacceptable audible traffic noise even indoors, to residents living along the Newark Dyke.</p> <p>What are the predicted noise levels when the scheme is completed?</p> <p>Will these levels be within the accepted World Health Organisation recommended limits of noise pollution for social well-being?</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at all relevant sensitive receptors, including addresses in the vicinity of Farndon Roundabout.</p> <p>Noise monitoring was undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment. The noise assessment is nonetheless predominantly based on forecast traffic flows (for the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios) and noise levels have been calculated for all noise sensitive receptors within the operational noise study area. All relevant locations are therefore included in the assessment. No additional noise monitoring is required to facilitate the assessment. No residual significant adverse effects are predicted at the locations the Consultee refers to.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The World Health Organization's Environmental <i>Noise Guidelines</i> have been considered within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. It is noted however that the World Health Organization's guidelines do not take account of sustainability which is a key element of the Noise Policy Statement for England that takes precedence. Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented for all areas relevant to the Scheme within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Noise and vibration; Population and human health	*Noise* Traffic noise in the areas around the end of Winthorpe road can already be bad, particularly in certain wind conditions. Further traffic noise from an elevated A46 combined with the slip roads and A1 could be worse than existing. This is a concern. Noise is pollution. It is detrimental to health and wellbeing. The impacts can go further than just the immediate streets.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The assessment concluded that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur in the Winthorpe area as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the scheme on the local population and human health receptors.</p> <p>As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>It is noted that while control of noise levels from the A1 is outside the scope of the Scheme, cumulative levels from all highways, including the A1, have been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b></p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Noise and vibration; Population and human health; Landscape and visual effects	<p>The estimated noise pollution levels are also totally unacceptable. There is growing evidence on the impacts noise pollution has on people's health and well-being. The associated costs of impacts to health and well-being needs to be taken seriously into account with such projects. Our health service is already struggling without knowingly increasing the risks to people's health and well-being with projects like this. The proposals are not in keeping with the communities, rural landscape and local character. National Highways own documents show that there would be a significant adverse effect in this regard, and that again is unacceptable. There would be detrimental impacts during the construction period if this project is progressed, having impacts on communities, health and well-being.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment concluded that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes in the short and long-term (the year the Scheme is open to traffic, 2028 and 15 years after opening, 2043, respectively) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. The landscape design and choice of indicative species has been informed by a number of sources including national and local character assessments.</p> <p>These assessments included identifying key actions for landscape in the district as set out in in the Newark and Sherwood District Council's <i>Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document</i> which is based around a sense of place, local distinctiveness, characteristic wildlife and natural features. Additionally, key aspirations are highlighted for each policy zone and lists potential species for inclusion within the regional character areas identified.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Construction of the Scheme will have associated effects including community severance to public health and social care and educational facilities. Temporary severance of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders including mobility-impaired users provision and delays in access for users to green space is also considered.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment would be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out a number of mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the severance of walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions and green space provision, maintaining Public Rights of Way wherever possible and providing appropriate signage for temporary walking, cycling and horse-riding diversions.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVB-C	Population and human health; Noise and vibration	It can not be stressed too strongly that residents within close proximity to the enhanced traffic measures are protected and not subjected to the social and psychological degradation that will result with the possible additional noise pollution.	2H	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Construction of the Scheme will have associated effects including community severance to public health and social care and educational facilities. Temporary severance of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders provision and delays in access for users to green space is also considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Population and human health	I have serious concerns about the effect on public health and well-being if the proposals are implemented as they stand.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Population and human health	You give only very vague information about the impact on human health of the scheme. Given that many similar schemes have been carried out, it must be possible to provide more detailed information about the impact of such Schemes on local residents.	2B	N	<p>Consideration of impacts on Population Human Health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Noise and vibration	Noise pollution will affect residents and wildlife this will be compounded by the relocation of the lorry park to the showground area.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>No significant effects on wildlife are anticipated that relate to noise and vibration during construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, as described within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The potential effects of the Scheme and the lorry park in-combination are considered within Chapter 15 (Combined and cumulative effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and from this assessment no significant combined or cumulative effects have been identified for 'noise and vibration' or 'wildlife'. Though a temporary slight adverse combined effect for noise and vibration is anticipated during construction works and combined slight adverse effects upon wildlife are anticipated during construction and operation, these effects are anticipated not be significant.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSZ-1	Noise and vibration	I have spent some time in Winthorpe recently for various reasons and the noise from the A1 in particular is very bad. Sound screening of both the A1 and the new road would be a good thing for the local communities	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>It is noted that while control of noise levels from the A1 is outside the scope of the Scheme, cumulative levels from all highways, including the A1, have been considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With mitigation in place no significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted in Winthorpe during operation or construction of the Scheme. Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long- term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Noise and vibration	The dwellings shown will be adversely affected by increased noise and visual pollution from increased levels and speed of traffic. We therefore request the use of specialised noise road surfacing and the installation of acoustic facing along the side of the existing road We suggest from the Cattle market roundabout to approximately point (as shown) to include the bridge *image on Freepost Response Form 93*	2D	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The mitigation measures were identified following completion of the noise assessment after the statutory consultation period had ended, and address all locations where significant effects due to operation of the Scheme would occur in the absence of these measures. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Noise and vibration	A speed limit is essential for safety and hopefully would reduce some of the noise.	2D	N	<p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of the modified road. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Noise and vibration	Further assessment is required to establish the potential for noise and vibration impacts from changes to traffic flows and levels ... potential for significant adverse effects as a result of changes to views for residential receptors and from public rights of way, including the Trent Valley Way, and for visitors to recreational facilities including Newark Castle, and road users.	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and assessed the impact on existing views including from residential properties and Public Rights of Way as well as other recreational receptors with views towards the Scheme. The outcome of the assessment has informed the Scheme design development as well as mitigation requirements including planting of trees and shrubs, landscape bunds and earthworks to help settle the Scheme in the neighbouring landscape.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	Noise and vibration	If the Newark Bypass is to be restricted to 50 MPH, how is this going to be policed? It's OK putting a limit on the road but if people do not adhere to it the noise to the village will increase.	2C	N	<p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Noise and vibration	How will noise and vibration be reduced - so that residents and wildlife including bats are unaffected ,especially as noise levels are already too high.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>No significant effects are predicted in relation to noise and vibration on any protected species such as bats with mitigation in place, during construction or operation of the Scheme as described within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVT-X	Noise and vibration	<p>My main concerns relate to the potential noise levels once the road is completed. Currently the bypass noise levels are above 60 decibels measured from my address on Wolsey Rd during daytime traffic hours.</p> <p>If the proposed speed is limited to 50 miles an hour to reduce noise levels, how will that be monitored as I see traffic currently going well above current speed limits and nothing is been done to reduce or police the situation.</p> <p>What actual plans are there to reduce noise, will there be noise barriers along the raised section?</p>	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with both the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide noise screening, measures which can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> presents the positioning of the mitigation in the context of the Scheme including adjacent to the proposed grade-separated junction at Brownhills. There are no residual significant adverse effects predicted at the location referred to by the Consultee with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Noise and vibration	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Volume 2 Figure 12.2 Noise Monitoring Locations demonstrates a complete lack of monitoring noise to the surrounding area in the long term with the proposal for no noise monitoring locations along the River Trent, where there are many homes on both sides, with some properties being less than 150 meters from the A46. How are you going to establish a baseline for noise levels or monitor any increase if you have no noise monitoring locations near these residential properties? More so, if you intend at later point in time to take action to reduce noise, how will you establish if this has been successful? Given the lack of noise monitoring stations, I will be setting up a network of my own noise monitoring stations to continually monitor the noise over the course of this project for accountability and transparency.</p> <p>As it stands, the proposed noise monitoring method is woefully lacking in being able to monitor the noise generated along the A46 and the impact it will have on residential areas.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the noise assessment methodology and results of the noise monitoring undertaken for the Scheme.</p> <p>Noise monitoring was undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment. The noise assessment is nonetheless predominantly based on forecast traffic flows (for the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios) and calculated noise levels for all noise sensitive receptors within the operational noise study area. All relevant locations are therefore included in the assessment. No additional noise monitoring is required to facilitate the assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Noise and vibration	<p>Existing noise measurements (Table 12.9) recorded in the vicinity of [redacted] and [redacted] are above the daytime LOAEL [Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level], and close to or above the SOAEL [Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level] criteria. Night-time noise levels at both locations clearly exceed the SOAEL by more than 5db meaning significant effects are already likely to human health and wellbeing. Other receptors in the village experience noise at or above the LOAEL during the day and night, but do not breach the SOAEL criteria. The village is already overburdened with noise levels likely to cause health related issues. ANY additional noise generated by the A46 would be unacceptable.</p> <p>This includes effects on a Noise Important Area and according to The Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006; "Where road schemes have the potential to affect the exposure of populated areas within an NIA, this should be assessed and measured to avoid adverse changes as a result of the scheme or opportunities to create beneficial impacts should be considered".</p> <p>Section 12.11 details the effects of the A46 and changes in the noise characteristics to affected receptors. It is not clear to the general public who make up these receptors where the adversely affected areas are located. The data is summarised in terms of number of receptors, not location thus downplaying the lived experience of both the construction and operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Which properties and receptors are the ones who experience a deleterious effect from noise from construction or operation of the proposed scheme? A number of Winthorpe properties are likely to be within the distance limits described in paragraph 12.11.6 for construction noise, for example.</p> <p>The UK Health Security Agency in their response to the Environment Scoping report state that the LOAEL and SOAEL levels and noise analysis described and undertaken in accordance LA111 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges is not sufficient to characterise the effect of noise on human health and wellbeing. In addition, the statistical data and numbers presented do not enable the general public to understand and experience the changes in noise they would experience as a result of the proposed scheme. We would support and advocate immersive experiences for people to hear first-hand the noise effect experienced in the Winthorpe Conservation Area. Vibration in operation is 'scoped out' of the environmental analysis as 'a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance'. This is</p>	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the use of lowest observed adverse effect level and significant observed adverse effect level. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> which takes into consideration lowest observed adverse effect level and significant observed adverse effect level exceedances, both with and without the Scheme to determine significance of effect.</p> <p>Lowest observed adverse effect level and significant observed adverse effect level as proposed within the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> guidelines have been used for the purposes of this assessment. The assessment concludes that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Noise impacts on noise important areas in the year the Scheme is open to traffic are shown to be negligible (or slightly better in all noise important areas within the study area) during operation. Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the use of immersive technologies can aid understanding of potential noise impacts on a subjective basis. While this facility is not part of the statutory consultation offering, the noise assessment information that is provided as part of the consultation process, and within the development consent application, presents the information that is necessary to demonstrate on an objective basis that no noise and vibration related significant effects would occur as a result of the Scheme as outlined in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These would vary in form from noise barriers,</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		an idealised picture and, in practice, as the experience of anyone using the A46 between Newark and Lincoln can testify, the road surface is rarely free of irregularities, and is consistently undergoing maintenance. The nature of the low noise surfacing proposed is that it has a shorter service life and is likely to need maintenance more often than other options. This will bring periods of vibration associated with surface defects e.g. fretting and potholing, and maintenance generating often night time noise on a semi-regular basis (every 5 to 8 years).			<p>bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that maintenance operations would be necessary to retain the intended benefits of low noise road surfacing so that operational vibration would not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects. The maintenance would be infrequent and any noise and vibration associated with the maintenance activities are not considered to be outside of the usual maintenance activities carried out across the strategic road network. Where applicable, separate environmental controls would apply to these maintenance events.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration during both construction and operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Noise and vibration	<p>What is the current level of noise experienced on the south end of the village by the point that is nearest the line of the new a46 /a1 flyover.</p> <p>What is this noise level forecast to be once the road is built at this point ?</p> <p>Is the resultant noise level acceptable ? If not what noise mitigation will be implemented ?</p> <p>Noise from the new slip road / roundabout east bound by the kennels. What is the noise level now at the kennels and what disturbance / noise levels are expected once built.</p> <p>What road light pollution is expected and what pedestrian danger is expected ? What mitigation will be provided ?</p>	2B	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Noise mitigation addresses all locations where significant effects due to operation of the Scheme would occur in the absence of these measures to meet project requirements.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals is being developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Roundabout and Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration for impacts on walkers and cyclists is given in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health). No significant effects in terms of amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, and landscape and visual amenity impacts as assessed in other chapters of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> are anticipated on walking, cycling and horse-riding during construction or operation with consideration for mitigation measures included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. Further details of the Public Rights of Way are included in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> which detail new and diverted walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Noise and vibration	<p>2. Increase in noise pollution The residents of Kings Sconce and River View live in between the A46 and B6166, which will both increase in traffic significantly as a result will inevitably and unquestionably increase noise pollution (not a "potential of increased noise levels" as written in pg.42 of the pamphlet). According to this page, it states that National Highways will conduct assessment and will reduce any identified adverse effect. In relation to this assessment:</p> <p>1) What is the methodology used by National Highways to measure the increase in noise 2) Where are the "noise sensitive receptors"? And are you monitoring noise levels only in those areas? 3) What is your threshold in decibels for it to be identified as an "adverse effect" ?</p>	2B	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes mitigation to control this accordingly. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> forms part of the submission for development consent and will be a publicly available document available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		4) What is your timeline on this assessment and how will you inform residents on the results and mitigation measures?			<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> and it details the noise assessment methodology for the Scheme.</p> <p>A definition together with examples of what constitutes a noise sensitive receptor are provided within <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>. Residential receptors are identified among a number of other receptor types as noise sensitive.</p> <p>Noise monitoring was undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment. The noise assessment is nonetheless predominantly based on forecast traffic flows (for the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios) and simulated noise levels for all address base data points. All relevant locations are therefore included in the assessment. No additional noise monitoring is required to facilitate the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme and describes the methodology followed to define significance in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) throughout the Scheme, including Kings Sconce Avenue and River View, are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The assessments have concluded there are no residual significant adverse effect in these locations with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Information relating to the assessment will become publicly available as part of the associated Development Consent Order process.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWQV-U	Road drainage and the water environment	The flood plain proposal for Kelham is on the site of a proposed solar farm and battery storage facility, will this delay the solar proposal.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultees concerns regarding the locations of the floodplains. A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed and is provided at Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas may partially be used as a solar farm where the Scheme overlaps with a separate development, however other areas of floodplain compensation areas are currently used as agricultural land and it is not proposed to change this land use. The implementation of floodplain compensation areas does not inhibit the development of solar panel farms, as described in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The solar panel farm proposal at Kelham was not considered as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> due to the size of the development and as such it didn't require an Environmental Impact Assessment. This chapter was completed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i> and the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> guidance.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has coordinated the Scheme with the solar panel farm development proposals as they stand at the time of writing so that the schemes can occupy the same land. This included implementing a shared access track in the design of both schemes.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3C-A	Road drainage and the water environment	In the floodplain areas, there should be considerations for a raised solar farm to make the land dual use.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Road drainage and the water environment	I see the flood plan has been addressed. I have no personal knowledge of floods but can only assume the plans are adequate and shall be addressed and confirmed by the experts.	2C	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The Environment Agency were consulted throughout the design process of the Scheme mitigation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGB-W	Road drainage and the water environment	These seem suitable to me.	2G	N	<p>Comment acknowledged by the Applicant.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Road drainage and the water environment	The areas proposed for 'floodplain compensation' are areas which already flood fairly frequently, and there is no capacity for additional water. There is a risk that floodwater will overtop the existing flood barriers.	2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation.</p> <p>Floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East are embedded within the Scheme design to account for any loss of floodplain due to the Scheme footprint, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These floodplain compensation areas provide volume-compensation for any displacement of floodplain storage due to the Scheme footprint. The floodplain compensation areas are located in areas with good hydrological connectivity, enabling them to release stored flood water back to a watercourse once a flood event has passed.</p> <p>Any bunding or barriers used as part of a floodplain compensation area is designed to prevent any floodwater escaping the floodplain compensation areas and increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. Detailed hydraulic modelling has been undertaken during the design of the floodplain compensation areas to simulate a range of flood scenarios and levels, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Road drainage and	Excavate unused brownfield land for flood mitigation and creation of ecological improvement e.g. Old Notts County Council yard next to cattle market roundabout.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments regarding the floodplain compensation areas. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the water environment				Risk Assessment of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East which includes land to the north of Farndon Roundabout. The locations of these sites are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Road drainage and the water environment	Use brownfield land, where possible, rather than agricultural land.  Use bridges/road on stilts rather than embankments thereby cutting down on floodplain encroachment.	2G		
BHLF-559H-RWMX-S	Road drainage and the water environment	The proposed floodplain compensation area just south of the Farndon roundabout should extend further to the northwest of the A46 as these fields often flood	2G		Sites used for flood mitigation must have particular ground elevations, which a site next to Cattle Market Roundabout would not be able to fully accommodate. With regard to utilising brownfield sites for flood mitigation purposes, it would remove the potential of these sites for development and would often require significant remediation work to make them suitable.  Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for the design developed for the floodplain compensation areas.
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Road drainage and the water environment	Flood mitigation areas should be directed to areas of poor quality land in vicinity, and not make use of good quality agricultural land i.e. ALC grades 1, 2 3a, but land in 3b, 4 or 5 if possible.	2C	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees regarding the quality of land used for floodplain areas. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> . Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for how the design was developed for the floodplain compensation areas.  With regard to the quality of agricultural land, Agricultural Land Classification surveys carried out in 2021 and 2023 have identified that the Scheme alignment including the Farndon East and West floodplain compensation areas (2021 and 2023 data) predominantly comprises of non-Best and Most Versatile land, including Grade 3b (74.2ha, 49.6% of the area) and Grade 4 (57.5ha, 38.4%). Further information on this can be found in Appendix 9.3 (Agricultural Land Classification Report) in the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Road drainage and the water environment	Need to make sure these areas are poor grade agricultural land, and not ALC grade 1, 2 or 3a.	2G		
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Road drainage and the water environment	Please see above - turning the brownhills flood area into a nature reserve, natural walking area whilst maintaining or improving access to the river trent would help to minimise the impact of the additional road structures.	2D	N	The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements within the Order Limits and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .  Design proposals have evolved since statutory consultation and the area at Brownhills is no longer proposed as a floodplain compensation area. The area within the Order Limits around Brownhills Junction Roundabout has been designed following the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate, and enhance), detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . The attenuation basins around Brownhills Junction Roundabout are designed to be of benefit to wildlife in addition to their primary function.  The Scheme would not result in the severance of pedestrian access or wildlife commuting routes to or along the River Trent, due to the scope of works (widening of the existing A46 carriageway). The River Trent intersects the Scheme in two locations (Nether Lock Viaduct and Windmill Viaduct) and existing public access is only along the tow path parallel to Nether Lock Viaduct. The width of the Order Limits in this location would allow for provision of the planting design as detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> to maintain habitat connectivity with the River Trent.
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Road drainage and the water environment	We had some concerns over the new floodplain areas, and questioned if this would affect household insurance for those living near to these areas. We were assured that they would not increase flood risk as this would not be allowed so would not affect household insurance for residents.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regard to the floodplain areas. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		We do hope the one near Brownhills is eventually turned into some form of usable area as a large number of people walk dogs in this area, currently being able to access the river trent, walking into Newark and Winthorpe away from the road sides and enjoying the beautiful area on our doorsteps.			<p>Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>With regard to the previously proposed floodplain compensation area at Brownhills, it is no longer required during both construction and operation, and the land would return to its prior agricultural use following construction of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Q-R	Road drainage and the water environment	My main concern related to any increase in flood risk to my property either during the construction or once the improvements have been made. I am aware there is reference to 'floodplain compensation areas' but would like to see more detailed analysis? From the environment agency. There are many properties close to the Trent who would be affected including ours.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regard to being in proximity to floodplain compensation areas. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The mitigation scheme has been designed with input and scrutiny from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>With regard to the locations of the floodplain compensation areas, please refer to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVR-V	Road drainage and the water environment	You will be introducing possible flooding into new areas and destroying homes and businesses in and around Averham and Kelham. You will also be stopping the installation of a major solar farm and you will remove well used amenity land.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to possible flooding into new areas. The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on development land and businesses, including the proposed solar panel farm. The land required for the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is currently being used for arable farming and would be acquired for the works. Two farms would be impacted by the land requirement for the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, with one permanently significantly impacted.</p> <p>The land requirement for the floodplain compensation area would not have a significant impact on the land proposed for the solar panel farm. Design solutions for the floodplain compensation area have been developed in coordination and review with the developers and landowners of the solar panel development. The development of the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area represents a temporary use of currently non-operational land and should not affect the viability of the proposal.</p> <p>The solar farm proposal at Kelham was not considered as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> due to the size of the development and as such it didn't require an Environmental Impact Assessment. This chapter was completed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document <i>LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i> and the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> guidance.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					However, the Applicant has coordinated the Scheme with the solar farm development proposals as they stand at the time of writing so that the schemes can occupy the same land. This included implementing a shared access track in the design of both schemes.
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Road drainage and the water environment	Schemes should also be designed to aid flood alleviation.  Put new road on 'bridge' supports rather than embankment, thus saving encroachment on flood plain.	2D	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comments provided by the Consultee with regard to floodplain compensation areas. The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> . A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .  With regard to the Consultee's suggestion in relation to Scheme design, Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides further information on the route that was chosen and how the design was developed for the floodplain compensation areas. Steepened earthworks of the road embankment rather than bridge supports (a viaduct) have been incorporated into the Scheme design which have reduced floodplain compensation requirements.
BHLF-559H-RWQX-W	Road drainage and the water environment	allow for additional floodplains to be allocated due to increased weather changes. Double the allocated assessment and calculation it could be easily embarrassing for our grandchildren to reflect back to our miscalculations and say 'if only'	2D	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees with regard to flood risks. Whilst the Applicant would advise that existing flood risks in Averham are outside the scope of the Scheme, the Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Road drainage and the water environment	Could extra flood compensation measures be increased to ensure the flood risk to our village (Averham) is actually reduced due to the A46 and global warming issues.	2D		Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken to validate the Scheme, with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects. The mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> . Existing road drainage would be maintained as part of the existing maintenance regime.  Details on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . The Applicant is required to provide essential mitigation to offset impacts as a result of the Scheme. All land required to deliver the Scheme, both temporary and permanent has to be justified and this is set out in the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Road drainage and the water environment	Offer the residents of Farndon additional flood protection.	2D	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Floodplain compensation to mitigate the Scheme would be provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> . Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is provided within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW3X-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	You propose to take the airfield at [redacted] as part of your flood mitigation plan. The airfield is a long established asset to the area and should not be lost. The airfield has long standing support in the local area and has raised money for local charities including the Air Ambulance over the years, and I believe [redacted] has offer an alternative area of land to for flood purposes, which should be assessed and a report published.	2G	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> . This includes details of the mitigation scheme that has been developed that to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. With regard to the airfield mentioned by the Consultees, the design for the Scheme has been refined and the requirement to use the airfield for floodplain compensation has been removed. This is because other suitable land was identified. Floodplain compensation to mitigate the Scheme would be provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Road drainage and the water environment	As out lined in Section 2g the alternative suitable land offered up to spare Rectory farm airfield should be pursued and a report of the findings written for transparency.	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is provided within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) and Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) discusses how the revised floodplain compensation areas were developed in conjunction with the landowners, following the selection of the broader site shown at statutory consultation.
ANON-559H-RW7Y-4	Road drainage and the water environment	Please ensure you fully investigate all options for this and do not do the bare minimum. This should be a top priority		N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Floodplain compensation to mitigate the Scheme would be provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is provided within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification and how the design was developed for the floodplain compensation areas.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Road drainage and the water environment	It's a joke, the proposed flood plain at Kelham will nearly completely encircle the village	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's concerns regarding the floodplain compensation areas. The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) found within the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The Scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The reduced footprint no longer results in Kelham being encircled. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. Details on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Road drainage and the water environment	It should be taken into account that any scheme of this nature would necessitate much use of heavy vehicles and the predicted amount of flooding on the environment should be weighed against the disturbing of wildlife and existing habitat or land use caused by heavy vehicle traffic. For this reason I would suggest less floodplain compensation areas.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. This also sets out a mitigation scheme that has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. All of the floodplain compensation areas specified are required to mitigate the Scheme.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, the floodplain compensation areas would be excavated using excavators and dozers. As stated in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration), no significant effects are anticipated during construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place, including no effects on local wildlife and existing habitat.</p> <p>For Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas, the excavated material would be stockpiled adjacent to the temporary site haul road where it would be loaded onto wagons for transportation to the embankment and stockpile areas. At Farndon West and Farndon East floodplain compensation areas, the excavated material would be cleaned and graded to a specified material classification on site. This would be loaded onto wagons to be taken to the required fill locations. All works would be undertaken in accordance with mitigation measures outlined in the Register of Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>possible. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQX-W	Road drainage and the water environment	what calculation are you considering on a daily basis. some floodplains are generous in their compensation payouts.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken attenuation calculations. Storage volumes are adequate to attenuate run-off and discharge at a rate agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of correspondence with Nottinghamshire County Council and the Environment Agency regarding volume attenuation can be found in Appendix E (Correspondence) of the Drainage Strategy which forms Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Detailed drainage models will be made during the detailed design stage which will further inform the attenuation volume required.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9U-2	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>When the original A46 Newark Bypass was constructed, we were told it could only be single carriageway due to the increased risk of flooding. Since then, several things have occurred which has exacerbated this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further continuing flood prevention measures upstream have meant more excess flood water coming down the river towards Farndon. In November 2000, for example, a wall of water came down the Trent from Nottingham when their flood/ slice gates were opened. Is there any forward planning for when this occurs again, such as liaising with the tidal stretch of the Trent from Cromwell or reducing the volume of water released at once?</li> <li>2. There used to be at least four dredgers continually plying the Trent. Where are they now? The river needs to be regularly dredged to make sure that any excess flood water can escape as quickly as possible. To use an analogy, if the farmer does not clear his ditches, his fields will flood.</li> <li>3. Similarly when the water table – as well as flooding, excess water causes the water table to rise, which can cancel out the effect of floodplain compensation. How can you store excess flood water if the borrow pits fill from underneath as the water table rises?</li> <li>4. They tell us that climate change leads to a greater risk of flooding. Has this been factored into your calculations?</li> <li>5. I understand that you are running a yearlong trial with regards to the Trent – not every year is a flood year, so what happens if this chosen year is not?</li> <li>6. Will there be any compensation for properties that will flood as a result of the dualling of the A46 Newark bypass?</li> </ol>	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. Alterations to the road network would provide adequate drainage to accommodate potential changes in surface run-off, including allowance for climate change in accordance with the national design standards for highways, the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 - Design of highway drainage systems</i> and through consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken attenuation calculations. Storage volumes are adequate to attenuate run-off and discharge at a rate agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council. These calculations and the record of correspondence with Nottinghamshire County Council can be seen in Appendix E (Correspondence) of the Drainage Strategy which forms Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Detailed drainage modelling would be undertaken during the detailed design stage which would further inform the attenuation volume required.</p> <p>With regard to the concerns about water from the River Trent, dredging of the River Trent is a matter for the Environment Agency, who consider the usage of the River and the habitat impacts of dredging when deciding on suitable locations to dredge. The wider hydraulic catchment of the River Trent, including flood defences serving Nottingham, are also a matter for the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. This also sets out a mitigation scheme that has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. This hydraulic modelling includes events that account for climate change and considers hydrology from prior flood events over many years. Both the Flood Risk Assessment and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> consider the impact of groundwater to and from the floodplain compensation areas and borrow pits.</p> <p>With regard to compensation for properties, provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: <i>'Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Large tracts of countryside are identified as potential flood compensation areas- at Farndon, Kelham and Winthorpe. The lack of defined detail of these aspects at this statutory consultation stage is unacceptable. The environmental information and assessments in relation to these areas is simply lacking and people cannot reasonably comment in any detail at this stage, there are too many unknowns and it will be too late once the DCO application is made.</p> <p>These aspects need to be designed in more detail and then a further brief public consultation should be run before an application is submitted- particularly for the local residents most affected.</p>	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. With regard to the level of information provided during the statutory consultation, the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment presented within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). Further information on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation area is to ensure the land can continue to be used by the landowner. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The main habitats within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East have also been included.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Road drainage and the water environment	Drainage not adequate and might affect the Fleet.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant can advise that attenuation calculations have been undertaken for all watercourses with outfalls, including The Fleet. Storage volumes have been calculated using the MicroDrainage's Quick Storage Estimate, which utilises rainfall and catchment permeability characteristics to estimate an upper and lower bound storage requirement. The upper bound storage requirements have been used for the design of the basins at concept stage and can be seen in the Engineering Plans and Sections (<b>TR010065/APP/2.6</b>).</p> <p>The basin storage requirement will be calculated by the use of a detailed model at detailed design stage to ensure they are adequate to attenuate run-off and discharge at a rate agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Water quality assessments have also been undertaken to assess the impacts on watercourses. The drainage system would adequately treat the run-off from the highway but water quality assessments at the current design stage highlight that The Fleet would require extra considerations at detailed design stage. Details and limitations of this assessment approach at this design stage can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW83-Y	Road drainage and the water environment	I recently submitted an aerial photograph to National Highways taken from the roof of Newark Sugar Factory depicting the extent of flooding in and around the area of Kelham Lane during the Jan/Feb flooding of 2001. My main concern is the effect the construction of the new road will have on increasing the risk of flooding to properties in Kelham Lane and whether the areas highlighted for mitigation purposes will benefit the area. Also, who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed mitigation sites.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Currently the gulleys and culverts that were created around the Cattle Market roundabout as mitigation areas for flooding when the original bypass was constructed, particularly on the sugar factory side of the roundabout, are no longer fit for purpose as they are full of vegetation and overgrown with weeds etc.</p> <p>I appreciate that Newark needs some form of congestion relief, due to the increased number of accidents/road closures on the A1 and constant queuing from the railway crossing, but as the area being proposed by national highways is in such a vulnerable area for flooding and as global warming will only make the situation worse will hydraulic models be enough to verify the extent of the problem which I believe will only increase in severity.</p>			<p>The drainage asset management would be distributed between National Highways, Nottinghamshire County Council and the Environment Agency. The Draft Asset Management Plans can be found in Appendix F (Draft Asset Management Plans) of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A final management plan will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated which include an allowance for climate change, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>As part of the drainage design, allowances for climate change have been made, including an increase to design rainfall intensities. In addition, drainage has been modelled and passed using 1% Annual Exceedance Probability fluvial event with a 39% climate change allowance. Mitigation is detailed in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Road drainage and the water environment	The floodplain compensation areas need to allow for the large volumes of rainwater that pass by the Lord Nelson public house and through the village of Winthorpe after torrential rain or storms, often resulting in flooding of the property.	2G	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including a mitigation scheme to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This includes flood risk from the Slough Dyke, Winthorpe Airfield Drain and other Ordinary Watercourses local to Winthorpe. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas being provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Road drainage and the water environment	Around the proposed new island by Winthorpe Kennels is a recognised flood risk area. We feel therefore that the island and surrounding roads need to be raised up to minimise the risk of them flooding.	2B	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme is at the correct elevation near the boarding kennels to mitigate flood risk.
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Road drainage and the water environment	It would be a good opportunity to improve the flood management for the whole town	2G	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWTN-P	Road drainage and the water environment	The surrounding area to the bypass has flooded for years. Maybe your plans could have an improvement. Dig on.			
BHLF-559H-RWW2-W	Road drainage and the water environment	We hope that these proposals are being tied in with those for the final portion of the southern bypass, as the whole area on the south and southwest of Newark are known to be liable to flooding.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The southern bypass being referred to is assumed to be the Southern Link Road scheme, which is identified in the Flood Risk Assessment as being a nearby but unconnected development. The Southern Link Road scheme is not considered to have a material flood risk impact on the Scheme and the Scheme is not considered to have a material impact on the Southern Link Road development.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW39-Z	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>I am concerned, living in Kelham adjacent to Kelham Bridge and the River Trent, that increased flooding could become an issue.</p> <p>NB: I spoke to a representative at the Newark Showground Christmas Gift weekend. I wasn't reassured, as he didn't appear to address my concerns, and wasn't forthcoming with the details of the proposal!</p>	2G	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees and has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWWK-P	Road drainage and the water environment	My only concern is if the new bypass will make the flooding worse in bad weather and effect my village of Farndon	2C		<p>consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information is provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/AP/6.1)</b>. The floodplain compensation areas have been designed to mitigate flood risk in the entire floodplain, not just where the floodplain compensation area actually is.</p> <p>The flood mitigation works would not address the existing flooding which occurs at the A617 between the bridge at Kelham and the rugby club, as the flood mitigation focusses on the flood mitigation of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7A-C	Road drainage and the water environment	It appears that the flooding on Kelham Road will not be improved and the road between Kelham and Averham is likely to be flooded at times, which does not currently happen.	2G		
BHLF-559H-RWWK-P	Road drainage and the water environment	As mentioned previously I am worried that the new bypass may make the flooding worse along the A46 from Farndon to the Cattlemarket roundabout	2G		
ANON-559H-RWS1-R	Road drainage and the water environment	The A617 between the bridge at Kelham and the rugby club regularly floods. Will this scheme alleviate that?	2G		
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Road drainage and the water environment	I live in Averham and am very concerned that your road proposal will alter the flood plain in a detrimental way to affect my property. Are the calculations correct?  Could it potentially make the flood risk to my property worse?	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWTB-A	Road drainage and the water environment	I am worried about the floodplain causing more water to come into my garden as it already covers 3/4 of the grass in winter when the fields at the back of the property flood. And the compensation area doesn't cover my area.	2G		
BHLF-559H-RW7S-X	Road drainage and the water environment	I am concerned that there is the potential for additional flooding on Farndon Road, as a result from possible changes to the floodplain for the proposed works.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Road drainage and the water environment	We are particular concerned about the following: 1. Flooding	2B		
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Road drainage and the water environment	Flooding ought be your priority.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Road drainage and the water environment	The consultation booklet is good apart from the lack of detail on the flood compensation areas and borrow pits. The PEI report is also vague about this.	2I	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMC-4	Road drainage and the water environment	concerned about the effect on river levels	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regard to the effect on river levels. The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMC-4	Road drainage and the water environment	concerned on the effect on river levels	2C		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Road drainage and the water environment	I have read same, yet I see no adequate support for waterways and flooding.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> has been conducted and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Road drainage and the water environment	Work must not lower the capacity for river trent flood water. My house is on the flood plain, and therefore could be severely impacted if new road takes up flood water capacity.	2C	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The floodplain compensation areas would compensate for floodplain volume lost due to the Scheme by providing replacement floodplain.</p>
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Road drainage and the water environment	Flooding protection for the Trent and the river Devon.	2D	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding with consideration for future climate change effects. Outside of the scope of the Scheme, the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) are responsible for wider flood risk issues in the area and look at wider flood resilience issues.</p> <p>The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has</p>
ANON-559H-RWE4-D	Road drainage and the water environment	As identified, flooding is a regular occurrence in Newark and the surrounding areas (Kelham, South Muskham) and drainage issues exist on Drove Lane). Proper compensation and attenuation is required in the scheme design.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Road drainage and the water environment	Could the flood compensation scheme be extended to ensure some sort of flood safety for Averham village? Could there possibly be a 10% or more tolerance to ensure the safety of Averham.	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Road drainage and the water environment	Additional flood plain protection for Farndon Village	2G		been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Road drainage and the water environment	Prevention is better than cure. No thing can compensate for 2-3 years of flood recovery, nor can we afford it!	2G		The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWTJ-J	Road drainage and the water environment	I thought we had a floodplain for the town, so if you are going to make it better, that's fine with me.	2G	N	A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.
ANON-559H-RWX-K	Road drainage and the water environment	It is vital all the flood compensation/management must remain high on the planning agenda as the entire area/surrounding fields flood very easily.	2G	N	<p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks (and emerging draft National Policy Statement for National Networks) is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State for Transport in deciding whether to grant the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>) and Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.3</b>). Paragraphs 5.90 - 5.115 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks state that the Secretary of State for Transport should be satisfied that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere and should only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where it can be shown that: <i>'the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required; that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning; and that priority is given to the use of sustainable drainage systems.'</i></p> <p>Applications for projects should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment to assess all risks of flooding and take climate change into account. The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation Scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNY-U	Road drainage and the water environment	I just hope you have got all your calculations correct . because all though I live on the flood plain my property as never had any problems even in the worst years like 1947 or 1963.	2G	N	A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ). Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.
BHLF-559H-RWWJ-N	Road drainage and the water environment	Not in flood zone	2G	N	<p>The widened embankment for the Scheme passes through land that acts as the floodplain for the River Trent. By using this land, the Scheme has the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere unless mitigation is provided. This mitigation would include three floodplain compensation areas which would seek to provide an equivalent volume of floodplain storage in the local catchment by excavating land at similar elevations to that which would be displaced by the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken to validate the Scheme with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. This was carried out to inform the preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information on the Floodplain Compensation Areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The selection of the alignment through the floodplain has been subject to an assessment of different options which commenced in 2018. The selection of the alignment has been informed by stakeholder engagement and consultation with the likes of the Environment Agency, Natural England, Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council, further details about this engagement can be found in the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>. Details of the process and alternative options which have been considered are presented in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>I also object to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the impact on the flood plain</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Road drainage and the water environment	The proposed A46 goes through a flood area, floods shall increase due to global warming, Newark and Farndon have experienced both in recent years. No account has been taken for this fact.	2B	N	<p>Alterations to the road network would provide adequate drainage to accommodate potential changes in surface run-off, including allowance for climate change in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 - Design of highway drainage systems</i> and through consultation with the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Other explicit design guidance has been used for the interaction with the wider hydraulic and environmental design requirements. A list of guidance and standards used for the drainage design can be found in Appendix C of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects. The mitigation scheme consists of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Road drainage and the water environment	This project would go through flood plains. At a time when we need to be fully aware of climate change and the associated outcomes, such as increased rain and rising water levels, flood plains become more and more relevant and important, and should not be having bypasses built through them like this.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWW6-1	Road drainage and the water environment	I'm not sure they will be adequate enough for the amount of rainfall that is being predicted in the future. And I think Farndon will be more vulnerable in the years to come	2G		
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Road drainage and the water environment	Who and how will the new "lakes" for road drainage near Winthorpe be managed ?	2C	N	<p>There are no new lakes being created near Winthorpe as part of the Scheme. Attenuation basins are being created to accommodate rainfall from the highways drainage system and temporarily store it before being discharged into local watercourses at a controlled rate (agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority), or dissipation through infiltration.</p> <p>These facilities would be owned and managed by the Applicant at all times, forming part of the permanent land ownership by the Applicant. The details of the drainage features proposed around Winthorpe village can be found in the Drainage Strategy which forms Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the Engineering Plans and Sections <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Road drainage and the water environment	As noted in the section on Road Drainage and the Water Environment, the two water courses flowing through our village are significantly impacted by the road drainage, construction disturbance and the increasing developments around the showground. Where appropriate we would encourage National Highways to provide flood management features and pollution control structures, such as attenuation basins and weirs, incorporating reed bed technology. Aquatic environments such as these not only provide some pollution reducing action but can also serve as habitats for animals and birds. A greater benefit to the local environment would be if the existing flows in the Fleet and the Slough Dyke were intercepted and controlled by such structures.	2D	N	<p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>The drainage strategy includes multiple measures to improve water quality, such as reed planted forebays and check dammed swales which would act as the primary interception of pollutants. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>(Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Interception of rivers can have negative impacts that the Scheme looks to avoid by minimising watercourse intervention and realignment as much as possible.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Road drainage and the water environment; Biodiversity	Will the run off ponds include vegetation for bird habitat or will they be concrete ponds ?	2E/2F	N	<p>The drainage design has been designed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 - Design of highway drainage systems</i>. The design incorporates nature-based solutions (where possible), including swales, wetland areas and ponds. These assets would be planted in areas which maximise the pre-treatment and would provide biodiversity benefits. In addition, the shapes of the basin and forebays have been designed to maximise treatment and create richer zones of transitional habitat to improve biodiversity. Further detail can be found within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Drainage features would be above ground as much as possible, including attenuation features, swales and ponds. Blue-Green infrastructure has been provided throughout the Scheme to maximise the treatment and biodiversity potential of these drainage features, while also attenuating the road run-off. Attenuation basins have been designed in close collaboration with the landscaping, ecology and wider environment team to provide sustainable planting which is tolerant to both wet and dry conditions and can provide habitat to wildlife. The design ethos and concept of the Blue-Green infrastructure can be seen in the Drainage Strategy which forms Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the Drainage Plans and Sections <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>. Details of the planting will be finalised in the detailed design stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBY-F	Environment – general	Old County Council yard next to Cattle Market Roundabout. Left redundant since council left, better used for a small environmental park than suggested supermarket which is not required. Could be excavated out to give some flood alleviation volume along with environmental enhancement features - e.g ponds, wetland, woodland along with public access.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Scheme requires a main construction compound and smaller, satellite compounds within the Order Limits prior to, and to facilitate, the main construction works. The proposed locations are shown on Figure 2.4 (Location of Temporary Works Areas Required During Construction) contained within the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main construction compound would be established at the site of the old Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Maintenance Depot site. During construction, the former council depot site would be used as the main construction compound and offices for the Scheme. When the Scheme is completed, it would be handed back to Nottinghamshire County Council, who own the land.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Environment – general	Plenty of fields, some in apparent poor condition alongside route. Old Council Yard, once scheme completed, could be excavated to create a small area of ecological improvement and flood alleviation.	2E/2F		<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Floodplain compensation areas would be provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Further information on the floodplain compensation areas can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. Sites used for flood mitigation require particular ground elevations, which the site next to Cattle Market Roundabout would not be able to fully accommodate.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Environment – general	Expand Farndon Natural Reserve	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, an expansion of Farndon Natural Reserve has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RW3Q-R	Environment – general	Field behind car dealership on Farndon Road	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Environment – general	Farndon Residents Environmental Group	2E/2F	N	The Applicant received a response and approached the group mentioned by the Consultee (as can be seen under reference ANON-559H-RWQK-G) and will continue to engage with the group where necessary as the Scheme develops.
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	Environment – general	The area alongside the A46 between Newark Moring and Crackley point is a little used and almost inaccessible parcel of land. This would benefit from becoming a riverside nature reserve as the footpath/ bridlepath to the elbow bridge currently runs through this field. It could also be used for flood mitigation and maybe soil extraction for embankments	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. A previously proposed floodplain compensation area adjacent to Brownhills Junction (adjacent to Severn Trent Sewage Works) has been removed from the Scheme due to this site not having the hydraulic connectivity to the River Trent required.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGK-6	Environment – general	Fields at the end of Kelham Road, by the cricket club	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to potential available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. The fields opposite the cricket club, between Kelham Road and the A46, have been developed as part of the environmental mitigation strategy for the Scheme and include new areas of planting including species rich grassland and native tree and shrub planting areas. The creation of species rich grassland is compensation for the temporary loss (during construction) of Lowland Meadow Habitat of Principal Importance which is a very high distinctiveness habitat.</p> <p>The planting design has been informed by botanical surveys and the Biodiversity Net Gain report as noted in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure a measurable net gain in habitats units and for biodiversity is achieved. Protected species surveys have identified this land as a suitable location for the provision of species-specific compensation, for example, hibernacula creation close to the source of impact (to compensate for the loss of habitat supporting reptiles). Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWS2-S	Road drainage and the water environment	I would like to hear a reply with constructive solutions to the problems I have raised regarding making the Newark area safer. Not just because of the obvious road improvements, but also taking into account the potential risk of flooding due to climate change and negative effects that flooding has on the roads surrounding the A46. The A46 may be much improved, in the near future but the surrounding roads and properties could also be improved at the same time by increasing the flood plain compensation work this project will require.	2I	N	A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Land is acquired on the basis that it is required in order to deliver the Scheme, with all considerations being taken. All land required to deliver the Scheme has to be justified and this is set out in the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b>. The Applicant can mitigate the impacts predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme but must ensure that proposals are lawful and satisfy established legal and policy tests including the requirement that proposals are necessary for the development to proceed. Wider flood improvements fall outside the remit of the Scheme.</p> <p>As part of the drainage design, allowances for climate change have been made, including an increase to design rainfall intensities. In addition, drainage has been modelled and passed using 1% Annual Exceedance Probability fluvial event with a 39% climate change allowance. Mitigation is detailed in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	A particular concern for the residents of the Southfield estate and properties on the north end of Gainsborough Road (this includes me!) is the style of lighting for the new Winthorpe roundabout. Floodlighting the junction from very tall lamp standards would be exceptionally intrusive. We already suffer from light pollution and glaring floodlights from the showground, we do not wish this pollution to increase, more planting of tall trees is needed. The same concerns will be experienced by residents local to the new Brownhills Junction roundabout. Noise is already a problem, lorries sounding their horns etc - what is going to be done to prevent this? Brakes, screeching cars, late night boy racers, we hear it all and this needs to be dealt with.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. With regard to the lighting concerns, information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Roundabout and Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout and the single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The road lighting in the vicinity of affected properties would be carefully designed to ensure minimal adverse impacts from obtrusive light. The Institution of Lighting Professionals guidance document <i>GN01 Guidance Note 1 The Reduction of Obtrusive Light</i> would be consulted during detailed design stage, to ensure that any impact falls within acceptable limits.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting including trees and shrubs would be provided alongside the Scheme including new landscape bunds that would be introduced adjacent to the existing A46 south of Winthorpe and up to the A113 on the Winthorpe Roundabout. This would aid screening at a lower level with immediate effect, with increased screening value over time as tree and shrub planting mature. In addition, a new hedgerow with trees would be provided to create a new boundary between the existing field system and the A46 highway corridor.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>With regard to the noise concerns, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment concluded that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur in the Winthorpe areas as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>It is noted that while control of noise levels from the A1 is outside the scope of the Scheme, cumulative levels from all highways, including the A1, have been considered as part of the assessment. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. The Scheme only considers the development of the existing A46. Therefore, mitigation of noise from the A1 is not within the remit of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Very satisfied: I totally agree that the A46 needs improvement and agree the need for the bypass.</p> <p>Very dissatisfied: I am very concerned regarding the possible implications regarding flood issues by displacement of water where new road will be built.</p>	2B	N	<p>The widened embankment for the A46 carriageway passes through land that acts as the floodplain for the River Trent. By using this land, the Scheme has the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere unless mitigation is provided. This mitigation would include three floodplain compensation areas which would seek to provide an equivalent volume of floodplain storage in the local catchment by excavating land at similar elevations to that which would be displaced by the Scheme.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Road drainage and the water environment	Access to my land bordering the Fleet was requested – what are the findings of this and other flood risk surveys?	2B	N	<p>Channel surveys were undertaken on this parcel of land, these were used to help inform a Flood Risk Assessment. This can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWN-S	Road drainage and the water environment	Having spoken to the environmental team member, I was pleased to hear the flooding problem had been tackled to protect the town over the next 100 years taking into account the raise in water levels had been addressed that can only improve the roads. Provision had been thought of a petrol/ service stations for recharging points which I see as a problem for future road users.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns with regard to charging points. Electric charging points have not been included in the Scheme design as they are not required to mitigate environmental effects resulting from the Scheme. The Applicant notes that providing electric charging points at petrol stations would be outside the scope of the Scheme. The petrol stations are private land not required compulsorily to deliver the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWS2-S	Road drainage and the water environment	By over compensating for the effect of climate change as well as to the completed road project with regards to flooding in local area. The A617 floods regularly closing the road on every occasion. This makes the alternative routes extremely busy on roads that are not suitable for main road traffic. Road closed signs on some of the local lanes are ignored by thousands of drivers daily making them dangerous. This is never policed and the roads are never blocked, only coned,, which drivers move to aid their intentions to drive though road closures. Stopping the A617 from flooding by over compensating for flood plain, during the new road project would alleviate practice and allow the roads flow more smoothly. This has happened for years and the effect on the local verges, farmers fields, which have also been illegally used to avoid road closure is massive and destructive to crops etc.	2D	N	<p>Alterations to the road network would provide adequate drainage to accommodate potential changes in surface run-off, including allowance for climate change in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 – Design of highway drainage systems</i> and through consultation with the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Other explicit design guidance has been used for the interaction with the wider hydraulic and environmental design requirements. A list of guidance and standards used for the drainage design can be found in Appendix C of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Information on the drainage design is provided in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation has been developed to mitigate impacts of the Scheme only. The mitigation would not provide any wider floodplain compensation benefits to mitigate those events described for the A617.</p>
ANON-559H-RWS2-S	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>I am seriously concerned about how the finished project, when added to the high potential of further worsening weather patterns due to climate change, will alter the flooding issues that are becoming more frequent. I have lived in Kelham since 1987 and as far as I am aware our property has never flooded since it was built in the 1950'. But, several properties in the village have been very close to being flooded. The A617 has been closed many times over the years because it has flooded. When it closes, the flood water is both deep and fast flowing and damaging to the road and pathway.</p> <p>The proposals on pages 26/27 of your 'statutory consultation' booklet regarding 'The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area' appears only to take into account compensating for the completed project using present day and past flooding data. It is extremely important to take this opportunity to resolve the regular flooding of the A617, and to ADD COMPENSATION FOR FUTURE CLIMATE CHANGE AS WELL AS FOR THE COMPLETED ROAD PROJECT. I understand that climate change is not a precise science, but surely the safest way forward is to over-compensate for flooding at this stage rather than wait for the inevitable to happen in the not too distant future. This is a golden opportunity to realistically alleviate both traffic and future flooding problems in the area. It would be a great advert for futuristic planning and an opportunity to right the wrongs of the previous Newark Bypass poor planning decisions.</p>	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. Alterations to the road network would provide adequate drainage to accommodate potential changes in surface run-off, including allowance for climate change in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 - Design of highway drainage systems</i> and through consultation with the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of the drainage strategy can be seen in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the Drainage Plans and Sections <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>. Other explicit design guidance has been used for the interaction with the wider hydraulic and environmental design requirements. A list of guidance and standards used for the drainage design can be found in Appendix C of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation has been developed to mitigate impacts of the Scheme only. The mitigation would not provide any wider floodplain compensation benefits to mitigate those events described for the A617.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Road drainage and the water environment	As above - concerns over household insurance and how the area is developed after. Small lakes need to be safe, but could enhance the area if redeveloped correctly.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described below to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>Three areas have been identified for floodplain compensation. These locations are Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East floodplain compensation areas, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas are designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure the land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Averham floodplain compensation areas, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to arable use.</p> <p>Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East have also been included within the design. The Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> show all land that would need acquiring and managing for the Scheme. Discussions are ongoing with the respective landowner to agree a strategy for long-term management of the Farndon East floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>Attenuation basins included as part of the Scheme's drainage strategy would be located on private land. The land would be fenced with no access for the public, and therefore would not pose a safety risk. The attenuation basins and pond form part of the Blue-Green infrastructure included throughout the Scheme which would provide biodiversity, water quality improvements and attenuation. The drainage strategy has been developed in close collaboration with the landscape and ecology teams to ensure the biodiversity and habitat creation potential has been maximised. Details of the drainage strategy, including the safety precautions included in the design, can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the Drainage Plans and Sections <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Road drainage and the water environment	My worry is that if it is incorrect and has an affect on the flood plain and this will potentially have a knock on effect on the possible flood risk at my home in my village.	2G	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> . Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Road drainage and the water environment	Having spoken at length to 2 of your flooding experts at the consultation I feel that you have not investigated the areas of the surrounding villages sufficiently. Currently in Averham we experience flooding from the dykes across 2/3 fields opposite Church Lane and the church. The fields flood to a depth of 150cm in winter and if you create flood plain in the field the opposite side of Church Lane too, this put these houses on Church Lane at huge risks. The flooding starts near the footpath where it goes under the railway line and often lasts 2-3 months in winter, January to March.	2G	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee and has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> . A mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Flood Risk Assessment contains details regarding mitigation in the form of a floodplain compensation area between Kelham and Averham, the location of which is shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> . The flooding issues referred to by the Consultee are related to existing conditions, and therefore responsibility for their mitigation does not lie with the Applicant. General flood risk concerns should be directed towards Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.
BHLF-559H-RW3Q-R	Road drainage and the water environment	See 2b. When there has been prolonged heavy rain the fields on the Kelham side of the Trent field massively - there is also minor flooding to riverside footpath off the Farndon Road. It would take little change to the levels for the flood risk to property to be greatly increased.	2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>Mitigation has been developed to mitigate the Scheme only. The mitigation would not provide any wider floodplain compensation benefits to mitigate those events described for the A617.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Road drainage and the water environment	Not qualified to comment. Historically, possibly due to work dualling A46 towards Leic. Village is now experiencing flooding so hope this will not be the case following this project	2G	N	The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWWN-S	Road drainage and the water environment	Could the flood plains be adapted to make a reservoir for the water shortages we will encounter in the future due to longer dry spells in the summer months because of climate changes and hotter weather; ensuring our crops are covered, local farms helped, gardener supported.	2G	N	<p>The Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>The creation of potable water reservoirs would be a matter for Severn Trent Water and falls outside of the Applicant's remit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWS2-S	Road drainage and the water environment	It is a good scheme, but to make it a great scheme it needs to be forward thinking with regard to climate change and in particularly, potential future flooding issues caused by climate change. This is a golden opportunity for all sections to come together and work out what is best for the Newark area with regards to future flooding threats, and deal with them now. The last Newark Bypass, was built without thought for the future, this scheme needs a different approach. It needs to obviously compensate for the affect it is causing to the floodplains, but compensate more to lessen the chance of flooding in the future	2H	N	<p>Alterations to the road network would provide adequate drainage to accommodate potential changes in surface run-off, including allowance for climate change in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CG 501 - Design of highway drainage systems</i> and through consultation with the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Other explicit design guidance has been used for the interaction with the wider hydraulic and environmental design requirements. A list of guidance and standards used for the drainage design can be found in Appendix C of Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, with consideration for future climate change effects. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Road drainage and the water environment	(Flood compensation areas) I hope these will have safety precautions around them, and no danger to village children.	2G	N	<p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Attenuation basins would be fenced and kept shallow in accordance to design and safety standard. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to the concerns raised around the floodplain compensation areas, measures would be implemented including fencing to reduce the risk of access to the general public. Detailed hydraulic modelling to demonstrate suitability has been undertaken with a range of return periods simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Road drainage and the water environment	Protection of the Fleet stream.	2E/2F	N	<p>There are two tributaries of The Fleet stream which pass through the Scheme. Slough Dyke (which is mainly culverted under Newark-on-Trent) passes through the Scheme to the east of Brownhills Junction as an open channel before flowing parallel with the A1 and being culverted under the A1 to flow through Winthorpe. The Scheme would result in a minor realignment of the Slough Dyke watercourse to allow for the A46 bridge to be constructed. This minor realignment would result in the watercourse increasing in length and sinuosity which is considered to be minor beneficial for the watercourse conditions. Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> identifies the outfalls into this watercourse as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The second tributary of the Fleet is located east of the A46/A17 roundabout. This watercourse is culverted under both the A17 and A46 before flowing through Winthorpe to converge with the Slough Dyke to become The Fleet.</p> <p>Appendix 13.5 (Surface Water Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> outlines the monitoring being undertaken as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction and in operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes general best practice construction practices in accordance with <i>Construction Industry Research and Information Association</i> guidelines to ensure the protection of watercourses such as the Fleet. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWFD-X	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	Concerned about the raising of the road near my house - visual aspect and noise levels, particularly during construction, especially if carried out at night. I understand trees will be planted to try to address these issues, but the effect will be minimal for some years.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised with regards to the road surrounding their property. Details of the Landscape and Visual impact Assessment for the Scheme including construction impacts are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided where possible to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details, including those in relation to construction lighting are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations has been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst case. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during detailed design stage where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the noise levels, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided along the northbound carriageway at Brownhills Junction up to Winthorpe</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Roundabout and along the western verge of the southbound entry slip from Brownhills Roundabout.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise in the vicinity of the property the Consultee refers to, including the above measures as well as temporary acoustic barriers during construction, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The assessment concludes no noise related significant adverse effects are predicted during construction and operation of the Scheme with this mitigation in place. Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented for all areas relevant to the Scheme within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW8V-2	Noise and vibration	I'm worried about the noise i will hear while the work is going on. I live right next to the A46 and its already quite noisy. I am autistic and noise stresses me out.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns with regards to noise in the vicinity of the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and following general best practice. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Noise and vibration; Air quality	No pollution to air or sound pollution	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees with regards to noise and air pollution.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	Noise and vibration; Air quality	We are worried mainly about extra noise, and secondly of air pollution.	2C		<p>With regards to air pollution, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. No significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme on local air quality.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Noise and vibration; Air quality	Pollution both air and sound	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNY-U	Noise and vibration; Air quality	As in the past you get it wrong, as with the dualling of the A46 the noise and air pollution where meant to decrease not so. At certain times the noise is just the same and even louder. because of the traffic jams air pollution is just as bad. You are constrained by the various regulations that are in place, instead of common sense and seeing it on the ground.	2C		<p>Regarding noise pollution, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to noise changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment concluded that no noise related significant adverse effects would occur as a result of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b> which sets out the need for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Scheme looks as if it will dominate that entire arc of the town, increasing traffic volumes and noise as well as pollution.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to the impacts of the Scheme on traffic, noise, and pollution.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>With regards to the concerns around noise, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken traffic modelling. The current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads, including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road. More details on the volume of flow decreases are available in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	I still have concerns about the height of the bridge carrying the A46 over the A1 and its impact visually and noise wise on the village.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact upon the Scheme.</p> <p>The landscape proposals include planting of trees and shrubs on roadside embankments, and a block of woodland planting between the A1 and Winthorpe village to help to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors. Mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the A1/A46 Crossing, this has been set as low as possible to provide minimum clearance above the A1.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme and would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. For the area referred to by the Consultee, noise mitigation would be provided along the northbound carriageway of the Brownhills Junction through to Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I fully back the additional recommendations put forward by the A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. My particular concerns are environmental i.e. noise, visual impact, habitat loss and improving provision for NMUs.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee has referenced recommendations put forward by the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. The Applicant has shown regard to the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group's recommendation within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWXU-1.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) (which accompanies the development consent application), provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects, including noise, visual and biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity, which includes improving facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Along the route there is one permanently stopped up Public Right of Way with other routes impacted slightly due to the Scheme. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the impact of the Scheme on walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by pedestrians and cyclists. The Scheme aims to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network. Further detail on new and diverted walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes are available in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Right of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>With regards to noise impacts, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>reduce the visual impact upon the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has adopted the principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) which are embedded in the Scheme design and assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, with focus on the avoidance of high value and/or irreplaceable habitat.</p> <p>Following the mitigation hierarchy, the quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland). A bespoke compensation package has been produced for the unavoidable permanent loss of lowland meadow Habitat of Principal Importance, a very high distinctiveness habitat. The Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises of habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated, or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated. Compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Site. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated.</p> <p>The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has also worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before, during and after construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV6-Z	Noise and vibration; Air quality	<p>A higher level road over the A1 with significant traffic can only increase the noise and pollution levels in Winthorpe, bearing in mind the prevailing wind direction.</p> <p>Noise reduction methods such as - 'road surface' and 'noise fencing' are the only mentions of how noise will be addressed for this project. This seems a lot less detailed or considered than I would have expected considering this will be probably the most significant element during</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>and after construction.</p> <p>I am seriously concerned that when the money runs out for this project the noise reduction elements will be the parts sacrificed, leaving the environment significantly worse off.</p>			<p>the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>With regards to the A1/A46 Crossing, this has been set as low as possible to provide minimum clearance above the A1.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These mitigation measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance. Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment.</p> <p>The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Scheme would need to be developed in accordance with details approved by the Secretary of State. The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport. Further information relating to the Scheme's budget is detailed with the Funding Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/4.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	Significant need for noise and visual impact attenuation measures including extensive advanced planting are required.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees with regards to noise and visual impacts of the Scheme. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form of barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWG5-G	Noise and Vibration	I would very much like to see much more in the way of noise prevention on the current road (retained) – such as curved noise barriers between cattle market and brownhills. This area surrounds a housing estate and road noise is a major pollutant. It would be good to see some inclusion of noise reduction planning.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNC-5	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	We do need to see concrete details of bunding, tree planting and other noise / air pollution measures affecting Winthorpe village both at south and north ends. Given the A1133 will be moved closer to the village, we request tree planting alongside the south side of the A1133 from Winthorpe junction for a similar distance to that already proposed for the north side of the A1133 (which seems rather odd, given the road moves further away from the land on the north side!).	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWWX-3	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Tree and shrub barriers on the east side of the A1 due to prevailing westerly winds blowing noise and pollution to residential villages east of the A1 from the south. This should be blackthorn, silverblack and deciduous trees. Sutton-on-trent, is the most polluted village in Nottinghamshire.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity	3 Tree planting is extremely important BUT they must be the correct species: Conifers to capture large particulates, silver birch and elder to reduce small particulates. These in addition to other indigenous species which would reduce noise and visual impact. Indigenous species of trees along with hedgerows and/or shrubs will help mitigate loss of habitats. Bat boxes on these trees would also help with the bat population.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	2 Bunds must be sufficient to reduce noise and visual impact	2D		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The above mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. Concentrations of up to 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> have been predicted at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives and considered to be worst-case for concentrations at Winthorpe village. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting, which would include the use of native tree species, would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting. Additional planting has been included within the design since the statutory consultation, and planting would also be provided either side of the A1133 near Winthorpe. On the right-side linear trees and shrubs would be provided and on the left, hedgerows with trees would be provided to form the field boundary.</p> <p>Opportunities for advanced planting would be explored, however this would be limited to areas of land not impacted during the construction of the Scheme. Given the restrained Order Limits, these areas are likely to be few, but where early works can successfully be undertaken without risk of damage, this would be sought.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken bat surveys. The results of the surveys undertaken to date are detailed in Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. One of the buildings to be demolished to facilitate the Scheme comprises of a daytime roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle. An application for a bat mitigation licence would be submitted to Natural England for the destruction of any roosts (one soprano pipistrelle daytime roost, at the time of writing this response).</p> <p>The impact assessment, including mitigation, is detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The installation of one bat box is proposed outside of the zone of potential construction disturbance and close to the building to be demolished where a single soprano pipistrelle roost has been recorded. This is considered as mitigation, to provide a safe location for any bats found by the bat licenced ecologist during a daytime soft-strip of this building, prior to demolition. Mitigation measures can be found in the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Further bat boxes would be installed across the Scheme and Natural England have been consulted in regard to the proposed ratio of bat boxes.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Road drainage and the water environment; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Around the proposed new island by Winthorpe Kennels is a recognised flood risk area. We feel therefore that the island and surrounding roads need to be raised up to minimise the risk of them flooding. This would also keep the underpass currently there as a safe route into Newark. Sufficient noise and pollution protection measures must be in place though to protect the houses at that end of Winthorpe and those on Winthorpe Road.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. With regards to the flood risks, the Applicant has completed a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed. The new road infrastructure and the diverted walking and cycling route in this area has been set above the flood water level for a 1 in 100 year + climate change fluvial flood event (an extreme storm event).</p> <p>The existing walking and cycling underpass beneath the existing A46 would be retained and the route connecting to this from Bridge House Boarding Kennels would be above the 1 in 100 year + climate change fluvial flood level, therefore retaining connectivity as with the existing route.</p> <p>The above mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form of barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Noise and vibration; Air quality	Noise reduction is important and road surface for this is not enough alone. These surfaces do NOT last long either. They can soon add to PM pollution of the air. Air quality will be a concern – particularly as a school will be not far from the road.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultees. With regards to the noise concerns, please refer to Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which considers potential noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware of its obligations to maintain low noise road surfacing along the Scheme, and this would form part of the usual highway maintenance activities carried out across the strategic road network throughout the life of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>These mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The air quality assessment concluded the Scheme would not have a significant effect on PM during operation. This conclusion is based upon modelling at worst case receptors located within 200 metres of the Scheme's affected road network. The assessment considers operational emissions from exhaust emissions and non-exhaust emissions, which include tyre and brake wear and road abrasion. The effect of road abrasion is accounted for within the assessment method through the use of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' <i>Emission Factor Toolkit</i> and background pollutant maps.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Construction; Noise and	Whilst we agree that there have been improvements to the proposals which were initially presented, we still feel very anxious about how we and other residents are going to be	2B	N	In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	vibration; Air quality	affected. The construction period and the disruption is going to be horrific for Winthorpe residents. Our lovely Conservation village is going to be severely affected with noise, dust, road access, construction traffic etc etc We hope that construction is managed sensitively and with care and respect to Winthorpe residents.			the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Air quality; Landscape and visual effect; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity; Geology and soils	<p>Environment</p> <p>Although you agree that there will be an effect to our environment both during construction and through the operational stage and that Highways are assessing the impact this causes, takes years to rectify.</p> <p>We have major concerns about the environmental impact, this will have on the local area, including the impact it will have on Winthorpe Village, which is a conservation village.</p> <p>There are many issues that cannot be avoided such as air &amp; light pollution, noise levels, impact on wildlife (bio-diversity), the need to land-take, land contamination and the visual impact it will also have on the surrounding area.</p>	2C		<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). A temporary significant effect is predicted on Winthorpe Conservation Area during construction, however, this would reduce to a slight adverse non-significant effect in operation with the provision of landscape planting. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>), a Traffic Management Plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the local road network. The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>The human health aspect of the assessment also assessed the impact of the Scheme on access to local services, changes in the provision of green space and recreation, social cohesion, employment and income. It concluded that there were no significant impacts on human health either during construction or operation of the Scheme. Considerations of these impacts are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects. This is due to the fact that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect in air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the Scheme and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe (which are within 200m of the affected road network) have been included in the assessment. The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of landscape proposal for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the ecological surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible (including impacts of pollution, light, noise and vibration disturbance). Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible has been a key principle within the design from the outset. Where impacts cannot be avoided then mitigation measures would be in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to address any potential for adverse effects on air, light, noise, landscape and visual, biodiversity, and potential for contamination (before and during construction as well as once the Scheme is in operation) are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Climate; Population and human health; Landscape and visual effects	<p>I have serious concerns about the impacts of the proposed bypass to our natural environment, and also to the health and well-being of communities in the vicinity of the proposed bypass. Our country is one of the most nature depleted countries in the world, we need to be saving, protecting and enhancing our natural environment, not destroying and impacting it with projects like this. We cannot afford to be losing trees. Millions are being spent on planting trees as a matter of urgency, so it would be ludicrous to allow millions to be spent on a road that destroys so many mature trees.</p> <p>In conclusion, this would be a destructive and harmful project, that is not fit for purpose. It would be more harm than good and shouldn't be progressed.</p>	N/A	N	<p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037) and is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment has identified that the emissions arising from the Scheme represent less than 0.007% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. The assessment therefore concludes that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have a material impact.</p> <p>The climate assessment also includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon. Methods include the reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) are embedded within the assessment process and the Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss, with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland).</p> <p>Compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost. The species mix is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Once planting has established, provision of habitats would be measurably greater than pre-construction and would enhance connectivity for wildlife as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/ 6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Replacement tree planting would be secured, managed, and maintained to compensate for the tree loss as set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. However, replacement planting cannot compensate entirely for the loss of a mature specimen. Therefore, through an integrated design process and with the use of appropriate protective measures, all of the veteran trees are to be retained, and every effort made to enable the retention of mature and higher-value trees where reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Construction methods, haul routes, temporary and permanent access tracks, road designs, floodplain compensation areas, landscape features, and drainage features are several of the Scheme components adapted to enable the retention of trees. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic and environmental factors that influence human health status, such as neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income, access to green space, recreation and physical activity. The assessment predicted that there should be no significant impacts on human health as a result of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6G-H	Air quality; Noise and vibration; Cultural heritage; Landscape and visual effects	Air Quality, Noise and Cultural Heritage: Congestion on the existing A46 frequently causes traffic displacement (with associated congestion) into the Newark Town (Centre) - particularly along the Victoria Street/Millgate/Lombard Street/Castlegate/Northgate corridor. This is a densely populated area frequently characterised by residential and other environmentally sensitive development immediately abutting these roads. This displaced traffic causes serious detriment to the environment by virtue of noise and poor air quality, serious threats to pedestrian safety and visual and other harm to the historic environment. The upgrading of the road, combined with	2C	N	<p>The aim of the Scheme is to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This will contribute to the UK, regional and local Government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46 as detailed in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		effective traffic management/ calming measures within the Town Centre will significantly mitigate these impacts and this positive outcome needs to be given due weight in considering the overall environmental impacts of the scheme.			The traffic modelling carried out as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that in general there is forecast to be a reduction in traffic in the centre of Newark-on-Trent. Along Fardon Road, at the start of the corridor mentioned, there is predicted to be a large reduction in traffic with vehicles predicted to use the A46 more with the Scheme in place.
BHLF-559H-RWZ9-7	Air quality; Noise and vibration	The fact that traffic will be free flowing should lessen, significantly the impact of exhaust fumes and noise pollution currently being experienced, both by human population and the flora and fauna.	2D	N	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) confirm that no significant noise effects are predicted at any noise receptors with mitigation in place, and no significant effects on air quality are predicted at any human health or designated ecology receptors, from the operation of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWBA-Q	Air quality; Noise and vibration	With regards to increased air pollution due to increased volume of traffic, by the time this project is completed most vehicles on the road will most likely be electric driven, therefore no increase of pollution or noise for that matter.	2H	N	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) has assessed the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m <sup>3</sup> for NO <sub>2</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> , and 20ug/m <sup>3</sup> for PM <sub>2.5</sub> ). These objectives are policy targets generally expressed as a maximum ambient pollutant concentration to be achieved. The objectives are set out in the UK Government's <i>Air Quality Strategy</i> for the key air pollutants.  The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant, so no mitigation measures are proposed.  The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs publishes future national projections of air quality based on evidence of future emissions, traffic and vehicle fleet. Projections are updated as the evidence base changes. The uptake of electric vehicles and other technologies into the UK's vehicle fleet has been addressed in this assessment as emission factors derived from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' <i>Emission Factors Toolkit EFT (v11.0)</i> . Adding to this, long-term trend gap analysis factors have been applied to uplift opening year concentrations in order to address the uncertainty relating to predictions of future emissions.
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Air quality; Population and human health	Our Government are soon to enshrine new air pollution targets into UK law, including for PM2.5. It concerns me greatly that National Highways are not taking deadly PM2.5 pollution into account, this needs to be addressed. These are particles so tiny they get into our organs via the bloodstream. Non-fossil fuel vehicles emit PM2.5 too, so it is not a problem that will reduce. PM2.5 has been proven to travel over great distances, so is a risk regardless of how close to the source you are. Not only does PM2.5 pose a serious risk to our health and well-being, but it also pollutes our water and soil.	N/A	N	The assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. The relevant air quality thresholds which must be met are set out in Table 5-1 of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and consider the following pollutants: NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> .  During construction and operation, the concentrations of the above pollutants at worst case human health receptors are assessed to be below the air quality thresholds outlined in Table 5-1 and therefore effects are not significant. During construction, mitigation measures would be in place to ensure the air quality thresholds are not exceeded and dust deposition is kept to a minimum, as outlined below.  The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> guidance states that there should be no need to model PM <sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM <sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds. Modelling of PM <sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM <sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. This is an appropriate approach and method of assessment given that PM <sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future and PM <sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM <sub>10</sub> , which means that vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM <sub>2.5</sub> would be lower than those for PM <sub>10</sub> .  The construction mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) and included within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) are as follows:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>• Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>• Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or cover, seed or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>• Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washes</li> <li>• Maintain a low-speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>• Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>• Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>• All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>• High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for ensuring the above mitigation is adhered to through daily inspections across the construction site.</p> <p>Future thresholds for PM<sub>2.5</sub> have been considered as part of the air quality assessment. The new annual mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 10µg/m<sup>3</sup> by 2040 does not need to be met until 2040, which is after the Scheme opening year of 2028, and the interim annual mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 12µg/m<sup>3</sup> by 2028 is not a legal threshold. The targets are also required to be met at air quality monitoring stations however there are no air quality monitoring stations in the vicinity of the scheme in respect of which measurements could be made. Therefore, neither target has been considered further in this assessment.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration across the modelled human health receptors for 2022 is 9.7µg/m<sup>3</sup> which is below the new PM<sub>2.5</sub> target, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future. Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> contributions from changes in road traffic from the Scheme would also be very small, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are mainly influenced by existing background concentrations, which are currently below the future target. Therefore, the Scheme would not have a significant effect on the ability to meet the future PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 10µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3U-V	Air quality; Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	<p>There are many issues that cannot be avoided such as air &amp; light pollution, noise levels, impact on wildlife (bio-diversity), the need to land-take, land contamination and the visual impact it will also have on the surrounding area.</p> <p>There are many different types of wildlife habitat in the area, and it is a concern that this will have a significant impact by the scheme. It is unacceptable to say, that Highways will take measures to try to reduce the risk to habitat loss etc, and replacement habitat can be re-established. As you can appreciate this all takes time, and what about the loss to this wildlife in the meantime. Surely preservation of what we have, is hugely important.</p>	2C	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) are embedded in the Scheme design and assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), with focus on avoidance of high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity during operation and construction, including designated sites, Habitats of Principal Importance, Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, habitats of ecological value and the protected species they support. Further information is detailed in Appendices 8.1-8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/6.6</b>) assesses the impacts (including light and noise disturbance) on river and sea lamprey in greater detail (qualifying features for the designation of the Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar), as the River Trent intersects the Scheme and is a known migratory route for lamprey. No residual significant effects are anticipated on the movement of protected species.</p> <p>The quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in (Appendix 8.14) Biodiversity Net Gain Report of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland).</p> <p>Once planting has established, provision of habitats would be measurably greater than pre-construction and would enhance connectivity for wildlife as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. A bespoke compensation package has been produced for the unavoidable permanent loss of lowland meadow Habitat of Principal Importance, a very high distinctiveness habitat.</p> <p>Following the application of mitigation, a significant effect during construction is identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no significant effects identified. The compensation planting design is detailed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible, and where removal is required replacement planting would be introduced to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals is being developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link (Friendly Farmer Link Road) between the roundabouts is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to address any potential for adverse effects on air quality, light, noise, biodiversity and potential for contamination as a result of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme to address the potential for adverse effects on geology and soils (including potential for contamination) is included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNZ-V	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	I live at the A1133 end of the village and having studied the plan of the Winthorpe Roundabout, which is going to be sizeably larger than the existing one. The plan shows tree planting on the northern side of the A1133 but not on the south side? Which I find odd as the road will come closer to the village therefore tree planting should be included on the south side too. This roundabout will be larger busier, noisier with the hamburger design consequently bunding and tree planting could help to alleviate this.	2D	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The environmental design has evolved since statutory consultation and now includes a provision of planting including trees and shrubs as well as a hedgerow with trees to the southern side of the A1133. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6G-H	Biodiversity	Biodiversity: The scheme affords a significant opportunity for biodiversity net gain/enhancement-through additional planting and features such as the borrow pits/flood mitigation measures both 'on-line' and 'off' site and in the sustainable sourcing of construction materials ('offsetting'). This needs to be weighed against the stated adverse impacts on biodiversity. HS2 provides an exemplar for this approach.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the sustainable sourcing of construction materials, the Material Assets and Waste section of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments includes commitments to reduce the use of materials and ensure resource efficiency, and provisions for low carbon materials and materials with recycled contents. The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> details an integrated planting design to mitigate impacts on various receptors (e.g. heritage, ecology and landscape) based on professional expertise and knowledge including across other sectors, such as HS2.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's comment about borrow pits/flood mitigation measures, the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure the land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West floodplain compensation area would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main habitats within Farndon West floodplain compensation area include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees.</p> <p>Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East floodplain compensation area are also included within the design. The locations of borrow pits and the extents of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> show all land that would need acquiring and managing for the Scheme. Discussions are ongoing with the respective landowner to agree a strategy for long-term management of the Farndon East floodplain compensation area.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9S-Z	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	Fruit trees and plenty of scrub area for wildlife would be good	2C	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>New areas of planting including species rich grassland and native tree and shrub planting areas would be provided to benefit wildlife. Indicative planting mixes for the landscape design include various native tree species which produce fruit such as Cherry and Crab Apple whilst various scrub species would also be provided that produce berries such as Hawthorn and Buckthorn, which would benefit wildlife.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7Y-4	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	<p>You need to minimise the environmental impact throughout.</p> <p>When trees and hedgerows are planted these need to be maintained going forward to ensure survival not left to die like they are normally. You need to build wildlife habitats and corridors to keep our precious wildlife safe.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant's development consent application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which has written been in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will be prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) are embedded in the Scheme design and assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, with focus on avoidance of high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present.</p> <p>The quantity (area) of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value have been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in (Appendix 8.14) Biodiversity Net Gain Report of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland).</p> <p>Existing community or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Once planting has established, provision of habitats would be measurably greater than pre-construction and would enhance connectivity for wildlife as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. The planting species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Mitigation measures, including provision of habitats for protected species and keeping wildlife safe, have been informed by robust survey data (results are provided in technical reports in the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>) and are detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how these will be implemented and managed.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7X-3	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity; Climate; Noise and vibration	You need to ensure this is top of your list. Lots of trees and hedgerows needed for our wildlife, carbon emissions and noise barriers.	2C	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting includes the provision of tree and shrub planting, woodland, hedgerows, and grassland.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWT1-S	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity	It is difficult to view how many trees will be planted, but if attention can be given to planting trees where the roads will result in traffic noise affecting housing nearby. This should not only reduce noise pollution but also improve aesthetics/ block unsightly construction/ encourage wildlife.	2G		<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. Planting is not typically considered to be a suitable alternative to other means of noise screening e.g. noise barriers, therefore it does not explicitly feature in the noise mitigation strategy. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, the noise impacts are predicted to be not significant during operation and construction of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The noise mitigation measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity; Air quality	Plant new woodland. Excavate unused brownfield land for flood mitigation and creation of ecological improvement e.g. Old Notts County Council yard next to cattle market roundabout. Reduce use of traffic lights. Only leads to increased air pollution from standing traffic.	2D	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including the planting of areas of woodland, shrub and tree planting.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme has been developed that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, details of which can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010054/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment that has been completed.</p> <p>Sites used for flood mitigation are required to have particular ground elevations, which the site referred to by the Consultee (the Old Council Yard) would not be able to fully accommodate. Utilising brownfield sites for flood mitigation purpose would remove the potential of these sites for development and would often require significant remediation work to make suitable.</p> <p>The dispersion modelling undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> demonstrated that pollutant concentrations at human health receptors are predicted to be well below the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective in the opening year of the Scheme, with a maximum concentration of 31.9µg/m<sup>3</sup> being predicted in the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme). The dispersion modelling takes into account the effects of additional emissions generated by standing traffic at roundabouts and traffic signals. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p> <p>Traffic lights would be provided where required to control traffic flows and queues. Farndon, Friendly Farmer, Cattle Market and Winthorpe roundabouts are only partially signalised. Further details can be found in Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6G-H	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	Work with the Local Highway Authority and the District Council to plan traffic management in the Town Centre and to co-ordinate these measures with the delivery of the By-pass improvement. Draw up a comprehensive Environmental, Landscape and Biodiversity Improvement Plan (including new habitat creation) for both the By-pass corridor and on other related sites (e.g. raw material sources) and sites 'nominated' by the Local Authorities and other agencies (e.g. Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust etc.).	2D	N	<p>During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> a Traffic Management plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the local road network. The Traffic Management Plan would be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> the Applicant has submitted with the application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan provides details of how the construction works would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> will be developed in consultation with the local highway authority and would aim to minimise disruption to the traveling public</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>during construction. Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new bridge crossing the A1. Also, construction operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout would be phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3C-A	Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	The planting of trees should be given a high priority. Not only is this area a traditional forestry area, it will help to contain flood water alongside floodplain areas.	2C	N	<p>New and replacement planting would be provided in order to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme as well as providing habitat value. This includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration and over time provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNN-G	Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	More trees - everywhere. We need to work with the flood plains not against.	2D		<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. At the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area the flood risk mitigation is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure the land can continued to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West floodplain compensation area would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 Environmental Masterplan of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The main habitats within Farndon West floodplain compensation area include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the large body of water in Farndon East floodplain compensation area have also been included within the design.
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects	Impact on nature and green space-habitat Not to mention how ugly it will look.	2B	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The outcome of the assessment has informed the Scheme design development as well as mitigation requirements including planting of trees and shrubs, landscape bunds and earthworks to help settle the Scheme in the neighbouring landscape and reduce visual effects. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Appropriate planting has been included to reflect the local character of the area and species distribution.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity during operation and construction, including designated sites, Habitats of Principal Importance, Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, habitats of ecological value and the protected species they support. Further information is detailed in Appendices 8.1-8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders. Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be implemented. Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Road drainage and the water environment; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Biodiversity	The report does not mention the Farndon Ponds Natural Reserve and the Marina. The impact in terms of noise and air quality could be significant and thus must be taken in consideration, especially for birds.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Both of the receptors referred to in the Consultee's comment are considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Although Farndon Ponds Local Nature Reserve and Farndon Marina are adjacent to the River Trent, they are located upstream of the Scheme and therefore there is no surface water pathway for the Scheme to impact these receptors. This chapter has been informed by robust survey data. The zone of influence and the results of bird surveys are detailed in Appendix 8.5 (Breeding Bird Technical Report) and Appendix 8.6 (Wintering Bird Technical Report). No significant effects are predicted on these receptors given the distance between them and the Scheme (approximately 500m).</p> <p>The air quality assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been undertaken in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> which sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>effects of highway projects on air quality. Receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>, as this is the distance within which air quality impacts are likely to occur. The Farndon Ponds Nature Reserve and the Marina are located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore have not been included in the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The Farndon Ponds Nature Reserve and Marina fall outside the study area defined in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> and therefore have not been included in the assessment. The southern boundary of the Marina marginally overlaps the study area where a reduction in noise levels with the Scheme in the opening year has been identified.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Air quality; Landscape and visual effects; Population and human health	Atmospheric pollution increases by lorry park and diesel fumes. Our village is known to be 'wooded' should have mature trees planted not saplings, these could also reduce increase in nitrogen which is detrimental to our health, especially our lungs.	2C	N	<p>The assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. For construction, the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). These objectives are policy targets generally expressed as a maximum ambient pollutant concentration to be achieved. The objectives are set out in the UK Government's <i>Air Quality Strategy</i> for the key air pollutants. No significant effects on air quality are predicted as a result of the operation of the Scheme, therefore there are no mitigation measures to be provided here.</p> <p>Some mature tree planting would be considered, however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. Such planting is only required to mitigate visual or ecological effects from the Scheme. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	'The spinney' residents will be directly impacted with loss of visual aspect - currently they overlook trees which hide the Knowhow warehouse which is huge and an eyesore. Removal of any trees will mean that they will be subjected to an increase in light pollution, noise and air pollution. please consider how this can be prevented.	2D	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. A significant amount of the existing trees have been retained as part of the design development and where removed new planting has been provided alongside the Scheme to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p> <p>Due to design development, the landscape design of the Scheme has evolved since statutory consultation and now includes tree and shrub planting in this area. In order to mitigate the potential landscape and visual and noise impacts on The Spinney, an environmental bund has been embedded in the Scheme design to the south-east edge of Winthorpe along the A46 westbound.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects. Further details of the noise assessment can be found in the Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The noise mitigation measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownhills Roundabout and Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting have been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to mitigate any potential adverse effects. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible in the vicinity of this location which would aid mitigation of light effects here. This can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and also the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. Adherence to the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be secured by Requirement 3 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. Details regarding the Scheme lighting proposals are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation. The assessment concludes that there are no significant effects on air quality. The assessment of the operational phase does not consider tree/vegetation cover and its effects on air quality in any modelled scenario as this is not a requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. It promotes a conservative assessment and quantification of the interaction between air quality and vegetation which is still subject to ongoing research. By excluding the effects of vegetation from the Do Something modelled scenario, the assessment predicts a worst case with scheme concentrations. As predicted impacts are concluded to be not significant. No mitigation measures are required for impacts on air quality during operation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Landscape and visual effects	Worried that it may impose more on the village than stated. I live very close to the Mint Leaf.	2B	N	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the Scheme on the environment including those upon Winthorpe village and surrounding properties. The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The Environmental Statement considers effects upon air quality, cultural heritage, landscape and visual effects, biodiversity, geology and soils, material assets and waste, noise and vibration, population and human health, road drainage and the water environment, climate and combined and cumulative effects. The Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary <b>(TR010065/APP/6.4)</b> has also been produced and provides a summary of the above information.</p> <p>The potential impacts upon visual receptors and landscape character have been assessed within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Outcomes of the assessment have informed the development of the design including the environmental design as illustrated in Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVB-C	Geology and soils; Air quality	The proposed extensive flood plain enhancement will involve huge groundwork and soil redistribution. During the summer months the combination of sunny weather and brisk South Westerly winds will undoubtedly cause an extremely difficult to manage dust problem. Does the scheme consider the requirement to provide cleaning services for vehicles and residential/commercial building exteriors in lieu of dust management inadequacies?	2G	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme on air quality during construction. The methods of dust suppression would follow current construction and demolition site best practice and would include measures such as water spraying during cutting/grinding operations, damping down dry surfaces during dry conditions and switching off vehicle engines and plant motors when not in use.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The implementation of the mitigation measures included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments would minimise construction dust effects so that they are unlikely to result in significant effects at nearby human health receptors.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Population and human health; Cultural heritage; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Again, as a local resident, I am extremely concerned that the work on A46 bypass will decrease the quality of living, endanger the safety of pedestrians/cyclists and drastically alter the unique, historic character of Newark town.	2B	N	<p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration amenity effects which includes the coexistence of environmental effects such as air quality, noise and vibration, and landscape and visual amenity. The assessment found that there is likely to be no significant impacts on human health or amenity as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> found that there may be some adverse effects on the community as a result of access to walking, cycling and horse-riding routes, specifically access to Newark BW2 and Newark FP48#1 during construction, and access to Trent Valley Way during operation due to the required diversions. Embedded mitigation measures in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) include the provision of appropriate signage for temporary and permanent changes to walking, cycling and horse-riding provision. This is detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>One of the key Scheme objectives is to provide inclusivity which improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected, the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> provides detail on how the Scheme meets this key objective. All new walking and cycling routes would be separated by a 1m hard strip, a kerb upstand and a 0.5m separation next to the 3m walking and cycling route. This detail provides safe facilities for users.</p> <p>Engagement with local people through all stages of construction is committed within the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>. The Applicant would provide regular updates on the Scheme throughout construction using the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as newsletters and public information events. The aim of this community engagement is to ensure that the Applicant can address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and mitigate impacts related to the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of these engagement methods.</p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). A permanent slight adverse non-significant effect is predicted on Newark Conservation Area during both construction and operation with provision of mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Landscape and visual	*Cattlemarket flyover- impact on Newark Castle* It will be imperative to understand the visual impact of the flyover when viewed from Newark Castle- at the windows and from the tower/gatehouse. The road is likely to be very intrusive at this view and detrimental to understanding the castle's position and historic significance. The landscape and visual assessment needs to include several photomontages from the	2B	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and associated appendices in the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). Mitigation has been embedded into the Scheme design which</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	effects; Cultural heritage	castle. There are also plans to create a new visitor offer in the gatehouse and so more people will be going to the top in future. Their experience of the history will be detrimentally affected.			<p>means no permanent significant effects on Newark Castle are predicted. Further detail on embedded mitigation for the Scheme can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). With embedded mitigation in place as part of the Scheme, a temporary slight adverse effect is predicted on Newark Castle during construction. Due to the presence of the existing road infrastructure and intervening development, no change to the asset is predicted as a result of operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme, including views from Newark Castle towards the Cattle Market Junction are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Photomontages are included in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Photomontage locations were chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of structures within their setting once the Scheme is in operation and were prepared in accordance with the <i>Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals (September 2019)</i>. Locations did not include views from Newark Castle as it was considered that the locations chosen better reflected the scale and presence of the Scheme in the surrounding landscape.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Road drainage and the water environment; Cultural heritage; Material assets and waste	The land take for these features could be far larger than the actual road footprint. The environmental impact of these flood areas and pits could be huge- landscape/visual, ecology, archaeology (especially rich with ice age, roman and civil war). These would in effect be quarries for several years. Where material would be excavated and where and how it would be transported is not set out- would for example materials be HGV hauled over Kelham bridge -which will be very controversial. It is not right to be speculating over all this. People need to know.	2G	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assessments have considered any effects as a result of the works associated with the floodplain compensation areas and borrow pits upon all environmental disciplines. This includes landscape and visual (detailed within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement), ecology (Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement) and archaeology (Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement). The design of the Scheme includes the formation and use of borrow pits, the purpose of which would be to extract suitable earthworks materials for use during construction of the Scheme. Information on the borrow pits can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Three borrow pits are to be formed at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon West, to the north of the River Trent</li> <li>• Farndon East, to the north of the River Trent</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction</li> </ul> <p>These locations have been selected due to their proximity to where material would be needed during the construction phase, and to minimise the distance over which material would need to be transported. Further information on the location and extents of the borrow pits can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>The average depth of the borrow pits would be between 1-4m. The topsoil excavated from the borrow pit areas would be stockpiled adjacent to the areas such that it can be re-soiled after completion of the works. Settlement and recharge lagoons would be constructed adjacent to the borrow pit areas to allow dewatering operations to take place. The settlement lagoons allow for the sediment that is pumped out of borrow pits to be discharged to the ground or a watercourse. The recharge lagoons are used to store water that would later be pumped back into the ground to restore the ground water level.</p> <p>Necessary environmental permits would be sought from the Environment Agency before commencement of works and a no derogation agreement made with the owner/operator of any private groundwater supply which may be temporarily impacted by dewatering. Further information can be found within Appendix B.3 (Outline Soil Management Plan) of the First</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which outlines how soils would be managed during construction.</p> <p>The excavated material would be cleaned and graded to a specified material classification on site. This would be loaded on to wagons to be taken to the required fill locations. Material excavated from the Farndon east site is likely to be sands and gravels and would be processed into a class 6i/j material (selected granular fill material, as specified in the Specification for Highway Works) for use in the reinforced earth soil embankment between the River Trent and the Nottingham to Lincoln Railway Line.</p> <p>Material excavated from the Brownhills site is likely to be a class 2 clay (general cohesive fill, as specified in the Specification for Highway Works). This would be used to construct the new embankment at Brownhills Junction.</p> <p>As part of the Applicant's application for development consent, it is proposing to lower the ground in two locations within the fields to the north of the A617 between the villages of Kelham and Averham to create floodplain compensation areas for the Scheme. The locations of these are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p> <p>The excavated material from these areas would be transported to the soil stockpile areas on the northern end of the Scheme between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Landscape and visual effects; Population and human health; Noise and vibration; A1/A46 Crossing	<p>I have major concerns around the visual impact of this new road - the impact on property enjoyment, noise levels, visuals, light pollution and ultimately property values: The latest design proposals for the road alignment have reduced the impact on the landscape character of Winthorpe's locality compared with earlier proposals. As part of the East Nottinghamshire Sandlands Regional Character Area, Winthorpe is noted for its historic field patterns and hedgerows, of which some will be lost where the A1 bridge and embankments link to the road at the service stations. We would like to see significant effort put into preserving these characteristics.</p> <p>Elsewhere there will be some loss to sound barrier bunds and NMU tracks. It is hoped that there will be an acceptable level of re-planting of trees and hedges in these areas. There will, however, be a significant level of visual intrusion for a wide range of properties in Winthorpe and also on the Winthorpe Parklands, a part of the conservation area. Of particular concern is the impact of the unexpectedly high A1 bridge and its approach embankments. This will be clearly seen by properties in the Lowwood area and The Spinney as it is a full 2 metres above the height of the existing bridge. The bridge could, with advantage, be constructed at a lower level.</p> <p>Residents of The Spinney are particularly concerned that, whereas their present view of the A46 is mostly obscured by the zone of trees between the A1 and the Esso Service Station, a significant area of these will be removed and the bridge and approach embankment will be fully exposed to their view until the suggested area of planting alongside the embankment has matured. An augmentation of the existing tree belt along the higher boundary of the field adjacent to the A1, between the road and Lowwood area is needed, especially some lower height shrubs and trees as the existing trees are quite tall with bare lower trunks.</p> <p>PEI Vol 1 section 8.11 20 comments that the new road will be very dominant at Crees Lane and Sandhills Park, but no mention is made of Barley Way, Wheatsheaf Avenue and southern properties in Winthorpe which are even more dominated by the high embankment and bridge.</p> <p>For some aspects of The Spinney and the Southfields location it is hoped that the construction of the earth bunds, together with extensive tree and vegetation planting will help to mask the road. We note that, in the Forestry Commission's response in the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion, they say 'Where woodland loss is unavoidable, it is expected that there will be significant compensation and the use of buffer zones to enhance the resilience of neighbouring woodlands.'</p> <p>They also comment on the Government's aspiration to plant 30,000 ha of woodland per year by 2025. In their response to the Planning Inspectorate, Newark and Sherwood District Council call for the planting of medium and large trees in these zones. We would like to see</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>With regards to property enjoyment, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors.</p> <p>As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. No predicted significant adverse amenity effects have been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant will also continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This includes properties on The Spinney, Barley Way, Wheatsheaf Avenue and southern properties in Winthorpe. Efforts have been made to retain existing landscape features wherever possible. Where this has not been possible, the landscape design has been developed to reinstate features where appropriate, including the parkland landscape and hedgerows in the vicinity of Winthorpe. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme to aid landscape integration and visual screening. To the south and east of Winthorpe, new hedgerow field boundaries with trees, a small number of individual trees, as well as linear belts of trees and shrubs are included adjacent to the A46 to help screen views from the village.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		an extension of such proposed tree and shrub planting zones to the Winthorpe side of the new NMU.			<p>The height of the A1/A46 Crossing is due to it being a single span. Placing a central support would impact on visibility for the A1 mainline and on slip and also introduce hazards during construction.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since statutory consultation as part of ongoing detailed design stages. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users. Lighting would be installed or modified at the following locations across the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farndon Roundabout</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction</li> <li>• Brownhills Junction and Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Friendly Farmer Roundabout area including the slip roads into the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• The single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> </ul> <p>The requirements for road lighting at these locations have been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users, the design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark.</p> <p>The existing lighting on the dual carriageway between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would remain. The single carriageway link between the roundabouts (Friendly Farmer Link Road) is currently anticipated to be illuminated. The environmental impact of this lighting has been assessed as this is the worst-case scenario. All lighting extents are to be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction.</p> <p>The landscape design has considered impacts resulting from the Scheme and evolved from the design presented during statutory consultation. An environmental bund has been embedded in the Scheme design to the south-east edge of Winthorpe along the A46 westbound, whilst acoustic barriers and tree and shrub planting would also be provided here. Beyond this, a new hew hedgerow with trees would be provided on the Winthorpe side of the walking and cycling route, providing a new field boundary with the landscape beyond.</p> <p>The Applicant has taken account of the Forestry Commission's response and as such some mature tree planting would be considered, however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishing more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. Lighting at junctions would be required as is currently the case.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Plant mature trees and shrubs not saplings which will take many years to become established. Those in the Spinney area will have their garden views negatively affected due to the closer proximity of the proposed road and have to endure more noise ,air and light pollution from vehicles.	2D	N	<p>The assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant therefore no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact upon the Scheme, by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors.</p> <p>An environmental bund has been embedded in the Scheme design to the south-east edge of Winthorpe, (which includes The Spinney) along the A46 westbound, whilst acoustic barriers and planting would also be provided here. The bund would provide immediate screening of lower-level traffic movements, whilst tree planting would provide a greater level of screening over time. Significant effects during operation are not anticipated in Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) or Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening). Some mature tree planting will be considered, however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishing more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p> <p>The combination of bunds and barriers to reduce noise impact on Winthorpe village would also prevent light pollution from vehicle headlights.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>The proposed tree and shrub planting along and between the A46 and Winthorpe village needs to be fully explained to the Winthorpe residents.</p> <p>What will be the minimum height of the new tree lined embankment (bund)?</p> <p>What type of tree and shrubs will be planted?</p> <p>How long will it take for the embankment to mature and provide a good and traffic noise and pollution barrier?</p> <p>Trees usually take up to 15 years to provide effective visual screening depending on the species</p> <p>Who maintains the trees and plants and embankment?</p> <p>A full noise and air pollution assessment needs to be undertaken?</p> <p>No information was available at any of the consultations.</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the Scheme on air quality. During operation, concentrations across human health receptors are expected to be well below the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded not to be significant therefore no mitigation measures are proposed. The assessment does not consider tree/vegetation cover and its effect on air quality during operation.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, including the type of planting provided. The landscape bund included as part of the Scheme would be approximately 2m in height. Planting is considered to have met full screening function by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) within the assessment of landscape and visual effects, albeit screening value would start to be afforded prior to that time. Immediate screening to lower portions of passing traffic would be afforded by the introduction of the landscape bund.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. Planting is typically not considered to be a suitable alternative to other means of noise screening e.g. noise barriers, therefore is not explicitly featured in the noise mitigation strategy. No significant noise effects are predicted at any receptor during construction or operation with mitigation in place.</p> <p>The noise mitigation measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice.</p>
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	Visually intrusive, environmentally damaging and noisy flyover at Cattle Market Roundabout. Environmentally damaging roundabout at Winthorpe.	2B	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> informed design decisions. Currently, at peak times there are queues at Cattle Market Roundabout, these queues would continue to develop and worsen in the coming years if no changes are made at the junction.</p> <p>The design at Winthorpe Roundabout has evolved since the statutory consultation to improve traffic flows and reduce the area of land required. It also minimises impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect would occur based on the removal of suitable habitat</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>outside of the breeding season, the availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) could support the rookery.</p> <p>New and replacement planting would be provided to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of trees and shrubs to aid landscape integration and over time provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors. Planting would be provided around Cattle Market Junction as well as around the A1/A46 Crossing. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are provided on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at this location, along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which would be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration	Unclear how you measure and weight visual and noise pollution/impact on residents	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Further details regarding the methodology used for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is contained within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment of construction noise and vibration, and operational noise impacts has been undertaken in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 111 - <i>Noise and vibration</i> to identify potential significant effects.</p> <p>No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme for air quality and noise are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Road drainage and the water environment; Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects	How will the fleet stream be protected? This stream runs through our village and contains small fishes which feed kingfisher, egrets and other birds. Deer can often be viewed on the park adjacent the current route of the A46, their habitat should be preserved. Light pollution is a concern which will affect bats which can be observed near current A46 roundabout at Winthorpe.	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and supporting Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on different protected species and habitats.</p> <p>Fish are known to use The Fleet (also known as Slough Dyke) and therefore mitigation measures would be undertaken to avoid injury and death of fish, including electro-fishing, which would be undertaken as part of fish rescue prior to any works to Slough Dyke. Any sheet piling or dewatering would be undertaken under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works outside the coarse fish spawning season (avoiding between March to 15 June). Further details on such mitigation measures to protect fish are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. With these measures in place there would be no significant effects upon fish as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>A variety of birds were identified across the Scheme during breeding bird surveys, although only one record of a kingfisher was identified along the River Trent during another survey. The assessment of effects upon birds (including kingfisher, egret and other birds) have been detailed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation measures relating to birds are secured within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. There would be no likely significant effects on birds with the following the adoption of mitigation measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation clearance undertaken outside of the breeding bird season or sensitive working methods (including ecological supervision) implemented for any clearance required during the breeding bird season</li> <li>• Landscape planting incorporating breeding bird habitats and installation of bird boxes in woodland and retained trees and creation of wetland</li> </ul> <p>The assessment of effects upon bats have been detailed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation measures to avoid adverse effects where possible include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal inspection by licensed surveyor prior to back-filling accessible crevices on trees and buildings and prior to soft-stripping materials from one building to be demolished</li> <li>• Felling of trees with hibernation potential undertaken outside of hibernation period or sensitive working methods implemented within this season (as per mitigation above)</li> <li>• Landscape planting and creation of the Farndon East and West wetland area would mitigate for loss of foraging and commuting routes</li> <li>• Installation of bat boxes in retained woodland and trees</li> </ul> <p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of the Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) as they are not a protected species by law. However as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> directional planting has been designed to</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed mammals are protected species, however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and have been informed by available roadkill data. The directional planting has been designed to encourage mammals (such as badger, otter and foxes) to use existing safe passages under the A46 carriageway that connect suitable habitat.</p> <p>Existing community or foraging routes would be retained where possible to ensure safe movement of mammals in proximity to the Scheme, minimising any long-term impacts. Full details of mitigation measures, how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The disturbance from the widened A46 carriageway and directional planting during operation are considered to deter deer from wanting to cross the widened A46 carriageway. Terrestrial mammals would continue to use the landscape to commute and access foraging habitat and move away from temporary disturbance as they currently do now. Full details of mitigation measures including how they would be implemented and managed are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. These measures would minimise long-term impacts upon these species.</p> <p>Information regarding lighting proposals has been developed since statutory consultation as part of the ongoing design process. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Road lighting incorporated into the design of the Scheme reflects the level of safety required for road users, as well as minimising effects on nocturnal species including bats. Lighting would be installed or modified at the Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>All lighting extents would be confirmed during the detailed design stage, where the level of lighting may be reduced.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with lighting during construction. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road drainage and water environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and supporting Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on the water environment.</p> <p>In relation to pollution prevention and water management to ensure the protection of Fleet Stream, best practice measures would be followed in accordance with Construction Industry Research and Information Association's <i>Control of Water Pollution from Linear Construction Projects</i> as well as the Environment Agency's <i>Protect groundwater and prevent groundwater pollution</i>.</p> <p>A <i>Highways England Water Assessment Tool</i> assessment was applied to all outfalls throughout the Scheme to assess the impact of the Scheme on water quality in the local watercourses, including those to the Fleet. This assessment 'passes' for all outfalls, including those to the Fleet, indicating that the proposed drainage strategy treats surface water run-off sufficiently to not impact the wider water environment. Further detailed assessment would be undertaken at the next design stage to ensure that, if the need for mitigation is identified in respect of the impacts of the Scheme, it would be incorporated as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>A detailed drainage model would be made in the next design stage to inform this assessment. Once additional information is available, the <i>Highways England Water Assessment Tool</i> assessments would be re-calculated and additional mitigation provided if required to ensure that all outfalls pass the <i>Highways England Water Assessment Tool</i> assessments. More information on the current iteration of <i>Highways England Water Assessment Tool</i></p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					assessments can be seen in Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The construction of the new road around Newark will have a significant impact on the flora and fauna in our locality. Where there are impacts we would hope that mitigation infrastructure will go beyond maintenance of the status quo and provide real term improvements in Biodiversity metrics as called for by the Environment Agency and mandated in the 2021 Environment Act.</p> <p>The aspects that we would like to see addressed include tree and hedgerow planting and maintenance, preservation and further provision of wildlife corridors and protection of the aquatic environments of the Fleet and the Slough Dyke.</p> <p>Tree and shrub planting is important for the provision of cover, food availability and habitats as well as for visual amenity. Hedgerows are a vital feature of animal mobility and should be preserved and enhanced. Trees provide roosting sites for the wide variety of birds found locally. We are particularly concerned that the removal of the copse on the existing Winthorpe roundabout and adjacent tree belt will displace the colony of rooks and other birds currently using them. Sufficient trees of a suitable nature should be planted locally and in advance of the works.</p> <p>It is likely that the flood mitigation zone adjacent to Brownhills Junction will be a permanently wet site and might attract water fowl. We would welcome some investigation, alongside the RSPB from Langford Lowfields, on what provisions could usefully be made in this area.</p> <p>Tree and shrub planting requires a long term maintenance plan, with early term watering and longer term pruning and trimming. The selection of appropriate species of trees for sound and visual attenuation, pollution interception and animal habitation is also important. Is such a plan provided in your contracts?</p>	2D	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on foraging, commuting and migration routes (wildlife corridors) of wildlife recorded in the area. The chapter details appropriate and proportional mitigation informed by robust survey data and desk study records, as well as an assessment of likely significant effects.</p> <p>Following the application of mitigation, a significant adverse effect during construction is identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. The compensation planting design comprises of habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated, or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated. This compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Site. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated.</p> <p>The location of Local Wildlife Sites habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. No residual significant effects are anticipated during operation. Monitoring would aim to record changes in the ecological baseline, determining whether the mitigation/compensation measures are successful, and inform whether remedial actions are required. The Scheme mitigation, compensation and monitoring requirements are detailed within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Statutory requirements for biodiversity net gain on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are expected for those applications for development consent which are not yet in examination, in November 2025. Given the timing of the application for development consent for the Scheme, there are no statutory requirements to undertake a biodiversity net gain assessment or to achieve a particular percentage increase in habitat value for wildlife compared with the pre-development baseline. However, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project applicants are encouraged to take a proactive approach in the transition to mandatory biodiversity net gain by completing a metric and taking opportunities to improve scheme performance against this. The use of a metric is also useful in demonstrating to stakeholders how a scheme is taking biodiversity into account.</p> <p>The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery and much of this copse habitat would now be retained. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season, the availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) would support the rookery.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss (including for important habitats such as hedgerows) with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present. The design and construction methodology has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. All veteran or notable trees within or in close proximity to the Order Limits are to be retained. The environmental design for the Scheme proposes a variety of planting types including tree and shrub planting, hedgerows and grasslands. Planting has</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>been designed not only to meet the biodiversity objectives of the Scheme but to mitigate landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals of the Scheme. As set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, the Scheme is anticipated to result in a slight adverse effect on hedgerows once the hedgerow is established, which is not significant.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The floodplain compensation area at Brownhills is no longer required, and after its use for the construction of the Scheme the land could be returned to its prior agricultural use following completion of the Scheme.</p> <p>There are two tributaries of The Fleet stream which pass through the Scheme. The first of these, (Slough Dyke), which is mainly culverted under Newark-on-Trent, passes through the Scheme to the east of Brownhills Junction as an open channel before flowing parallel with the A1 and being culverted under the A1 to flow through Winthorpe. The Scheme would result in a minor realignment of the Slough Dyke watercourse to allow for the A46 bridge to be constructed. This minor realignment would result in the watercourse increasing in length and sinuosity which is considered to be a minor beneficial effect for the watercourse conditions.</p> <p>Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> identifies the outfalls into this watercourse as a result of the Scheme. The second tributary of The Fleet is located east of the A46/A17 roundabout. This watercourse is culverted under both the A17 and A46 before flowing through Winthorpe to converge with the Slough Dyke to become The Fleet. Appendix 13.5 (Surface Water Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> outlines the monitoring being undertaken as part of the Scheme. Chapter 13 (Road drainage and water environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and supporting Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on the water environment.</p> <p>Fish are known to use Slough Dyke and therefore mitigation measures would be needed to avoid injury to and death of fish, including electro-fishing, which would be undertaken as part of fish rescue prior to any works being undertaken to Slough Dyke. Any sheet piling or dewatering would be undertaken under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works outside the coarse fish spawning season (avoiding between 15 March to 15 June).</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes general best practice construction practices in accordance with the Construction Industry Research and Information Association's guidelines to ensure the protection of watercourses such as Fleet stream (and Slough Dyke).</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including indicative species mixes, which have been chosen to provide visual screening and maximise biodiversity as far as possible. Planting is typically not considered to be a suitable alternative to other means of noise screening e.g. noise barriers, therefore it is not explicitly featured in the noise mitigation strategy. No significant noise effects are predicted at any receptor during construction or operation with mitigation in place.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	4. Section 8.11.20 of the PEI vol 1 names Sandhills Park as likely to suffer long term significant adverse visual impairment, where the Cattle Market flyover is at an elevation of 8m, but there is no similar concern over the Newark to Winthorpe visual break area. Is there some method of protecting from the flood risk whilst keeping all the roads at a significantly lower level?	2B	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The potential impacts upon the Winthorpe Open Break have been assessed as part of the broader landscape character assessment of Winthorpe village and Farmlands, which is considered to have a large adverse effect during construction and Year 1 (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic), reducing to a moderate adverse effect by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening).</p> <p>The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting, as well as woodland in some areas. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. This assessment (through flood risk mapping showing surrounding low lying land at flood risk), shows that lowering the Cattle Market Roundabout to provide a lower flyover would not be possible due to flood risk in the area.</p> <p>The new roads around Brownhills have been set as low as possible to provide clearance over the A1 and to prevent them from flooding in the design flood event (1 in 100 year fluvial event with climate change).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Landscape and visual effects; A1/A46 Crossing; Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction	For National Highways' publication 'People, places and processes: A guide to good road design' sets out an ambition to create 'good' road designs, this is referenced in the PEI vol 1 at 8.2.15. Where elements of the road environment have a particular visual effect, such as bridges, lighting, ponds, swales and road furniture we would like to see a commitment to providing aesthetically pleasing designs. Whilst it is clear that, where existing structures such as the river and rail bridges are duplicated, a sympathetic similar structure is appropriate, in the case of the A1 and Cattle Market bridge structures something more elegant is required as both mark the entrance into Newark.	2B	N	<p>The Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b> sets out how the Scheme has considered and complied with the ten principles of <i>The Road to Good Design</i> which are reiterated in the follow up guidance document <i>People, places and processes: A guide to good road design</i>, as referenced by the Consultee. Annex A (Design Principles) of the Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b> defines the Scheme's design principles for the key disciplines, which are central to the Scheme's delivery.</p> <p>As set out in the Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b>, multidisciplinary teams all fed into the design to mitigate impacts on various receptors (e.g. heritage, ecology and landscape). The retention of existing vegetation where possible and the implementation of mitigation planting is key in aiding screening of the Scheme and to help soften the presence of the Scheme within the receiving environment. It has been informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape And Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Bridge aesthetics have been considered in collaboration with the Scheme's landscape architect and built heritage specialist. At Cattle Market, the retaining walls are formed in split block units in a stretcher bond pattern. The split block facing would have a red coloured lower section to link in with the adjacent Smeaton red brick parapet walls, with the introduction of local artwork to the walking and cycling route abutment wall being considered during the detailed design stage. The A1/A46 Crossing is a single span structure to create an unobstructed view for users of the highway and walking and cycling route beneath it.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	I would expect that National Highways and their partners will continue to exercise utmost care to minimise noise, visual and environmental impacts both during the construction phase and for the operational phase of the new bypass.	2B	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme for landscape, noise, air quality and other environmental disciplines are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects; Air quality	The detrimental effects on the landscape, noise levels, environment and air quality cannot be justified for saving a few minutes time, especially when there is a southern relief road planned.	2B	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>) sets out the need and economic case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The aim of the Scheme is to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would contribute to the UK, regional and local Government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected in 2025. Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council are the developers for the Southern Link Road.</p> <p>The implementation of the Scheme is required independently of the proposed Southern Link Road and is not reliant on this development. The Do Minimum modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) forecasts that there would be delays along the section of the A46 being addressed by the Scheme. The Do Something modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Environment - general; Biodiversity; Consultation - general	There is not sufficient detail about mitigation measures, or environmental/biodiversity impact, or how the roads will cope with showground traffic. Overall there is very little detail.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Events at the Newark Showground site have not been considered in the traffic modelling. The varying nature and timing of events at the Showground, along with the potential impacts of the manual marshalling of traffic, and any temporary traffic management measures, make the representation of event scenarios in a traffic model a complex and uncertain undertaking. The Applicant has modelled a business-as-usual day and it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise the impacts of event traffic on the road network, further information on the modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Climate; Noise and vibration; Air quality	The highway shouldn't be built and this would have much better environmental impacts, for CO2 emissions, noise, other local air quality (NOx/VOCs etc.), and surrounding landtake.	2D	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>) set out the need and economic case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The aim of the Scheme is to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would contribute to the UK, regional and local Government's transport, and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Land take has been minimised to areas needed to deliver the Scheme, with effort made in the design development to limit impacts upon existing vegetation and habitats. Details of the landscape proposals are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The assessment in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects. This is due to the fact that maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub>, the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. Therefore, the Scheme would help contribute to exposure reduction. Overall, the assessment concludes the effects on air quality are not significant in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidance.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects on Climate is made by comparing project emissions, from construction and operation, with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). In accordance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraph 5.17, and the requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 114 – <i>Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes no likely significant effect. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement reports a 44% reduction in construction emissions through the use of resource efficiency, the use of materials and efficient designs when compared to the baseline.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, a bund or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. No significant effects are predicted from the construction or operation of the Scheme in relation to noise and vibration with mitigation in place.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	Noise mitigation is vital for Winthorpe. We have attended A46 Think again meetings and are well informed by the group, but there is a huge lack of detail from Highways England about noise mitigation, and this, together with light pollution and environmental impact is of major importance to village residents. We feel as if we are going to be a glorified traffic island.	2H	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to address environmental impacts would be implemented before and during construction, and during operation. These are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWB6-C	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity	I've noticed that recently certain authorities have planted wildflowers (for bees/butterflies) on the borders of major roads instead of planting grass. Could this be done? Native trees with fruit for birds could also be planted.	2E/2F	N	<p>The landscape design includes the use of species rich grassland (including a mixture of grass and wildflowers) on areas of low nutrient soils including adjacent to the highway. Planting of native trees and shrubs would be provided along the length of the Scheme, with native woodland planting provided between Winthorpe and the A1/A46 which would all result in a predicted overall net gain in biodiversity. Further details such as methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Indicative planting mixes for the landscape design include various native tree species which produce fruit such as Cherry and Crab Apple whilst various shrub species would also be provided that produce berries such as Hawthorn, which would benefit wildlife. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including indicative species mixes.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWGS-E	Landscape and visual effects; Climate	<p>If any trees or greenery are made in the construction of the new road then they should be replaced in the rate of 2 to 1 removed.</p> <p>Trees are essential to reducing carbon emissions but should not be placed so that signage is obscured or where they could cause road safety problems.</p>	2E/2F	N	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along the length of the Scheme, with woodland planting provided between Winthorpe and the A1/A46. Planting proposals follow the requirements set out in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LD 117 - Landscape design</i> document which stipulates offsets for planting to ensure visibility and safety are not compromised. The landscape design accounts for the sightlines needed for traffic signs and other infrastructure such as traffic signals. Planting would be designed to avoid these sightlines and avoid road safety issues.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWQK-G	Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	Very well considered over all. Screen as much as possible please. Protect green spaces and flood zones.	2C	N	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, consisting of floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity; Air quality; Construction; Noise and vibration	<p>The quality monitoring report has not yet been issued, so the impact of these works cannot be forecast at this time. What tests and will take place during and after the build? What will happen when these promises and forecasts turn out to be worse than predicted?</p> <p>The highways own information states the scheme will result in permanent loss of vegetation, permanent habitat loss and fragmentation of habitat at multiple sites. Construction activities could also increase the risk of a pollution incident, such as contaminated run off, spills/leaks of oils and fuels, and increased airborne pollutants.</p> <p>The scheme will result in loss of priority habitat consisting of deciduous woodland, wood pasture, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, lowland meadow and lowland fen. It has the potential to result in indirect effects on other priority habitats due to construction activities required for the scheme and vegetation clearance required to Regional Delivery Partnership A46 Newark Bypass Preliminary Environmental Information Volume 3 14 facilitate construction. Additional indirect impacts may also affect habitats through airborne pollution, run-off, and compaction of root systems.</p> <p>Site clearance and construction activities may have an adverse effect on protected species where commuting, foraging, breeding and rearing habitats are lost. These protected species include otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers and bats. Construction related run-off could indirectly impact the water quality of local water courses inhabited by species such as water vole and otter.</p> <p>Night works would directly disturb nocturnal species and terrestrial invertebrates due to increased lighting pollution, noise and vibration. This disturbance could potentially contribute to the displacement of a number of species from the area. Additional impacts on species include mortality or injury through construction activities and indirect impacts. Changes in water levels has the potential to alter how bankside habitat can be used for water vole burrowing and otter resting sites. Nightworks and associated lighting have the potential to cause disturbance to bats, badgers and barn owls.</p>	2C	N	<p>The design has been developed to meet the Scheme objectives whilst also minimising environmental effects wherever practicable. Consequently, the Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle being to avoid potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and supporting Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) consider potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on different habitats including priority habitats (also known as Habitats of Principal Importance), habitats of ecological value and the protected species they support (such as otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers and bats).</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) are embedded in the Scheme design and assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The area of each habitat type required to compensate for the unavoidable permanent loss of habitats of ecological value has been informed by the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>, as reported in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>This approach was agreed with Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and would achieve a greater than 1:1 compensation of habitat of the equivalent condition for Habitats of Principal Importance or of greater ecological value for Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, where possible (for example, species-rich grassland would compensate for the loss of poor semi-improved grassland).</p> <p>A bespoke compensation package has been produced for the unavoidable permanent loss of lowland meadow Habitat of Principal Importance, a very high distinctiveness habitat.</p> <p>The Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises of habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated, or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated. Compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Sites. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Sites habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Technical Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the bat surveys undertaken for the Scheme. In summary, nine confirmed bat roosts have been recorded within the survey area to date, consisting of four trees and five buildings. Categorisation of the rarity of bat species present within the survey area is with reference to <i>Wray et al. (2010) CIEEM's In Practice: Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment</i>. All confirmed roosts in buildings and one confirmed roost in a single tree are of 'common' bat species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat). A Daubenton's bat maternity roost (at least 20 individual bats recorded swarming) and a single unidentified bat (day roost) were recorded in two separate trees outside of the Order Limits in the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation survey area. One noctule day roost was identified in the fourth tree. The noctule and Daubenton's bat are considered 'rarer' species. One of the buildings to be demolished to facilitate the Scheme comprises of a daytime roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle. An application for a bat mitigation licence would be submitted to Natural England for the destruction of this roost. The impact assessment, including mitigation, is detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>A minimum of eight bat species were recorded foraging and or commuting across the survey area, including one 'rarest' bat species (Barbastelle), four 'rarer' bat species (Leisler's bat, Noctule, Serotine, and Nathusius' pipistrelle), and three 'common' bat species (brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle). Unidentified <i>Myotis</i> sp., <i>Nyctalus</i> sp., and <i>Pipistrellus</i> sp. were also recorded. Barbastelle comprised less than 1% of total bat registrations, at the time of writing. This result is consistent with the low numbers recorded on the bat transect surveys and the geographical distribution of the species. Survey results are detailed in Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The installation of one bat box is proposed outside of the zone of potential construction disturbance and close to the building to be demolished where a single soprano pipistrelle roost has been recorded. This mitigation measure would provide a safe location for any bats found by the bat licenced ecologist during daytime soft-stripping of this building, prior to demolition. Further bat boxes would be installed across the Scheme and Natural England have been consulted in regard to the proposed ratio of bat boxes.</p> <p>Mitigation measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Mitigation for impacts on all protected species are detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>No otter holts or resting sites would be lost as part of the Scheme. No active badger setts have been identified within the survey area. No confirmed barn owl nest sites have been identified within the survey area. Otter, badger, and barn owl technical reports are confidential and will not be released into the public domain but will be submitted as part of the development consent application. Due to the length of time between survey completion and the development consent order being granted and as otter, water vole, barn owl, badger and bats are highly mobile, these species would require either pre-construction checks or surveys prior to works likely to impact these species commencing. Pre-construction monitoring surveys would be undertaken on inactive badger setts and large mammal burrows located within 30m of works likely to disturb badgers whilst taking shelter in these structures and works that would damage or destroy badger setts. This is secured within the Register of Environmental Actions found within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>A licence to 'interfere with (badger) setts for development purposes' would be applied for, if an active badger is recorded. A Stage 3 barn owl nest site verification surveys would be undertaken pre-construction. This is secured within the Register of Environmental Actions found within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. If a confirmed barn owl nest site requires closure (for which a licence would be required from Natural England), provision of a pair of artificial nest box (equivalent to one breeding territory) would be installed a year before closure.</p> <p>Water vole have been recorded within the survey area, outside of the Order Limits only. Technical Appendix 8.12 (Water Vole Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the water vole surveys undertaken for the Scheme. Current survey data indicates that no direct impacts to water vole are likely and therefore a licence is currently not required. Pre-construction checks for water vole burrows would be undertaken along this watercourse within proximity of works likely to cause disturbance whilst this species takes shelter in the burrow or works likely to damage or destroy water vole burrows. Should burrows be found, an appropriate licence will be applied for from Natural England. This is secured within the Register of Environmental Actions found within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>A slight adverse, not significant effect is predicted on aquatic invertebrates during construction as it is considered that common species of aquatic invertebrates would naturally recolonise the newly created pond within the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area to compensate for the permanent loss of pond P15. Further information regarding this can be found within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 8.8 (invertebrate (Aquatic) Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would result in a slight adverse, not significant effect on terrestrial invertebrates during construction with the permanent loss of terrestrial habitats within Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Site which supports the life cycle of the large garden bumblebee (<i>Bombus ruderatus</i>) and notable species such as the solitary wasp (<i>Lestiphorus bicinctus</i>) and large yellow-face bee (<i>Hylaeus signatus</i>). Retained hedgerows, tussocky grassland, wetland, scrub in sunny locations and flower-rich ditches and field margins adjacent to the works, continue to provide foraging and nesting sites during construction.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction impacts of the Scheme on air quality. The impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Construction dust would also be mitigated using best practical means, such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. This is secured within the Register of Environmental Actions within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 9 (Geology &amp; Soils) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the construction impacts of the Scheme on geology and soils. The impacts of pollution incidents from construction activities, such as contaminated run-off, spills/leaks of oils and fuels are not considered to have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils. These potential pollution incidents would be mitigated using best practical means, such as all immobile plant must stand on impervious drip trays to prevent spillage of fuel and oil. A spill response protocol would be developed. Fuels, oils and chemicals would be stored safely and be suitably banded. Repairs and refuelling of machinery would be carried out on impervious drip trays or within a designated construction site compound, and effects are not predicted to be significant.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before, during and after construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes a number of measures to reduce the risk of pollution incidents, contaminated run off, spills/leaks of oils and fuels, and adverse impacts on air quality and also reduce adverse impacts on protected species and habitats. Where necessary monitoring requirements have also been specified. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Road drainage and the water environment; Landscape and visual effects	Ensure that the fleet stream is protected in Winthorpe at all costs. Maintain flow though the village. do not divert the rate to 'new water lakes'. Plant mature trees not saplings which will take years to grow and become established. Protect our 'parkland', protect from machinery, diggers, do not use as a storage area. Respect our village and its residents.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee with regards to showing respect to Winthorpe village and its residents. The Applicant has engaged with Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council as well as the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group with regards to the impact of the Scheme on Winthorpe village. Further information relating to ongoing engagement with stakeholders is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration has been given throughout the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> for any potential impacts on the residents of Winthorpe including from a visual, noise and vibration and air quality perspective with consideration is also given for any impacts on community facilities, access and health. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts on the residents of Winthorpe from the construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road drainage and Water Environment) of the Environment Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the potential impact of the Scheme on the water environment. The flow rate of The Fleet stream is not anticipated to be changed as a result on the Scheme either permanently or temporarily. The Scheme would not require a diversion of the flow to 'new water lakes'. The attenuation basins would be supplied as a result of the drainage design (road run-off and rainfall). The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the surface water run-off and discharge this into the local watercourses at a restricted rate, agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. For details of the attenuation basin design and restricted flow rates, refer to Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Slough Dyke Water Framework Directive waterbody, a tributary of The Fleet, has been assessed within Appendix 13.1 (Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. This assessment ensures the Scheme is Water Framework Directive compliant in terms of hydromorphology status,</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>biological elements and chemical elements and outlines measures to protect Water Framework Directive waterbodies during construction and operation.</p> <p>The tributary of the Fleet at Winthorpe would be enhanced immediately downstream of where it passes under the A46. The stream passes through a strip of woodland, but the following biodiversity enhancements are included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More semi-natural habitat would be added in the bank top zone</li> <li>• Felled timber from the Scheme would also be placed on the bank top and banks to add structure to the riparian habitat</li> <li>• Stream banks may be locally regraded to more natural profiles to improve habitat quality</li> </ul> <p>Some mature tree planting would be considered however smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, and often establishes more successfully than mature planting. It can also grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, amendments have been made to the landscape proposals. As noted in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> there would be no adverse impacts on any land designated as open space across the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, proportionate mitigation would be implemented to minimise unavoidable impacts. Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Where necessary, monitoring requirements have also been specified. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7R-W	Environment – general	Environmental surveys are still ongoing, so how can the route be agreed before full appreciation of the impact!	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The surveys undertaken have contributed to and formed the iterative design process. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application provides the required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Surveys have continued since the statutory consultation to inform each chapter of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) as necessary.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Environment – general	It is difficult to comment when the surveys are not completed.	2G		
ANON-559H-RWBW-D	Environment – general	I have no issues with this.	2C	N	The Applicant notes these comments.
BHLF-559H-RWWD-F	Environment – general	Proposals seem as good as possible with regard to environment issues	2C		
ANON-559H-RWFU-F	Environment – general	The environment will not positively improve overall. Do not build	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments raised by the Consultees. The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) sets out the key national, regional and local benefits of the Scheme and describes how the A46 is part of the England's strategic road network. The majority of the existing route is built to dual carriageway standard between Leicester and Lincoln, with the exception being the single carriageway section around Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The existing A46 at Newark-on-Trent currently has the worst performance of any section of the A46 between Leicester and Lincoln, and congestion issues negatively impact upon the wider Newark-on-Trent area.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), which accompanies the development consent application, provides the required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the ecological surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible. Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible has been a key principle within the design from the outset. Where impacts cannot be avoided then mitigation measures would be in place.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Environment – general	The current countryside is just fine as it is.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Environment – general	No leave it as it is don't destroy it any further what you have there now is bad but this would be much worse Do you feel that just planting a few trees removes the awful damage you will have created it smacks of virtue signalling	2E/2F		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during the operation of the Scheme are described in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAP-5	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Too many trees will be lost as well as an increase in noise and air pollution	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's concerns. With regards to the concern raised over the loss of trees as a result of the Scheme, the retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to the concerns of an increase in noise pollution as a result of the Scheme, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice.</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document LA 105 - Air quality</i>. The chapter confirms that the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are also not predicted to be significant.</p> <p>Further to this, during operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area, and changes in air quality are concluded to be not significant. The maximum modelled concentration for NO<sub>2</sub> in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 31.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>. The maximum modelled concentration for PM<sub>10</sub> in the base year of the Scheme is predicted to be 28.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>. Although PM<sub>2.5</sub> was not modelled in the air quality assessment (as detailed in Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>), when considering the maximum modelled road contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> in the base year of 4.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded. Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction and during operation of the Scheme are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Environment – general	Scheme needs to have positive impact on the wider environment to North of Newark.	2C	N	<p>With regard to the environment to the north of Newark-on-Trent, floodplain compensation areas would be provided at Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Farndon East and West floodplain compensation areas would provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main habitats within Farndon West would include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. The Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> show all land that would need acquiring and managing for the development of the Scheme. Discussions are ongoing with the respective landowner to agree a strategy for long-term management of the Farndon East floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>At Cattle Market, the Scheme would provide planting of a linear belt of trees and shrubs to the south-east and south-west to aid screening of the junction. Species rich grassland would also be provided mitigate for loss of lowland meadow priority habitat here.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during the operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Environment – general	Road improvements tend to generate more traffic, resulting in more pollution and displacing congestion rather than relieving it. Your scheme will not benefit the environment and is redolent of the 1960s mindset that all we need to do is build more and more roads.	2C	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> sets out the key national, regional and local benefits of the Scheme and describes how the A46 is part of England's strategic road network. The majority of the existing route is built to dual carriageway standard between Leicester and Lincoln, with the exception being the single carriageway section around Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The existing A46 at Newark-on-Trent currently has the worst performance of any section of the A46 between Leicester and Lincoln and congestion issues negatively impact upon the wider Newark-on-Trent area.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, which accompanies</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (TR010065/APP/7.1), the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4). The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1).</p>
ANON-559H-RW8F-J	Environment – general	If anything the long term overall environmental impact will be reduced by an upgrade.	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Environment – general	It appears that the current environmental suggestions are fair as long as they are fully implemented and are not watered down if funding becomes an issue.	2C	N	<p>Environmental proposals to mitigate the Scheme are a commitment within the development consent application and will be a requirement if a Development Consent Order is granted. The enforcement regime for Development Consent Orders is set out in the Planning Act 2008. The mitigation measures would therefore have to be implemented to ensure the Scheme complies with the Development Consent Order and the Planning Act 2008. Budget for the implementation of landscape works and environmental mitigation is included within the overall Scheme budget. Further information relating to the Scheme's budget is detailed with the Funding Statement (TR010065/APP/4.2).</p> <p>Environmental mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during the operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (TR010065/APP/3.1).</p>
BHLF-559H-RW71-V	Environment – general	The rigorous analysis of the surrounding environment, both living creatures and growing, is impressive. We had not expected this. As members of the green party we are delighted to know about everything you have taken into consideration.	2C	N	This comment is acknowledged by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RW9F-K	Environment – general	we are very concerned about the environmental effects during the operational stage.	2D	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required during operation are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Environment – general	I think any environmental damage is going to be devastating and will take years to reset and bring back.	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the environmental design proposals for the Scheme, including locations of the proposed mitigation. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, as well as during the operation of the Scheme are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>A commitment would be made to ensure the successful establishment of the environmental mitigation via the Development Consent Order to ensure that planting matures to meet its intended function.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Environment – general	Environmental impacts are likely to be severe and there is very little detail on how this will be mitigated, other than general assurances.	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. Consultation responses and subsequent surveys have informed the iterative design process. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, as well as during the operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	Environment - general	All new roads will have an impact on the environment, but this is balanced by the effect of the standing traffic that is presently in place.	2C	N	When the Scheme is introduced, delays are forecast to be reduced and journey times improved, demonstrating the benefits of the Scheme, as detailed within the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ). Further information relating to traffic modelling is within the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Environment – general	I think the fact of using a flyover will deter travelling through the town centre, thus, by default would minimise environmental risk.	2D	N	The traffic modelling forecasts that by adding grade separation to the Cattle Market Junction, congestion and traffic flow would improve. Congestion in the town centre would reduce as more traffic would stay on the A46 carriageway. Further information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Environment – general	It is disingenuous to propose a highway project, ignore the CO2 emissions from increased traffic, and then seek small environmental improvements, such as habitat creation etc. The main environmental problems are overlooked - this is greenwashing.	2E/2F	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). As per National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraph 5.17 and the requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 114 - Climate, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes no likely significant effect. As the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) reports a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. No significant effects on climate are anticipated. The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the greenhouse gas emissions as outlined above. However, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant (less than 0.007%) and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Environment – general	The environmental impact is being massively down-played and the tiny benefit of maybe a few minutes faster journey on the A46 massively over promoted.	2H	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The Applicant has worked with stakeholders to develop environmental proposals that protect and enhance the local environment, details of which can be found within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the Strategic Road Network. The Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWMH-9	Environment – general	Can any redundant highways be dug up and returned to countryside?	2B	N	The redundant section of the A1133 at Winthorpe would be removed and landscaped. Other smaller areas are also removed and included as part of the landscape provisions. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Environment – general	All the space that you want to destroy is valuable	2E/2F	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>An assessment of all statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors is presented in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The Scheme design has sought to avoid or reduce impacts on any designations as far as possible.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>As detailed in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, the mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects would also be provided e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBZ-G	Environment – general	The planet is dying, we've given up so its all irrelevant.	2C	N	<p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> which sets out the need and economic case for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison).</p> <p>In accordance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraph 5.17 and the requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document LA 114 - <i>Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes no likely significant effect. The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i> states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, sets out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO <sub>2</sub> e, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO <sub>2</sub> e). This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.
ANON-559H-RWSN-N	Environment – general	I don't care. Maybe get some better EV charging facilities if we are worried about the enviroment.	2C	N	The Applicant acknowledges the suggestion with regard to electric vehicle charging facilities. This type of facility is not included within the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ) which sets out the need for the Scheme. The provision of electric vehicle charging points would not in itself achieve the Scheme objectives of improving safety, reducing congestion and accommodating economic growth whilst delivering better environmental outcomes.
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Environment – general	<p>The road which goes towards Gainsborough from the Winthorpe roundabout, and which then passes the entrance road to the village, has woodland planting shown part way along the Lincoln side. This to extend for some distance towards Gainsborough.</p> <p>It would be more effective in reducing noise pollution to the village, if it were planted on the Newark/Winthorpe side of the road instead.</p>	2E/2F	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. These would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening. These measures can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds would be provided where necessary to avoid any likely significant effects.</p> <p>Additional planting has been provided since the statutory consultation was undertaken. Planting would be provided either side of the A1133. On the right-side, linear trees and shrubs would be provided and on the left side, hedgerows with trees would be provided to form the field boundary. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ). A commitment would be made to ensure the successful establishment of environmental mitigation via the Development Consent Order to ensure that planting matures to meet its intended function. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWNY-U	Environment – general	Farndon roundabout, In the triangle of land between the Present A46 and the old Fosse road , This land is liable to flood at times but could be planted with the correct native trees and with the dyke already in place would create a Habitat for wild life plus would decrease noise pollution and air pollution by capturing the particles. If this Habitat was extended from Farndon Roundabout to the New proposed roundabout for the southern relief road it would mitigate some of the problems.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestions with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the field between Fosse Road and the A46 has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWGR-D	Environment – general	The triangle of land between A46 and Fosse Road just before Farndon roundabout. Currently looks very bare and unfinished after the previous A46 dualling approaching teh roundabout.	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RW36-W	Environment – general	Between the old A46 (Fosse Road) and Farndon Main Road: Cleared area of old woodland for development but not been used. So habitat has been lost, for no purpose. Could be developed for future habitat / environmental improvement.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWB9-F	Environment – general	planting trees or whatever in the field between the Fosse Road, Farndon and the existing dual carriageway to reduce noise.	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RWXZ-6	Environment – general	Plant trees the full length of the proposed new roadway.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestions with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ).  Planting of trees and shrubs would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. Additional planting would include areas of woodland planting, hedgerows and grassland. Some mature tree planting would be considered however, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting and is more likely to establish more successfully than mature planting. It can also grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable. As such, the vast majority of planting would be young stock.  The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b> ).
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Environment – general	Planting of mature trees along the whole route.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Environment – general	All along the route.	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RWAK-Z	Environment – general	I am unaware but tree planting is very important around to complete road layout and elsewhere.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RW7R-W	Environment – general	Sustrans track, Farndon marina, Scone Park , Balderton Lake	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWSC-A	Environment – general	Balderton lake	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RWFP-A	Environment – general	Fernwood – open spaces	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWBZ-G	Environment – general	Anywhere there is free space.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestions with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b> ) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Environment – general	The area between the A46 and Winthorpe leading from the Winthorpe roundabout towards the A1.	2E/2F	N	<p>Additional planting has been provided since the statutory consultation and planting would now be provided in the locations suggested by the Consultees including either side of the A1133 alongside the A46 between Winthorpe Roundabout and the A1 and to the south of Winthorpe between the Scheme and Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme this would vary in form to include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Environment – general	Tree planting Rather than just grassland alongside A1 east side between A46 and Trent Valley way (to reduce noise impact on southern part of Winthorpe village from the new bridge over the A1)	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Environment – general	As above, also a small field at the bottom of Winthorpe Road next to the underpass could be developed, its currently just left to over grow and it part of land owned by highways.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	Environment – general	Fields between the new scheme and Winthorpe.	2E/2F		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Noise levels with/without the Scheme in operation and the associated noise level changes (short and long-term) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWEC-V	Environment – general	Plenty of scope- the north side of the river is largely free from urbanisation.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestions with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested locations have not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening. The Applicant would provide groups of individual trees alongside the River Trent at the Farndon East and Farndon West floodplain compensation areas along with wetland habitat. Tree planting would also be provided at Nether Lock Viaduct.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Environment – general	Yes, support the River Devon and River Trent with environmentally friendly habitat creation AND woodland and river planting.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RW8Y-5	Environment – general	Along river Devon and Devon park	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RW9S-Z	Environment – general	All along the route around the river	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWMW-R	Environment – general	lots of spare unused space around Newark show ground; break up the old runway for hardcore and replace with tree and wildlife habitat. if not there then the old RAF Swinderby base at Witham-st-hughes along the A46 towards Lincoln, would be great to create a country park there.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestions with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested locations have not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7M-R	Environment – general	Newark Showground	2E/2F	N	
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Environment – general	To be noted grass airfields [redacted] of this nature provide brilliant opportunities for local wildlife especially in this case with the proximity to the river Trent. So its preservation as outlined in section 2g will have this added benefit.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWBW-D	Environment – general	The area around clay lane between barnby gate in Newark and the A1 that cut through the bridal way. Several fields in this location have been set aside for tens of years and trees and hedgerows have already begun to overtake this area naturally making this area a popular route for foot traffic into town away from roads and local residents use it for dog walking. Town council have been attempting to purchase this land so assistance and future woodland planting would really compliment the process already naturally occurring and further improve local wildlife.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSF-D	Environment – general	Plant trees on the flood plains	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> with a mitigation scheme to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>Sites used for flood mitigation need to have particular ground elevations, which a site next to Cattle Market Roundabout (the Old Council Yard) would not be able to fully accommodate. Utilising brownfield sites for flood mitigation purposes would remove the potential of these sites for development and would often require significant remediation work to make suitable.</p> <p>Farndon West floodplain compensation area would provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main habitats within Farndon West would include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification surveys carried out in 2021 and 2023 have identified that the Scheme alignment including the Farndon East and West floodplain compensation area predominantly comprises non-best and most versatile land, including Grade 3b (74.2 ha, 49.6% of the area) and Grade 4 (57.5 ha, 38.4% of the area). Agricultural Land Classification is graded from 1 to 5, with Grade 1 being excellent quality agricultural land, Grade 2 very good, Grade 3a good, Grade 3b moderate, Grade 4 poor and Grade 5 being very poor quality agricultural land. The best and most versatile agricultural land is defined as land which falls in Agricultural Land Classification grades 1 to 3a. Therefore, the majority of agricultural land impacted by the Scheme would be of lower quality. Further information on this can be found in Appendix 9.3 (Agricultural Land Classification Report) in the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Environment – general	Low quality agricultural land that is prone to flooding close to the trent could be evaluated for re-wilding, creation of wetlands or woodland as appropriate.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Environment – general	Plenty of fields, some in apparent poor condition alongside route. Old Council Yard, once scheme completed, could be excavated to create a small area of ecological improvement and flood alleviation.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	Environment – general	I'd suggest on the flood plains adjacent.	2E/2F		
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Environment – general	<p>Between the bypass and the B6166, there is unused land which could be used for environmental enhancements and reduce multiple negative aspects of the bypass, such as noise and pollution:</p> <p>Coordinates: 53.087486, -0.803692</p>	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
		This land is currently unused and is in an optimal position to be utilised for environmental enhancement that would positively impact the surrounding area and help offset the impact of the bypass.			Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Environment – general	<p>The triangle of land shown on plan in question 2d (image in Freepost RF93) The land is currently designated as a 'scrapyard' but is not being used as such at present due to the operator losing their licence. A private fishing business is currently operating along the bank of the river.</p> <p>The land is owned by a [redacted], who also operates the fishing business and previously operated the scrap yard. Some of the site is shown as being within the floodplain. [Redacted] may be open to...</p> <p>a) the site being excavated to provide material for new embankments- creating a possible fishing lake(s). b) a large-scale planting scheme c) your use of the site as a compound during the construction phase in exchange for rent and or works to improve the site d) none of the above has been raised with [redacted] but local residents would welcome any improvements to existing environment.</p>	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment relating to the fishing business operating along the bank of the river. The Applicant has engaged with all fishing organisations along the River Trent that are impacted by the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the suggestions with regards to the triangle of land currently designated as a scrap yard. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Temporary works would take place near to this area for construction access purposes related to the Nether Lock, details of which can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWT9-1	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Biodiversity	more trees along Nawton road. This would decrease noise, improve air quality, provide habitats and stop people parking on the pavement grass patches which ruins the soil/ grass and makes it difficult to see when getting out of driveway.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant has been unable to identify Nawton Road and considers the location being referenced to be Hawton Road. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested locations have not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Road layout; Landscape and visual effects	In addition to these in 2d. Extend thoroughfare lane and plant trees and hedges on either side. Create a habitat rich lane to the school.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion to undertake planting to the north-east of Winthorpe. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Environment – general	Any green space in the Town needs to be preserved at all costs.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes that the response refers to the town of Newark-on-Trent and can advise that the environmental design has been evolved since statutory consultation. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Greenspace within the town itself would not be affected by the proposals. Where vegetation is removed to

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					accommodate the Scheme, replacement planting would be provided along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting.
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Environment – general	I don't know whether land is available or not, because I am not informed of land ownership in the area, but Winthorpe village needs protective planting - as much as possible.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant can advise that the environmental design has evolved since statutory consultation and now includes the provision of planting on the southern side of the A1133 as well as alongside the A46 to south of Winthorpe.  Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Environment – general	Behind beacon heights estate there is lots of land already which could accommodate more trees. We all go for walks in this area which is lovely and the insertion of more trees would hopefully make this a more protected area from over development of potential new build houses! The views are amazing and it is so peaceful, enhancing this area with natural beauty would be fabulous.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion to undertake planting at the suggested location. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.  The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Environment – general	All arable fields abutting the development could with the owners permission benefit from more tree planting.	2E/2F	N	Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Some areas of arable farmland adjacent to the scheme footprint would become key areas of environmental mitigation, with planting of trees, shrubs and grassland as well as areas of wetland, marsh grassland and lakes.
BHLF-559H-RWWX-3	Environment – general	Many small paddocks near the bypass - go look.	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RWAU-A	Environment – general	There is an arm of land at the junction of Crees Lane that is allocated as an Open breck arm in the local plan. This arm will be an ideal place to create a woodland plantation and other habitat creation to support the wildlife clusters by the widening project.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to Farndon Open Break being a location that could be used for environmental enhancement. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.  Replacement planting for existing vegetation lost due to construction between Crees Lane and Farndon Roundabout would be provided as well as additional tree planting to the north-west of Farndon Roundabout.  The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .  The Applicant notes the offer from the Farndon Residents Environment Group and has contacted them to discuss how the Scheme could potentially work with them going forward.
ANON-559H-RWQK-G	Environment – general	Farndon green breaks could take more planting of woodland to reduce noise. I am a founder member of FREG (Farndon Residents Environment Group). If you were willing to fund the trees, we would plant and maintain the new woodlands. Contact me [redacted] if you wish to know more about us and our capability. Or review <a href="https://freg.chessck.co.uk/">https://freg.chessck.co.uk/</a>	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RW3E-C	Environment – general	All land from A617 towards Kelham (Solar farm site) could this be land be a nature reserve.	2E/2F	N	It is anticipated that the developer of the solar panel farm proposals would be required to provide suitable planting as part of their development. For the Scheme, a floodplain compensation area would be provided at Kelham and Averham and land would be returned to arable use in agreement with the landowner, whilst hedgerows would be provided along the field boundaries of the floodplain compensation area. Species rich grassland would also be provided for the ditch connecting the north and south floodplain compensation area at

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Kelham and Averham. Further information with regards to the landscape proposals is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Environment – general	Notts County Council yard has been left vacant for a number of years.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion to utilise Nottinghamshire County Council's vacant depot site. This area of land would be the main construction compound during construction of the Scheme, housing the main offices and storage areas. This information is detailed further in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and is also shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. When the Scheme is completed, it would be handed back to Nottinghamshire County Council, who own the land.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Climate; Road drainage and the water environment	A cycle path alongside the A617 separated from the road by a row of trees would make a much better option for walking and cycling and the trees would buffer noise and pollution improving the experience and helping reduce climate change whilst also providing a safety barrier. The scheme should be extended to include this. Maybe alongside other roads too. Trees would also help flooding.	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the Consultee. One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity which improves facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Improvements along the A617 would require additional land acquisition and the removal of vegetation. Surveys undertaken as part of Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> demonstrated that the usage was low and the cost and environmental impact could not be justified. Further information regarding this can also be found within Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Improvements along the A617 would need to be considered by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Scheme is unable to justify making changes to the route as it has no impact or connection with it. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by pedestrians and cyclists. The objective of this is to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network. More information can be found within the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW71-V	Environment – general	Between Winthorpe and Collingham is a nature reserve - Longford Lionfields. This is managed by the RSPB and was once gravel pits. Gravel is being constantly dug out of the ground in this area by TARMAC and the pits are then left to be turned into nature reserves. The RSPB has done an amazing job at Longford Lionfeilds and they are extending into new areas where there are just trees.	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. Langford Lowfields is approximately 3km from the Scheme Order Limits and has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWE6-F	Environment – general	Plenty of unused land around the back of the sugar factory	2E/2F	N	The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.  The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> . Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Environment – general	The fields on the North side of the cattle marked roundabout could be rewilded.	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RW35-V	Environment – general	Close to Farndon end possibility of planting / creation of wildlife habitats - caring for birds / mammals / insects	2E/2F	N	The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .  Farndon East and Farndon West would be provided as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.  The Applicant received a response and approached the group mentioned by the Consultee (as can be seen under reference ANON-559H-RWQK-G) and will continue to engage with the group where necessary as the Scheme develops.
BHLF-559H-RWW1-V	Environment – general	Farndon environmental group would be able to help identify areas locally (they have done much to enhance the Farndon area)	2E/2F		
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Biodiversity	I have serious concerns about the effect on biodiversity concerns if the proposals are implemented as they stand.	N/A	N	The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> also summarises the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible. Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible has been a key principle within the design from the outset. Where impacts cannot be avoided then mitigation measures would be in place. Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Cultural heritage	Complete disregard of Conservation areas.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment and advises that measures have been adopted through design and mitigation to limit the potential for adverse effects from the construction and operation of the Scheme. Consideration for the impacts of the Scheme on conservation areas is given in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Five conservation areas were assessed and Winthorpe Conservation Area is the only one predicted to be significantly affected by the Scheme.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>As reported in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> the setting of Winthorpe Conservation Area is one of rural, agricultural countryside, bounded by modern road networks to the south and west.</p> <p>The Scheme is expected to yield negligible change in noise at Winthorpe Conservation Area. In general, this is because the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and the traffic on this road has been predicted to have negligible change. Furthermore, the A46, despite being closer than its current position, is mitigated by a low noise running surface and noise barriers. The new A46 earthworks also block noise from the A1.</p> <p>The addition of the A1/A46 Crossing and alterations to the road between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts would only directly impact part of the conservation area and part of its setting, and therefore would not amount to substantial harm. However, it is acknowledged that views of the bridge and additional noise impacts would result in a temporary moderate adverse impact on the conservation area during construction. In addition, there would be a permanent slight adverse effect as a result of construction where views towards the A1 are more noticeable than elsewhere in the conservation area, when accounting for mitigation. Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. Any views of the new bridge should be reduced to glimpse views.</p> <p>Noise bunds along the Scheme would also mitigate against noise impacts to the south, and additional planting here would soften the visual impact of these bunds. Mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>With mitigation in place, it is considered that the impact on the conservation areas would be reduced to moderate or slight. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The provision of noise bunds is committed to in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment would be managed and monitored.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Traffic forecasts; Noise and vibration; Cultural heritage	Your scheme will cause EXTRA traffic especially HGV vehicles, noise pollution and vibration to me and my property. It is Grade II listed so we cannot have double glazing. The roads are not designed for the heavy traffic which causes manhole covers to be repaired on regular basis.	2H	N	<p>The Applicant can advise that the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate the impacts of noise and vibration from the construction and operation of the Scheme. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. This includes but is not limited to noise management, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and long-term noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. With regard to the Consultee's noise concerns, noise assessments have not indicated an impact on the property referred to in the Consultee's response, over and above the baseline assessment to such a degree that a significant impact was identified.</p> <p>When the Scheme is introduced, journey times are forecast to improve as outlined in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, demonstrating the benefits of the Scheme. There would be less through traffic on local roads in Newark-on-Trent, including a decrease in HGVs.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Air quality	I am very disappointed nothing has been done to improve conditions on the roads leading onto the A46. We already have high pollution in Kelham and Averham due to excess traffic and vehicles stopping or slowing for the bridge and the 2 sets of traffic lights near Averham.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's concerns relating to the current conditions of the roads leading to the A46. With regard to the pollution, assessments have been carried out which are presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area (including those in Kelham and Averham) and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant. In addition to this, the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N):	The Applicant's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
					included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Landscape and visual effects; A1/A46 Crossing	We note existing vegetation to the back of the Robert Dukeson Avenue, Haliwell Close along the A46 is now all remaining. This acts as a shield from existing road noise and can only help soak up road pollution, we would also like to mention the existing trees along the pathway to the current A46 underpass at the bottom of Winthorpe Road. These whilst possibly requiring some maintenance are crucial to prevent the new A1 flyover coming into view from the properties in this area for most of the year. We are aware they are inhabited by bats, having seen them from our garden, so need to be looked after by experts please.	2B	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible, albeit vegetation clearance on the southern end of Winthorpe Road and the Brownhills Underbridge would be required to accommodate the Scheme. New and replacement planting would be provided in order to reduce adverse visual effects associated with the Scheme. This includes planting of trees and shrubs along earthworks adjacent to the newly realigned A46 to aid landscape integration, and over time provide screening of the Scheme from local receptors.</p> <p>The existing A46 carriageway from Brownhills Roundabout would become the new south bound entry road onto the dualled A46. All vegetation along the existing bund to the south of the carriageway would be retained, including that along the pathway down to the existing underpass beneath the existing A46 in order to provide the same level of screening as at present. There would also be areas of new planting remnant to the new A46 embankments which would help screen aspects of the Scheme design.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. Appendix 8.3 (Bat Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the bat surveys undertaken for the Scheme. The surveys include the location raised by the Consultee.</p> <p>In summary, nine confirmed bat roosts have been recorded within the survey area to date, consisting of four trees and five buildings. Categorisation of the rarity of bat species present within the survey area is with reference to <i>Wray et al. (2010) CIEEM's In Practice: Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment</i>. All confirmed roosts in buildings and one confirmed roost in a single tree are of 'common' bat species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat). A Daubenton's bat maternity roost (at least 20 individual bats recorded) and a single unidentified bat (day roost) were recorded in two separate trees outside of the Order Limits in the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas survey area. One Noctule day roost was identified in the fourth tree located east of the A1 southbound carriageway.</p> <p>The A1 and trees along its embankment are likely to screen this bat tree roost from the A1 grade separation to a large extent, with mitigation further reducing impacts from disturbance during construction (detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>). The Noctule and Daubenton's bat are considered 'rarer' species. One of the buildings to be demolished to facilitate the Scheme comprises a daytime roost for an individual soprano pipistrelle. An application for a bat mitigation licence will be submitted to Natural England for the destruction of this roost. The impact assessment, including mitigation, is detailed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme on foraging, commuting and migration routes of wildlife recorded in the area. The chapter details appropriate and proportional mitigation informed by robust survey data and desk study records, and an assessment of likely significant effects.</p>

N.4.D: Overall scheme

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNJ-C	Overall scheme	I agree that there is a build-up of traffic on this section, causing delays and local traffic pollution and noise. However, I am concerned that the drawbacks outweigh the benefits and would like to see future planning involving moving freight onto railways and reducing the number of cars on the road.	2B	N	<p>Whilst the A46 carries a lot of HGV traffic (predicted to be around 13% in the year the Scheme is open to traffic), the majority of road traffic is made up from other vehicle types. Even if HGVs were to be removed, without the Scheme this section of the A46 would still experience delays.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>An Alternative Modes Assessment was carried out which suggested that the existing public transport network does not generally offer comparable alternatives to cars for most movements. Small traffic flows were distributed over a large area and therefore are not suited to be catered for by public transport.</p> <p>Therefore, a review of the largest public transport flows (represented by local bus services) suggested that there was no obvious non-highways intervention that could cater to any substantial proportion of these flows. Possible solutions for the Scheme were identified by the Applicant through collating evidence relating to network performance issues and engaging with local stakeholders.</p> <p>From this, the Applicant recommended dualling and bypass solutions which fed into Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> and National Highways' <i>Delivery Plan 2022 to 2025</i>. Further information on the Assessment of Alternatives is provided within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Overall scheme	New roads induce demand for yet more road capacity and lead to more traffic congestion and climate change (CPRE The End of the Road?). The PEIR states it is being designed to serve a trade corridor for port traffic to bypass Newark. Congestion on the A46 should be managed by demand managed and port traffic should be transferred by rail or short seas shipping.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Overall scheme	We should be moving freight onto railways instead of building roads.	2C		
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Overall scheme	Stop the scheme and use the money to upgrade rail links to improve the flow of freight in the cheapest and most environmentally friendly way.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Overall scheme	The scheme should be cancelled and rail links should be upgraded to move freight in a more environmentally way.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Overall scheme	I believe the £38 Billion road building programme of which the Newark Bypass is a part is a huge strategic mistake. The decision to build the road is predicated on increases in traffic and the continuance of an unsustainable model of individual car ownership. The science is clear on the threats posed by the climate and ecological emergency (the UN recently stated that we have a rapidly narrowing window to secure a liveable future). The design brief recognised that the project will result in "net environmental loss" and the carbon footprint will be enormous. In my view, major investment should centre on alternative ways of reducing congestion such as shifting investment to public transport, improving the existing rail network, making walking and cycling locally safe and easy, building 15 minute communities. I am saddened by the huge resource consumption, the impact on the environment and biodiversity and the damage that will be done to health and well being of local residents by the wrong project at include the wrong time.	2B	N	<p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport. In addition, National Highways' <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that '<i>net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset</i>' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives, need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Safety</b> - Improve safety through the Scheme design to reduce collisions for all users of the A46 Scheme</li> <li>• <b>Congestion</b> - Improve journey time and journey time reliability along the A46 and its junctions between Farndon and Winthorpe, including all approaches and A1 slip roads</li> <li>• <b>Connectivity</b> - Accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent and the wider area by improving its strategic and local connectivity</li> <li>• <b>Environment</b> - Deliver better environmental outcomes by achieving a net gain in biodiversity and improve noise levels at noise important areas along the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Overall scheme	The A46 Newark Bypass is not required, similar to most of the highway projects in the current highways programme. The £27 billion fund could be spent on tram projects, bus improvements and cycle networks – this would have a much improved impact on climate change and wider public policy goals. This highway proposal and the wider highways programme need a full assessment against environmental and social policy goals.	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Customer</b> - Build an inclusive Scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (National Policy Statement for National Networks) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p> <p>The Scheme has aligned with the National Highways <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i>. A 44% reduction has been achieved as reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.</p> <p>The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080</i> best practice which is the global standard for managing infrastructure carbon, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the need to build an asset, opportunities to build less, use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. This includes consideration of other corridors or alignments.</p> <p>Buses would benefit from these highway improvements and be able to deliver more efficient and reliable services on both the strategic and local road network. For example, the traffic modelling predicts that there would be less through traffic in the centre of Newark-on-Trent and also predicts reduced journey times on the A46, both helping to improve bus journeys.</p> <p>The A46 is a strategic route, and as such, one of the aims is to improve journey times. This includes focusing on trips that would be hard to undertake using active travel methods such as walking and cycling.</p> <p>However, in the Scheme's design, there are considerations for Public Rights of Way. This includes plans to develop new crossings and divert any crossings deemed unsafe across the A46 to provide a safer route to cross the highway.</p> <p>Further information regarding these can be found in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation, and physical activity. No significant effects have on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Overall scheme	5. The ROI on this stretch of the A46 – over the last two weeks we have used the A46 extensively to travel to visit family in the Cotswolds, Bristol and Somerset and would suggest that there maybe other parts of the Country that need investment more than a bypass in Newark.	2B	N	In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network as a whole, including in other parts of the country. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	Overall scheme	I think a lot of money is being spent, when I believe if the bigger picture was taken into consideration ie A1 & A46 there might have been a better way to spend the money.	2H	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme would also result in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Overall scheme	I dont see how it can have any benefits whatsoever it will just accomodate more traffic and more air pollution and destroy habitat for local wild life the only people I can see who will benefit from this are the construction teams you pay for the work plus all the numerous teams involved in ite planning. I would rather you spend the money on improving public transport throughout the area.	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that there will be an increase in traffic using the dual carriageway. However, when the Scheme is opened, journey times along the A46 are forecast to improve as outlined in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>A key benefit of reduced congestion would be improved journey time reliability and resilience. Improved safety is another benefit of the Scheme. The Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> sets out the record of collisions for the past five years and provides a forecast of accidents with the Scheme in place. Chapter 4 (Transport Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> also provides an overview of the road safety benefits including accident analysis and expected level of savings.</p> <p>Widening the A46 to a dual carriageway would provide opportunities for safer overtaking, and junction improvements will reduce congestion. Improved facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable road users would provide additional benefits.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> which contains information about the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highway projects on air quality.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> of 200 and 1,000 respectively.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust will be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant. The modelled results for NO<sub>2</sub> also indicate that the Scheme will have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest. The Scheme would therefore help contribute to exposure reduction. Air quality impacts associated with the Scheme were also assessed at Local Wildlife Sites (and other ecological designated sites: Ramsar sites, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, local nature reserves, nature improvement areas, ancient woodlands and veteran trees). Following consultation with the Scheme's biodiversity consultant, the residual effects are concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction, including on access to services health and social care; and access to green space and recreation.</p> <p>As part of the proposals, new 3m wide walking and cycling routes would be provided throughout the Scheme. A circular route would be created between Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer roundabouts, providing enhanced connectivity to the existing service stations, Newark Showground and beyond. The north-south severance would be minimised where possible, with new signalised crossings provided at junctions. Further details can be found within the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>An Alternative Modes Assessment was carried out by the Applicant for the Scheme, which suggested that the existing public transport network does not generally offer comparable alternatives to cars for most movements. Small traffic flows were distributed over a large area and therefore are not suited to be catered for by public transport.</p> <p>Therefore, a review of the largest public transport flows (represented by local bus services) suggested that there was no obvious non-highways intervention that could cater to any substantial proportion of these flows. Possible solutions for the Scheme were identified by the Applicant through collating evidence relating to network performance issues and engaging with local stakeholders.</p> <p>From this, the Applicant recommended dualling and bypass solutions which fed into Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> and National Highways' <i>Delivery Plan 2022 to 2025</i>. Further information on the Assessment of Alternatives is provided within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Buses would benefit from these highway improvements and be able to deliver more efficient and reliable services on both the strategic and local road network. For example, the traffic modelling predicts that there would be less through traffic in the centre of Newark-on-Trent and also predicts reduced journey times on the A46, both helping to improve bus journeys.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					The A46 is a strategic route, and as such, one of the aims is to improve journey times. This includes focusing on trips that would be hard to undertake using active travel.
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Overall scheme	I think I covered it all just get legislation to get unnecessary private car transport or just put mor tax on fuel	2H	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The Department for Transport is responsible for developing and implementing transport legislation across all transport modes.
ANON-559H-RWEE-X	Overall scheme	The money would be better spent on improving the condition of local roads, road safety schemes and more cycle routes.	2H	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Improving the conditions of the local road network is outside the scope of the Scheme and is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council, as the local highways authority. The local road network would benefit from improved journey times at all junctions on the Scheme whether joining the A46 or crossing it.</p> <p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to improve safety by reducing collisions for all users of the Scheme. The Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) sets out the record of collisions for the past five years and provides a forecast of accidents with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>As part of the Scheme, the following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall walking and cycling connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market, the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provision. Information relating to the ongoing engagement carried out by the Applicant is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW8V-2	Overall scheme	I don't have a very strong opinion either way. I also find it a bit confusing because I don't drive.	2B	N	The Scheme would also provide enhanced walking and cycling routes. These are particularly around Winthorpe and the Great North Road at Cattle Market. Details of the Scheme's walking and cycling routes can be found in the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b> ) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans ( <b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Overall scheme	You will probably be aware of plans to build greater road capacity in the Newport area of Wales, which were withdrawn a couple of years ago in favour of other solutions. Follow the Welsh example and build something for the future, not the past.	2I	N	<p>In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>Congestion on the single carriageway section of the A46 means that journeys are currently unreliable and have excessive travel times. Modelling shows that these travel times would only increase further as more people are expected to use the road in the future. Further</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>information on the traffic modelling undertaken can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also sets out the record of collisions for the past five years and provides a forecast of accidents with the Scheme in place. Widening the A46 to a dual carriageway would provide opportunities for safer overtaking, and junction improvements would reduce congestion. Improved facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable road users would provide additional benefits.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In line with the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>, traffic flows have been forecast up to 2061. This modelling forecasts that the A46 is not predicted to be over capacity within these timescales if the Scheme is implemented. Further information is set out within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Overall scheme	The proposed highway widening will lead to more traffic and CO2 emissions – it is the opposite to what is needed for climate change and sustainable transport objectives. The Newark area does not need more highways and dispersed new housing developments – the area is already highly dependent on the car for travel. The £500m could be much better spent on improved public transport and a cycle network.	2B	N	<p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents, such as the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, the need for the Scheme how it complies with national and local policy.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAD-S	Overall scheme	<p>I strongly oppose the A46 Newark Bypass project.</p> <p>There is no need for this scheme. New roads induce demand for yet more road capacity and lead to more traffic congestion and climate change (CPRE The End of the Road?).</p>	N/A		<p>Under the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Applicant is required to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p> <p>The project has aligned with the National Highways <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i>. A 44% reduction has been achieved as reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.</p> <p>The carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080</i> best practice which is the global standard for managing infrastructure carbon, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the need to build an asset, opportunities to build less, use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. This includes consideration of other corridors or alignments.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken as part of the Scheme accounts for induced traffic demand. Traffic modelling has been carried out to predict the likely growth of traffic and analyse the effects of the Scheme. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, predicts an increase of traffic on the A46. In a Do Minimum scenario, the Transport Assessment concludes that the higher demand would result in long queues forming. The design of the Scheme would improve traffic flow through the road network and assist with the higher demand originating from the increase of traffic on the A46.</p> <p>The Scheme would deliver economic benefits as detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would also improve safety by reducing accidents on this section of the A46. Information relating to the previous year's accidents including previous accident figures as well as the forecasted reduction in slight, serious and fatal casualties is also included within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including and increased accessibility via the new</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> also sets out the record of collisions for the past five years and provides a forecast of accidents with the Scheme in place. Widening the A46 to a dual carriageway would provide opportunities for safer overtaking, and junction improvements would reduce congestion. Improved facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable road users would provide additional benefits.</p> <p>Buses would benefit from these highway improvements and be able to deliver more efficient and reliable services on both the strategic and local road network. For example, the traffic modelling predicts that there would be less through traffic in the centre of Newark-on-Trent and also predicts reduced journey times on the A46, both helping to improve bus journeys.</p> <p>The A46 is a strategic route, and as such, one of the aims is to improve journey times. This includes focusing on trips that would be hard to undertake using active travel methods such as walking and cycling. However, in the Scheme's design there are considerations for Public Rights of Way. This includes plans to develop new crossings and divert any crossings deemed unsafe across the A46 to provide a safer route to cross the highway. Further information regarding these can be found in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The following improvements have been made, which aim to improve overall walking and cycling connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market, the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route will continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement carried out by the Applicant is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7K-P	Overall scheme	<p>I have read that Newark council do not support the dualling of the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe.</p> <p>We also agree that there is no benefit to local businesses and local people.</p>	2B	N	<p>Further to the statutory consultation response from Newark Town Council objecting to the Scheme, the Applicant attended a Newark Town Council Planning Committee meeting on 2 February 2023 to present the Scheme design and clarify Scheme objectives and benefits.</p> <p>In March 2023, the Newark Town Council Planning Committee approved a motion proposed by members to support the Scheme proposals. Engagement with Newark Town Council is</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>detailed within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would fulfil the economic objective of sustainable development by increasing capacity and reducing congestion on the strategic road network. This could help to facilitate the growth of a number of economic sectors, such as food and logistics, which are reliant on journey time reliability.</p> <p>As detailed within Chapter 3 (The Need for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme would help to unlock employment growth within Newark by facilitating the delivery of regional and local business developments. For example, the Newark Business Park concentrates a significant part of Newark's growth but is currently limited in its development by the lack of capacity at Brownhills Roundabout, as set out in the <i>Newark and Sherwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017)</i>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFU-F	Overall scheme	<p>The scheme will not support Newark town's traffic problems. It will be damaging to the environment. It is not needed.</p> <p>Please don't build it.</p>	2B	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy such including the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme would also result in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to traffic issues in the town of Newark-on-Trent. Although the Scheme is focused on reducing journey times along the A46, traffic modelling predicts that with the Scheme in place, there would be less through traffic in the centre of Newark-on-Trent thereby reducing journey times and improving journey time reliability.</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads. Significant decreases are predicted on roads through Newark-on-Trent, including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road. More details on the volume of flow decreases is available in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects upon various environmental topics such as air quality, noise and vibration and climate, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Table 4-1 of Chapter 4</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Overall scheme	I personally think that benefits are not been carefully weighted against cost and environmental impact. Especially regarding the latter, I cannot see it properly managed, taken into account and reported.	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>(Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> sets out the different environmental topics that have been assessed in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Overall scheme	yes I build it full stop you should be thinking less cars not more cars using the road If I lived any closer I would be incandescent at the thought of the impact near by during construction and living near it after construction think about the people would you like this on your doirstep I bet the answer is no you would all be nimbys I have no doubt of that.	2D	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Indicative key dates with respect for the construction programme are set out in Table 2-3 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Impacts during construction and operation on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as air quality and noise, will be managed and monitored. This includes but is not limited to dust management (such as locating stockpiles out of the wind, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and switching off vehicle engines when not in use), daily inspections to ensure dust management is effective, noise management (including temporary acoustic barriers where necessary), and general best practice construction practices. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>In addition to this, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> confirms that the impacts of emissions from construction plant, construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects. As detailed above, impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means included in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan and as such, effects are not predicted to be significant. Further to this, during operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality objectives at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Figures 11.1 (Long-term Noise Change 1-8) and 11.9 (Short-term Noise Change 1-8) in the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> show noise levels and noise level change with and without the Scheme in the short-term (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and long-term (2043, 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNA-3	Overall scheme	Don't build it.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant notes these comments. The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGY-M	Overall scheme	Not proceeding with the scheme	2D		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Overall scheme	Do not proceed with this scheme. It's madness to even consider it.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWFU-F	Overall scheme	Do not build it	2D		
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Overall scheme	Just stop this being done 'hat's the solution	2G		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Overall scheme	There is nothing that can compensate this scheme. Just don't do it.	2G		
ANON-559H-RWFU-F	Overall scheme	Do not build the road	2G		
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Overall scheme	Stop the scheme and this won't be required.	2G		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Overall scheme	Scrap this scheme.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Overall scheme	Do the right thing and don't proceed with this scheme.	2I		
ANON-559H-RW9W-4	Overall scheme	told you before dont build it full stop	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWA1-6	Overall scheme	Has a resident of Newark, i am appalled by this awful scheme.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RWQ7-V	Overall scheme	A complete waste of tax payers money	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWTE-D	Overall scheme	Waste of money!	2H		
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Overall scheme	A total waste of money, resources and time.	2H		
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Overall scheme	No benefit to Newark. Scheme designed to shorten (by approximately 10 minutes) journeys of freight traffic to Humber ports. Will attract extra traffic, potentially worsening congestion in Newark.	2H	N	<p>In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that there would be an increase in traffic using the road however when the Scheme is introduced, journey times along the A46 are forecast to improve as outlined in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> demonstrating the benefits of the Scheme.</p> <p>In line with Department for Transport modelling guidance, traffic flows have been forecast up to 2061. This modelling forecasts that the A46 is not predicted to be over capacity within these timescales if the Scheme is implemented. The traffic modelling predicts that there would be less through traffic going through the centre of Newark-on-Trent as more traffic would use the widened A46 with reduced delays along the Scheme section. In addition, the junctions along the Scheme would not be congested as they are currently, which would benefit local users gaining access to the A46 and across it.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZB-G	Overall scheme	I do not believe that this project has been designed to solve Newark's traffic problems, rather than it is being designed to serve a trade corridor for port traffic to bypass Newark. Evidence shows that new roads create new and increase traffic, induced demand. Now is not the time to be encouraging and creating more traffic like this. The project also fails to show that it offers any network resilience.	N		
ANON-559H-RWNC-5	Overall scheme	Recognise the need for improvements but this is more for through traffic on A46 and less so for residents of Winthorpe and Newark.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Overall scheme	I believe many people in Newark have been "mis-sold" the project as something that will solve Newark's traffic problems rather than as part of a national strategy to improve traffic flow to the ports on the East Coast. I believe the local people are entitled to understand the full impacts on traffic of the new roundabouts and slip roads once the increases in traffic have been brought about by the project.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWDF-X	Overall scheme	<p>The residents of Newark have lost a lot of businesses in the town in the last few years and I fail to see how this project will change that, just by making it easier for lorries to get to Hull 10 minutes faster.</p> <p>I agree with the town council who have voted against this disruption.</p>	N/A	N	<p>In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Scheme would fulfil the economic objective of sustainable development by increasing capacity and reducing congestion on the strategic road network. This could help to facilitate the growth of a number of economic sectors, such as food and logistics, which are reliant on journey time reliability.</p> <p>As detailed within Chapter 6 (Conformity with Planning Policy and Transport Plans) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), the Scheme would help to unlock employment growth within Newark-on-Trent by facilitating the delivery of regional and local business developments. For example, the Newark Business Park concentrates a significant part of Newark's growth but is currently limited in its development by the lack of capacity at Brownhills Roundabout, as set out in the <i>Newark and Sherwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017)</i>.</p> <p>Further to the statutory consultation response from Newark Town Council objecting to the Scheme, the Applicant attended a Newark Town Council Planning Committee meeting on 2 February 2023 to present the Scheme design and clarify Scheme objectives and benefits.</p> <p>In March 2023, the Newark Town Council Planning Committee approved a motion proposed by members to support the Scheme proposals. Engagement with Newark Town Council is detailed within Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW74-Y	Overall scheme	My concern is therefore that this is an expensive, highly disruptive project, which may well turn out not to deliver as much as road-users have been led to believe. I have started wondering whether the relief road from the A46 (near Farndon) to the A1 which is happening anyway, would play a role in reducing congestion in its own right. Given the extent of both cost to the public purse & disruption to residents & road users, I would prefer to see 'his can 'kicked down the road' for re-assessment after the other road link is built, operational & its effects on traffic-flow/congestion monitored.	2B	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasts that in the Do Minimum scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the section of the A46 being addressed by the Scheme. The Do Something modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Overall scheme	Has optimism bias been factored into the cost-benefit analysis?	2B	N	As the costs are derived via a comprehensive Quantitative Risk Assessment process this is considered to mitigate the factors leading to optimism bias.
BHLF-559H-RW6X-2	Overall scheme	I just think that the whole this is a colossal waste of money. Especially the proposed alterations to the Farndon Roundabout. Work done to date was late in completion and over continued, and for the little derivative benefit or improvement. at a time of financial hardship for the country as a whole, and in every sector, coupled with petrol prices at their highest ever levels, what is the real need for these works? the bypass isnt the M25 - minor inconveniences are park and parcel of everyday driving. the benefits do not outweigh the costs	2B	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). The Scheme would result in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Traffic modelling at Farndon Roundabout shows that without the Scheme, queues on all approaches are expected to stay the same length or slightly increase (circa 1m increase), with the exception of the A46 south approach. Queues on this approach are expected to increase by 4m (from 8m to 12m). This is due to the overall increase of traffic along the A46 which leads to an increase in queue length.</p> <p>Traffic modelling indicates that the measures that have been included at Farndon Roundabout as part of the Scheme, including traffic signals and additional lanes would</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					increase capacity and improve safety. The measures being implemented at Farndon Roundabout are a low-cost solution. Higher cost options (such as grade separation) were deemed unnecessary.
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Overall scheme	Six unnecessary bridges full of concrete and steel, wasteful use of limited and expensive resources.	2D	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The new bridges are needed to provide either additional width for the existing A46 to be dualled, grade separation or crossing of roads for the new offline section of A46. The provisions have been assessed against traffic flows and the solutions presented offer the best value for money options whilst minimising carbon and visual impacts.</p> <p>Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> outlines the broad sources of materials to be used by the Scheme, such as soil (site won material and imported fill), aggregates (sand, gravel and crushed rock) and manufactured products (precast concrete). Further details of the main types and estimated quantities of construction materials required for the delivery of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Overall scheme	I worry that there will be no money left to plant the amount of trees etc that will help with the look as well as the noise we already hear within the village.	2C	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Requirement 12 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> requires the Applicant to comply with the principles of the Environmental Masterplan showing the landscaping proposed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to their concerns in the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>Environmental proposals required to mitigate the Scheme are a commitment within the development consent application and therefore have to be implemented to ensure the Scheme complies with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Budget for the implementation of landscape works and environmental mitigation is included within the overall budget for the Scheme. Further information relating to the Scheme's budget is detailed within the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. In order to mitigate the effects to Winthorpe village, permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme including for noise and vibration and landscape.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEE-X	Overall scheme	Since the Covid epidemic more people are working from home and both rail and road traffic has declined. I really can't see any need for this scheme and regard as a waste of money.	2D	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The latest figures (including the impact of Covid-19) from the Department for Transport's <i>National Road Transport Projections 2022</i> show that traffic will increase in future</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					years. These forecasts have been reflected in the traffic modelling and predict that if the Scheme is not implemented then traffic delays would increase on the A46.
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Overall scheme	<p>*Value for Money*</p> <p>Overall I consider this project to be poor value for money and should be scaled back to improvements at the key junctions.</p> <p>Option 1 at the initial design stage only came out with a Cost Benefit ratio BCR of 0.88-which simply would not be funded and so had to be ditched. Option 2 only did slightly better at a BCR of 1.23. No updated BCR has been published for the amended</p> <p>Option 2 design now being proposed, but the PEI report acknowledges that the project is poor value for money. Further design work and expenditure should not be wasted unless the DfT are going to fund this- but even then it is not a good use of public money.</p>	2H	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>Funding for the Scheme has been secured. Details of this are presented in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme will result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Overall scheme	<p>Two of the plan objectives are given as:</p> <p>Environment: Deliver better environmental outcomes by achieving a net gain in biodiversity, and improve noise levels at Noise Important Areas along the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe junctions.</p> <p>Customer: Build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected.</p> <p>What evidence of this is there in the plan? Identify extra provisions that would address the previous 2 scheme objectives and which could be funded from the Development Fund. (This is separate to the A46 build project, and is explicitly for improving "Environmental and Wellbeing" factors – eg active travel, footpaths, tree planting etc).</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Figures 11.1 (Long-term Noise Change 1-8) and 11.9 (Short-term Noise Change 1-8) in the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> show noise levels and noise level change with and without the Scheme in the short-term (year of opening) and long-term (15 years after the year of opening).</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. These would vary in form from barriers, bunds or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on noise important areas around the Scheme is given in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and it is noted that short-term noise impacts in operation would result in either a negligible change or be slightly better in all noise important areas within the study area.</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking and cycling routes that currently exists have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>The improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market, the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Walking and cycling routes on the Scheme are presented on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment relating to the use of a Development Fund for environmental and wellbeing enhancement. The Applicant believes the Consultee is referring to the use of a designated funding mechanism. This funding stream is something that is not guaranteed as part of the Scheme and is therefore not included or assessed as part of the application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWSN-N	Overall scheme	Great, let's get on with it before anyone else gets killed.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments.
ANON-559H-RWBE-U	Overall scheme	Very badly needed it is chaotic at the moment.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBX-E	Overall scheme	Looks OK. Please complete the works ASAP.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMJ-B	Overall scheme	go ahead and do it! Anything has to be better than risking life in the current system with dual and single carriageway where others think its wide enough to overtake!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQE-A	Overall scheme	The design is fine – just need to get it underway asap	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGD-Y	Overall scheme	Fantastic, Bring it on ASAP Its Greatly needed. I give 110% support Do NOT waste to much time with the NIMBY Brigade TIME COSTS MONEY GO GO GO FOR IT TIME COSTS MONEY GO GO GO FOR IT	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWG2-D	Overall scheme	get on with it asap	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWTJ-J	Overall scheme	It needs to be done so people will have to put up with it till it's done and the roads are open	2D		
ANON-559H-RW7V-1	Overall scheme	Major improvements to the outdated bypass around newark are long overdue, the traffic congestion on the route means it is often quicker to travel through the centre of newark, which surely, defeats the object of a bypass in any event.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWDX-G	Overall scheme	ASAP The single lanes should have been changed when it was first diverted from Fosse Road, Farndon	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWXG-K	Overall scheme	Hurry up and start it!	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSA-8	Overall scheme	Build it ASAP!	2D		
ANON-559H-RWSN-N	Overall scheme	Get on with it.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWSF-D	Overall scheme	Please start asap!	2H		
ANON-559H-RWBZ-G	Overall scheme	Should have done this a long time ago..	2H		
ANON-559H-RW6G-H	Overall scheme	This scheme is urgently needed.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWV1-U	Overall scheme	Build it ASAP	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Overall scheme	Speed it up!	2I		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWF6-G	Overall scheme	please hurry the improvement along	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWAK-Z	Overall scheme	It is already very long overdue. A swift progression to construct is required.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSN-N	Overall scheme	Stuff the consultation. Just get on with it so Newark doesn't get stuffed up with traffic most days.	2I		
ANON-559H-RW8R-X	Overall scheme	I THINK THE PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN EXCEEDINGLY WELL THOUGHT OUT, ESPECIALLY SINCE IT IS A COMPLICATED SCHEME	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQH-D	Overall scheme	just best wishes for a job well done	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWF4-E	Overall scheme	The continuation of the dual carriageway is key to link at Winthorpe, improve heavy goods through time and thus reduce pollution. The single carriageway is currently not able to service the amount of traffic it is expected to carry. Upgrading to a dual carriageway enhances opportunity to develop business and residential on the band from Farndon to Winthorpe and beyond and therefore enhance the town and its prosperity prospects. looking forward to it!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWGH-3	Overall scheme	Happy with the proposal	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGQ-C	Overall scheme	USED TO CROSS THE CATTLE MARKET ROUNDABOUT EVERY DAY FOR OVER 30 YEARS TO MY JOB IN MANSFIELD, THE A46 FLYOVER WOULD HAVE BEEN A DREAM.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV1-U	Overall scheme	The design looks great	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3J-H	Overall scheme	It seems the best plan for what is needed at this time and for the future.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWWS-X	Overall scheme	Excellent idea, at last!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW6C-D	Overall scheme	This repair has obviously received very careful and considerate attention and it deserves recommendation.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWQX-W	Overall scheme	A much-needed improvement. we have to bypass the M1, A1, A46 around Newark, traffic on bypass to the northeast	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFH-2	Overall scheme	The plans mark a significant improvement, with grade-separated junctions and dual carriageway needed sorely on this stretch of road which suffers from congestion and capacity issues. I welcome National Highways plans and very much support them.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Overall scheme	In general strongly approve of the design, specific caveats described later	2B		
ANON-559H-RWQK-G	Overall scheme	Excellent balance of pass through traffic and local access. Long overdue.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8X-4	Overall scheme	You've done a great job. I have zero concerns about the environmental impact, lets get it done!	2C		
ANON-559H-RWM5-P	Overall scheme	I am satisfied that the environmental impacts of the scheme have been sufficiently considered by the designers.	2C		
ANON-559H-RMMW-R	Overall scheme	happy with the proposal, thank you	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWFT-E	Overall scheme	happy with proposal	2C		
ANON-559H-RWGQ-C	Overall scheme	NONE THE PROPOSALS ARE FINE WITH ME	2C		
BHLF-559H-RW9P-W	Overall scheme	what you have described seems quite adequate to me	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWWS-X	Overall scheme	moving in the right direction!	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWTN-P	Overall scheme	Can't think of anything you have missed. I am just glad that at last, something may be getting done.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW9P-W	Overall scheme	Being where it is I cannot foresee any problems	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWME-6	Overall scheme	but credit where it is due an excelled proposal to alleviate the current daily traffic issues. people dread not only in Newark, but in east midlands as a whole. I was at Butlins last week when the topic of conversation was 'we could of done it in 3 hours but took 4 because we got stuck in Newark' (lol)	2D		
ANON-559H-RMMW-R	Overall scheme	I'm comfortable with the proposals, thank you.	2G		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW9P-W	Overall scheme	I am content with your proposal	2G		
BHLF-559H-RWWS-X	Overall scheme	well needed	2G		
ANON-559H-RWQK-G	Overall scheme	Very well thought through and much appreciated.	2G		
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Overall scheme	It is a huge positive and I fully support it to go ahead.	2H		
ANON-559H-RW8T-Z	Overall scheme	Build it as soon as possible.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW65-Y	Overall scheme	marvellous	2H		
ANON-559H-RWGQ-C	Overall scheme	MUCH NEEDED LOOKS A REALLY GOOD SCHEME	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWWS-X	Overall scheme	This is a long awaited scheme that will really benefit the area.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Overall scheme	I sincerely hope this goes ahead.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWET-D	Overall scheme	It's a good idea and needed, the A46 improvements carried out so far have been well done.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Overall scheme	Very pleased to have this proposed improvement done.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEU-E	Overall scheme	Excellent	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWQ5-T	Overall scheme	good so far ... lets hope it doesn't get cancelled!	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Overall scheme	I's a good consultation with opportunity for the public to attend and be listened to. Overall, a well-thought out scheme to address modern congestion. I just hope that the volume of traffic does not increase to gobble it all up as has happened before in some parts of the country. God Bless.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWFM-7	Overall scheme	Very welcome and well presented	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWWG-J	Overall scheme	Happy with it	2I		
ANON-559H-RW8U-1	Overall scheme	About time it was improved should have been dualled originally	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW6Q-U	Overall scheme	A dual carriageway has been needed for many years.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEB-U	Overall scheme	Shame it wasn't done previously	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8C-F	Overall scheme	Having to do this is the result of saving 25% of the cost on the original relief road, which maybe around £100,000. what a waste.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW6Y-3	Overall scheme	I am a local and avoid the current road whenever possible. I live near the A1 roundabout and travel to Farndon at least 3 times a week and always go through town as the current bypass is a nightmare. Let's get on with this Scheme!	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEK-4	Overall scheme	I must congratulate you for informing the public at all stages of planning and preparation of this proposed scheme.  However, you stipulate many times this completes a continuous dual caring way between M5 and Humber Ports.  This is a wrong statement. Surely. National Highways are aware of two section of single carriageway on the Lincoln bypass ??????  OK. Given the terrain, floodplains river and rail crossings your designs are excellent and can only help towards relief of the anticipated traffic flows around Newark	2B	N	This information in the consultation materials relating to the single carriageway is taken from the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme. The statement considers the Hykeham Roundabout as the point that road users get to Lincoln, however the Applicant acknowledges this comment and would consider how to make sure future publications are clearer when referring to this area of the strategic road network.
BHLF-559H-RWA8-D	Overall scheme	This area of the A46 is not the only part that is not dualled. There are large sections of the A46 Lincoln bypass (main through roads to Immingham / Hull etc which are also still single carriageway and cause dreadful tailbacks consistently, let alone when there is an accident.	2G	N	

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		... really ought to realise that with our overcrowded country with thousands of vehicles that main trunk roads need to be dual carriageways in the first instance!			
BHLF-559H-RWWN-S	Overall scheme	The use of solar panels could be considered for potential charging points along the route to cover increased needs in the future electric power wanted, but that's another idea I have.	2I	N	The Applicant acknowledges the suggestion with regards to electric vehicle charging facilities. This type of facility is not included within the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWB9-F	Overall scheme	How realistic is the completion date?	2H	N	The Scheme is required to submit a development consent application to the Secretary of State before works can commence. The application would be independently examined by a single or panel of Inspectors who would make their recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether the development consent application should be granted. This process takes approximately 18 months from submission of the application.
BHLF-559H-RWAX-D	Overall scheme	Will believe when proposal is done.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Overall scheme	Can't it be done sooner!!!!	2H		
ANON-559H-RW8X-4	Overall scheme	Bring it forward to 2023!!	2D		
ANON-559H-RWBD-T	Overall scheme	It seems fine to me, apart from the time it has taken to get to this stage. I cannot believe it will have taken 5 years to even start construction (if not delayed further) and another 3 years to construct.  PLEASE just get on with it-- it is so inconvenient and frustrating at present and causes huge delays both on A46 and through Newark town, as people try to avoid queues.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFH-2	Overall scheme	If anything, please make the construction period as short as possible!	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8X-4	Overall scheme	I think it's absolutely brilliant and long overdue. Shame you're starting in 2025! 2023 would be better!!!	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWMU-P	Overall scheme	I remember filling in survey forms prior to the building of two existing roads in the 1980s. it should have been dualled then as we had asked.	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments.
ANON-559H-RWTY-1	Overall scheme	As a retired Civil/Highway Engineer I could never understand why the initial scheme was a single carriageway. A dual carriageway should have been constructed in the first place, no doubt at less than a half the cost of this scheme.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Overall scheme; Population and human health	Need to limit amounts of agricultural land being taken away.	2C	N	Further information regarding the land impacted by the Scheme can be found in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> .  The Scheme design has sought to minimise the area of permanent and temporary land take of agricultural land, including areas of the best and most versatile land as far as possible. However, as stated in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> , given the fixed location of the existing highway infrastructure that represents the start and end points of the Scheme there are no opportunities to deliver the Scheme in a way that avoids the development of any agricultural land.  The land required by the Scheme has been reduced since preferred route announcement by reducing the central reservation width, optimising the earthwork slopes by introducing some steepened soil slopes and retaining the majority of the existing A46. This has also reduced the impact on the floodplain and reduced the area of land needed for floodplain compensation, particularly the area required at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area.  All land required to deliver the Scheme has been justified within the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b> and is indicated on the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Overall scheme; Population and human health	Not sure what the land is currently used for. If this is agricultural land we would not support this.	2G		
ANON-559H-RW6G-H	Overall scheme; Population and human health	Policy of local recruitment by the appointed contractors.	2D	N	The Applicant notes these comments.  Commitments regarding the delivery of local social benefits, such as the creation of employment opportunities have been made in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> to capture and maximise socio-economic benefits within the Newark and Sherwood District. As part of this, an <i>Education, Employment and Skills Plan</i> will be prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan prior to construction which will identify targets and strategies to implement and will determine the types of local community groups who will be contacted.
ANON-559H-RWET-D	Overall scheme; Population and human health	Employ local people	2D		
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Overall scheme; Population and human health; Congestion;	This is going to cause delays, noise and inconvenience to lots of communities in the Newark area.  I am not looking forward to this happening.	2H	N	The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Noise and vibration				<p>Specifically, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation. Figures 11.1 (Long-term Noise Change 1-8) and 11.9 (Short-term Noise Change 1-8) in the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> show noise levels and noise level change with and without the Scheme in the short (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and long-term (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening).</p> <p>The assessment includes both construction and operational mitigation including site hoardings, plant control measures, noise barriers, bunds, and a low noise running surface. The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. It sets out commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>As well as the economic benefits detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, the Scheme would result in journey time savings and improved safety as detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWE6-F	Overall scheme; Population and human health	Environmental concerns are not my concerns. The benefits to the people and town of Newark and the surrounding area far outweigh any environmental impact.	2C	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Population and human health	I have serious concerns about the effect on public health and well-being if the proposals are implemented as they stand.	N/A	N	Consideration of impacts on population human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> . This takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWGY-M	Overall scheme	The will take up massive amounts of land.	2G	N	<p>The Scheme design has sought to minimise the area of permanent and temporary land take of agricultural land, including areas of the best and most versatile land as far as possible. However, as stated in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, given the fixed location of the existing highway infrastructure that represents the start and end points of the Scheme there are no opportunities to deliver the Scheme in a way that avoids the development of any agricultural land.</p> <p>The land required by the Scheme has been reduced since the preferred route announcement by reducing the central reserve width, optimising the earthwork slopes by introducing some steepened soil slopes and retaining the majority of the existing A46. This has also reduced the impact on the floodplain and reduced the area of land needed for floodplain compensation, particularly the area required at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area.</p> <p>All land required to deliver the Scheme has been justified within the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b> and is also shown on the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Overall scheme; Land ownership;	None-- but the compensation arrangements need to be made explicit and compensation made before land is taken; otherwise there is much concern for local residents losing land and potential blight.	2G	N	Provisions for compensation and blight are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance documents entitled: <i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of</i>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Population and human health				<i>our road proposal</i> " and <i>'Your property and blight'</i> available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.
ANON-559H-RWV8-2	Overall scheme; Population and Human Health	We would like to know what immediate compensation will be provided for having to live so close to this new project.	2H		The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that any policies relating to the temporary or permanent use of land are clear and understood and an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with.
ANON-559H-RWV3-W	Overall scheme; Population and human health	The proposed plan floodplain compensation will affect my flying activities at [redacted] (next to Kelham Hall). There are a very limited number of suitable airfields locally-- surely with amount of land surrounding the scheme as proposed it is not a good idea to curtail a long established and much used airfield ?	2G	N	The initial Order Limits were established prior to the preferred route announcement in February 2022. Following the preferred route announcement, the Applicant has worked closely with the landowner to reduce the impact and size of the Order Limits. The outcome of the engagement has been the development of new Order Limits which has substantially reduced the area of land required for floodplain compensation and its associated impacts on the landowner. This has eliminated any direct impacts on the house and the airfield referred to in the Consultee's response.
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Overall scheme; Population and human health	On the whole I am in favour of your Newark bypass scheme, but I wish to direct your thoughts to two elements that I find need serious addressing.  One is the potential destruction of [redacted] airfield a key local amenity as ive outlined in more detail in section 2G.	2B		With regards to the comment relating to the use of 'hardcore', utilising material from the lowered ground within the floodplain compensation areas in the Scheme is more beneficial than sending it to landfill and reduces the Scheme carbon footprint.
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Overall scheme; Population and human health	I strongly object to the use of [redacted] airfield being used as a floodplain compensation area. I feel that this is a very ill conceived idea that will directly and adversely effect the local community and business. This airfield has long standing planning permission and safeguarding in place, and with a decline in facilities of this nature through out the UK its protection should be guaranteed.  Alternative suitable land has been offered openly in its stead, so before this key local amenity is potentially destroyed by complete lack of oversight I feel this needs consideration and a report made out to show due diligence has been carried out.  I for one feel non of this has been made clear in your material ether by design or intention with simple fleeting slide and labelling not even stating what this lands current use is.	2G		Information regarding the floodplain compensation areas was included on pages 18, 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and assessed within the <i>Preliminary Environmental information Report</i> , using the information available at the time.  The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that particular stage. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.
ANON-559H-RWVR-V	Overall scheme; Population and human health	As a local resident, business owner and pilot I would like to object the current proposal due to the effects on [redacted] in Averham and it's airfield.  My business is located there and I also use the airfield as a pilot. This development will also destroy the future installation of solar panels on [redacted] land associated with in a time when we need to be embracing alternative forms of energy production.  National highways should be aware of these plans for the green and sustainable energy production and also the fact that the airfield has full planning permission which needs to be safeguarded.  There are other businesses based at [redacted], not including the working farm itself. There are also lots of resident aircraft based there and with the loss of local airfields such as Doncaster and potentially Gamston, it is becoming difficult to find homes for aircraft locally. The land here will be used for its hardcore underneath which when dug out, will be then free of charge to use by the contractor which is also ethically wrong.	2B		The new Order Limits includes an additional area of land that was offered as an alternative by the landowner, was considered and confirmed as technically viable and then subject to a targeted consultation which took place between 17 March until 16 April 2023. Following the targeted consultation, the area offered by the landowner has been included in the updated Order Limits contributing to the reduction in area to the benefit of all parties. For further information relating to the targeted consultation, please see Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWVF-G	Overall scheme; Population and human health	The proposed use of land in and around the village of Kelham appears nonsensical. Looks like a tick-box exercise rather than a reasoned argument for real mitigation of environmental impact regarding flooding. There is an active airfield between Kelham and Averham village which is used for both leisure and business activities marked as part of the floodplain compensation area.  I have an aircraft hangered at this airfield which is used for both business and private use; the availability of the airfield at short notice key to operate as part of my business. The aircraft is also maintained on site within the workshop facilities on site. The airfield includes hangers with several aircraft in regular use. This airfield and hangarage provides community amenity values. The airfield has been in use for many years and has full planning and safeguarding in place. The areas of flood mitigation in and around Averham are possible areas for emergency landing for aircraft.	2G		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		The proposal to use the area around Averham and Kelham, including direct impact to the airfield, for flood mitigation appears to be ill conceived, when there appears to be other more suitable land available in the area.			
ANON-559H-RW37-X	Overall scheme; Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	As stated in section 2G, I feel your material ether by design or intention is lacking clarity regarding the potential destruction of the Key local airfield at [redacted]. This need addressing.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWGT-F	Overall scheme; Population and human health	This project is not serving the local community.	2C	N	<p>In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country. Congestion on this single carriageway section of the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts means that journeys are currently unreliable and take longer than they should. This will only get worse as more people are expected to use the road in the future.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads through Newark-on-Trent, including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane and Fosse Road. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme also results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats as well as increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme would fulfil the economic objective of sustainable development by increasing capacity and reducing congestion on the strategic road network. This could help to facilitate the growth of a number of economic sectors, such as food and logistics, which are reliant on journey time reliability.</p> <p>As detailed within Chapter 3 (The Need for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), the Scheme would help to unlock employment growth within Newark-on-Trent by facilitating the delivery of regional and local business developments. For example, the Newark Business Park concentrates a significant part of Newark's growth but is currently limited in its development by the lack of capacity at Brownhills Roundabout, as set out in the <i>Newark and Sherwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017)</i>.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity and traffic impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Overall scheme	Very few Newark people are aware of the true purpose of this scheme. Many, including myself, will be thinking it is being done to improve traffic flow for the sake of local motorists and residents.  It has come as a surprise to realise it is part of a multi £billion national scheme, mainly focused on reducing journey time for lorries heading to ports – and that it was not designed primarily to reduce congestion in traffic flow around Newark for the benefit of Newark people's health and well-being.  Significant potential adverse effects on Newark are already documented by National Highways.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA6-B	Overall scheme	It is with great concern that I have recently read about the A46 bypass scheme. Apparently, the only ones to benefit from the scheme will be lorry drivers! Certainly not the people of Newark!  It will be the people of Newark who will suffer the most from this hugely expensive and disruptive scheme ,with what appears to be little benefit to the residents of our beautiful historic town and the environment.	N/A		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					In accordance with the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Overall scheme; Construction; Population and human health	<p>Overall, the Scheme is very beneficial to people who want to bypass Newark, rather than to the people who live and work in Newark.</p> <p>The project seems to be described from the point of view of commuters with little consideration of the impact on residents.</p> <p>The construction will be very disruptive for several years, and the disadvantages overall of the finished Scheme appear to outweigh the advantages, certainly for people living nearby.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant is responsible for operating, maintaining, and improving England's motorways and major A roads. Careful consideration is given to the impacts of any road scheme on a range of stakeholders, including local residents.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives, need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the impacts on population and human health on local residents during construction as reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration access to private property and housing, green space, community resources and walking, cycling and horse-riding routes in addition to effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts).</p> <p>The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. With mitigation no significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified during construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to remove congestion at the junctions of the A46 that link to the local network and not just the main carriageway. In turn, this would alleviate pressure on Newark-on-Trent and reduce the significant adverse effects on the local network.</p> <p>Improvement for local residents also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• The existing signalised crossings over the A46, at Cattle Market would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals, making it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>For an overview of the Scheme design, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comments about disruption, an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) will be developed in consultation with the local highways authority and will aim to minimise disruption to the traveling public during construction. Information regarding temporary diversions of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes can be found in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Construction methodology has already been considered in reducing the impact, such as the offline bridge deck construction for the new bridge crossing the A1. Also, construction</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					operations at Cattle Market Roundabout, Brownhills Junction, Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout would be phased to keep traffic moving during the construction period.
BHLF-559H-RWAP-5	Overall scheme	More traffic, loss of habitats and no improvements in linking the A46 and A1	2B	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that there will be an increase in traffic using the road however the when the Scheme is introduced journey times along the A46 are forecast to improve as outlined in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). Further details demonstrating the benefits of the Scheme can be found within the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>In line with the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>, traffic flows have been forecast up to 2061. This modelling forecasts that the A46 is not predicted to be over capacity within these timescales if the Scheme is implemented. Further information is set out within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>The existing road layout that requires road users to access the A1 northbound from the Brownhills Roundabout has been retained. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing (to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) would create a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and add extra capacity.</p> <p>With the introduction of the A1/A46 Crossing, all A46 mainline traffic would no longer travel through the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. This would reduce queues at both A1 exit slip roads as traffic exiting the A1 would have a considerably lower opposing flow on the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Overall scheme; Population and human health	I think the whole scheme will have an adverse effect on the quality of life in Winthorpe.	2B	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during the construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and permanent noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway through to Winthorpe Roundabout. This would vary in form of barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation required for the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers impacts to residential properties and community assets within Winthorpe (including Winthorpe Primary School and Winthorpe Community Centre). The assessment does not find any significant effects on access to local services or amenity as a</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>result of the Scheme. The Scheme is expected to have a beneficial impact for local people due to the reduced congestion and improved journey times it would deliver.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>, which is the standard used for all highways in England. The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures will not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions.</p> <p>Impacts from construction dust will be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. The affected road network is made up of the roads which meet <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> traffic scoping criteria i.e. 200 and 1,000 movements per day respectively for heavy-duty vehicle and total daily traffic, as well as changes in speed band and carriageway alignment of at least 5m.</p> <p>Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village.</p> <p>The highest annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the vicinity of Winthorpe along the A46 and A1 is predicted to be 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme). The greatest changes in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub>, at modelled receptors along the A46 and A1 outside of Winthorpe, are predicted to be a decrease of 2.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and increase of 0.5µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) or particulate (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any human health receptors within the study area, and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction, including on access to services health and social care; and access to green space and recreation.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Overall scheme	Use of the name 'CattleMarket Island' no longer applicable and could cause confusion	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comment with regards to the Cattle Market at Newark-on-Trent no longer existing. There are however, no immediate plans to change the name of the Cattle Market Roundabout as part of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWSJ-H	Overall scheme	From a road safety and traffic flow point of view, this proposal is a serious downgrade from the proposal in the previous consultation. You need to start again.	2H	N	Alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. An options consultation was held between December 2020 and February 2021 which sought the local community's views to inform the decision on the preferred route. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022. Information relating to the alternatives considered during the development of the Scheme is detailed in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ). Information relating to the options

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>consultation and preferred route announcement is detailed in Chapter 2 (Options consultation) and Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The options consultation outcome, together with technical appraisal, economic assessments and environmental assessments, were used to inform the Applicant's option selection. As a result, a modified version of Option 2, called 'Option 2 Modified' was selected as the preferred option.</p> <p>Since announcing the preferred route for the Scheme in February 2022 the Applicant has refined the design of the Scheme as a result of ongoing assessments and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>The Scheme aims to make the A46 safer for road users as well as reduce closures, congestion, and delays. The traffic modelling forecasts that the journey time along the A46 would decrease along with delays at the junctions surrounding Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

N.4.E: Stakeholder engagement and consultation

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW71-V	Consultation – positive feedback	My husband and I went to a consultation event at Winthorpe Community Centre. The information provided along with the supporting personnel for seeded our expectations and we felt that we were able to form a comprehensive view of what was being proposed. We were impressed with many aspects of it - the consideration of environmental impacts, the obvious need to improve traffic flows and so many issues related to a major work like this that we had not even thought of.	2B	N	Comments acknowledged by the Applicant.
BHLF-559H-RWMM-E	Consultation – positive feedback	a lot better design than original proposal	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVK-N	Consultation – positive feedback	Consultation materials were good and I liked the opportunities to talk through the proposals at the mobile locations i.e. north gate retail park	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWQE-A	Consultation – positive feedback	all fine	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWWD-F	Consultation – positive feedback	All good.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Consultation – positive feedback	This is very good and shows you have thought of all the affected areas.	2G		
BHLF-559H-RWWD-F	Consultation – positive feedback	very much appreciate all the consultation, which is clear and detailed.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Consultation – positive feedback	In respect of Winthorpe residents and, I believe, users of the road, the main alignment and general scheme has been improved significantly since the initial drafts.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSJ-H	Consultation – positive feedback	Thank you for making the material easy to browse and not making us go through one of those dreaded virtual 3D consultation experiences.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWS9-Z	Consultation – positive feedback	Excellent video clearly showing the proposed changes. Video and online survey should increase participants in consultation.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Consultation – positive feedback	It's all pretty good	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWW2-W	Consultation – positive feedback	Consultation appears to us to have been adequate. The consultation materials have been adequately clear and explanatory. Thank you.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Consultation – positive feedback	Good to know we have time to be consulted and give our opinions.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWGB-W	Consultation – positive feedback	The documentation is very comprehensive and the information van was an excellent idea; the people attending were very friendly and informative and explained a number of items that I was interested in.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWWN-S	Consultation – positive feedback	The consultation process I think is very informative and reassuring. The questions asked were answered fully and I felt listened too. I understand that things have been changed for the better good where possible when planning has caused problems for residents.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSZ-1	Consultation – positive feedback	The fly through video gave a good explanation of the scheme	2I		
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Consultation – positive feedback	From a bad start (timing before Christmas 2020 ) consultation has been good. Your interventions with Think again looks to have been collaborative.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWQK-G	Consultation – positive feedback	Very well presented. Attended the Farndon Village Hall presentation. Your team did an excellent job.	2I		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWEJ-3	Consultation – positive feedback	It's a lot of information to read so to be honest didn't read everything but found the video showing the new road plan very useful to give an idea of what itll be like	21		
ANON-559H-RWBA-Q	Consultation – positive feedback	A very good presentation, well done.	21		
BHLF-559H-RWM8-S	Consultation – positive feedback	Grateful to have received this informative brochure to explain the proposals. Thank you	21		
ANON-559H-RMMW-R	Consultation – positive feedback	the materials have been well put together and have enabled me to provide my above responses. thank you	21		
BHLF-559H-RWTN-P	Consultation – positive feedback	Very well done and easy to understand, congratulations to all concerned.	21		
BHLF-559H-RWF4-E	Consultation – positive feedback	great informative brochure that we hope will reduce any conflict and answer questions in advance.	21		
BHLF-559H-RW6F-G	Consultation – positive feedback	The process has been clear and open	21		
ANON-559H-RWGQ-C	Consultation – positive feedback	FINE VERY INFORMATIVE	21		
BHLF-559H-RW71-V	Consultation – positive feedback	We felt that the information presented was extremely clear and comprehensive. The support of key personnel was really helpful as well. Thank you.	21		
ANON-559H-RWNK-D	Consultation – positive feedback	good comms all round	21		
ANON-559H-RWV9-3	Consultation – positive feedback	I have found the consultation process very good, Lots of information made available via different methods, and consultation events with informed people who are able to answer questions, or admit no decision has yet been made.  Easy process to make your views known	21		
BHLF-559H-RW3T-U	Consultation – positive feedback	Well presented with comments accepted on previous points made	21		
BHLF-559H-RW3J-H	Consultation – positive feedback	The plans are very clear and the reading of the report very clear also, hopefully easy enough for the 'layman'.	21		
BHLF-559H-RWWJ-N	Consultation – positive feedback	The information is good, keep it up and keep updating on anything new.	21		
BHLF-559H-RWXP-V	Consultation – positive feedback	Very good - brochure is informative	21		
BHLF-559H-RWXG-K	Consultation – positive feedback	Very thorough and clear	21		
ANON-559H-RW3N-N	Consultation – positive feedback	I have felt that the consultation material provided to local residents has been very good.	21		
BHLF-559H-RWQW-V	Consultation – positive feedback	pleased with the consultation process so far. thank you	21		
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Consultation – positive feedback	Since the new proposal was released we have been contacted and consulted on a very local and town level.  We have now met with the designer and his team twice and had all questions answered. When we were missing documents that had been posted to other residents they brought	21		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
		these out to us personally. They were very approachable and appear to care about our concerns.			
ANON-559H-RWSW-X	Consultation – positive feedback	The video you have provided is very clear and explains perfectly what is proposed. It all looks completely the right way to go. It will make a big difference,	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWAX-D	Consultation – positive feedback	Good.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWV-G	Consultation - general	Consultation process seems to be taking a long period of time and costing a lot of money. Other road improvements in the area have not had half the money or consultation time spent in some cases no consultation was made, the work was just carried out.	2I	N	<p>The Scheme is classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project as defined under the Planning Act 2008. As such, the Applicant is required to submit an application for development consent to construct the Scheme.</p> <p>As part of the development consent application, the Applicant is required to produce a Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>). This sets out how the Applicant has complied with the Planning Act 2008 in terms of the statutory pre-application consultation requirements. It also demonstrates how the Applicant has shown regard to the consultation responses received. The Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>) also sets out any additional consultation (outside the statutory consultation) that that the Applicant has undertaken in order to reach its final Scheme.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate will consider whether the Applicant has complied with the pre-application requirements in deciding whether or not to accept the application for examination, including considering the adequacy of consultation. If accepted, the Scheme would be independently examined by an Inspector or panel of Inspectors (known as the Examining Authority) who will assess the Scheme based on a range of factors before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State on whether or not the Planning Inspectorate considers it should be granted development consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with a range of stakeholders, including the local community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to enable these groups/bodies to express their views on the Scheme through engagement, options consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation and its compliance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 is described within the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has shown that it has had regard to Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>), and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWQD-9	Consultation – general; Consultation – positive feedback	The people in Newark market place today, 19 November, were very pleasant and seemed interested in receiving feedback. This survey seems to be a tick box exercise that will be ignored.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWET-D	Consultation – general	Well consultations in my view and experience are just a smoke screen, these plans will go ahead and I'm sure 100% that a hell of a lot of internal consultations within the various bodies involved before being presented to Joe Public will go ahead, but I don't think you need to see if there is an alternative to the areas mentioned before a final decision is made.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWBD-T	Consultation – general	This has taken far too long.	2I		
ANON-559H-RW8J-P	Consultation – general	This question is an outrage, people/designers/planners are being paid an outrageous amount of money to work this out, and you are asking residents? Shame on you.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW7R-W	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Further consultation events required to fully appreciate impact	2B	N	
ANON-559H-RW7R-W	Consultation – more information/publicity/time requested	Further consultation required	2D		
ANON-559H-RWVW-1	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Need more consultation with more details about the route	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWDQ-9	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I write as a local resident to request that the consultation regarding the dualling of the A46 be extended until full information is available on the impact of the project and mitigation. This is particularly the case in terms of the ecological impact, the health impact of noise levels and the health impact of particulate air pollution.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Consultation - more information/	The consultation period needs to be extended, to allow residents to make comments on the findings of the surveys currently being worked on.	2I		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
	publicity/time requested				<p>A further targeted statutory consultation took place from 8 September to 6 October 2023 providing an opportunity for newly identified persons with an interest in land to provide their feedback on the Scheme as presented during the previous statutory consultation and subsequent targeted non-statutory consultation. Further information relating to these consultations is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b>, and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation on the full Scheme at this stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Consultation process needs to be extended so answers can be given after due consideration of the answered received during the consultation otherwise it is just a box ticking exercise and not a true consultation.	21		
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	consultation period must be extended until you have the full information we need to be adequately informed and consulted	21		
BHLF-559H-RWA6-B	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I urge you to extend the consultation period until the necessary information is available to all concerned, in both Newark and the surrounding villages.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWAT-9	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Please consider extending the period for public consultation on this project until after all necessary information on environmental, economic and health costs is available for public consideration,	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA4-9	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The replies to many of the questions asked of your department by concerned citizens about plans for the upgrades to the Newark bypass elicit the answer "we do not yet have the answers/data which we need to answer your question". In view of this I am writing to request an extension of the deadline for submissions on this subject until a time when the required information may be available. No consultation can be considered valid until all of the relevant information is available to the public.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA2-7	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	With regards to the A46 flyover in Newark, please will you do the right thing and extend the consultation period until the necessary information is available to enable the public to be adequately informed and consulted ??	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA1-6	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Please extend the deadline date for the consultation period.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA9-E	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Request to extend the public consultation on the A46 bypass scheme	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWA3-8	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I ask that the consultation time for the current proposal be extended.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWAR-7	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I live in Balderton and I wish to ask you to extend this deadline until all information has been received.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWAM-2	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Please delay your consultation until all legal avenues are explored.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWAF-U	Consultation - more information/	I am writing to request an extension to the public consultation on the A46 bypass project.	N/A		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
	publicity/time requested				
BHLF-559H-RWAB-Q	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Can you please extend the consultation period for Newark bypass? It appears insufficient information has been available to ensure residents fully understand the plans and the impact these will have on our town? We also need to know the full reasons behind some of the plans.	N/A		
BHLF-559H-RWU7-Z	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I request for the consultation period for Newark bypass to be extended.  More time is needed for residents to understand the plans and reasons behind them before any decisions our finalised. This is not just about dualling and there are wider implications that need further attention and consideration.	N/A		
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I also think that the consultation should be extended until the government have ensured that the carbon budget for the project is consistent with its commitments under the Paris Agreement, now its plans to meet net zero have been found to be unlawful in the high court.	21	N	<p>The Government publishes carbon budgets which are legally binding and places a limit on what the UK can emit over a five-year period. At the time of publication, the UK has carbon budgets set up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037). The Climate Change Committee, the committee that advises the Government on its carbon budgets, has not yet stated when the Seventh Carbon Budget (2038-2042) will be published. Although the High Court ruled that the UK Government's <i>Net Zero Strategy</i> was unlawful in 2022, the ruling does not impact the carbon budgets which the Scheme is assessed against. Therefore, the conclusion that the Scheme would not impact the Government's ability to meet its targets remains valid.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the time of development. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> contained a preliminary assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme, including the impact of the Scheme on Climate, for which consent is now sought. The results of the climate assessment are presented in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) of the Environmental Statement reports a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. No significant effects on climate are anticipated. The construction and operation of the Scheme would result in an overall increase of 683,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the greenhouse gas emissions as outlined above. However, the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant, less than 0.007%, and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>National Highways' <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that '<i>net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset</i>' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.
BHLF-559H-RWUU-X	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Please add my name to those asking for an extension to the consultation period.</p> <p>I have concerns that have not been answered fully about the increased air pollution and the effects on residents during construction and then use of the bigger bypass.</p> <p>Also concerns regarding the environmental impacts, such as loss of wildlife habitat, loss of trees, hedges, woodland, wetlands in the huge area that will be affected, much of this work may pollute the River Trent if safeguards are not followed.</p> <p>There must be more time given to these vital questions.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>This considers the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of a scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Consideration is given for the impacts on wildlife and habitats of importance.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. The assessment identified that there would be no significant air quality effects during construction of the Scheme, following implementation of mitigation measures for construction dust, or during operation.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified. Some habitat loss as a result of the Scheme is unavoidable, however, the Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Further details, including methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment would be managed and monitored. It sets out a number of commitments to monitor and mitigate the effects of construction on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme and also details a number of best practice measures to be followed to avoid pollution to watercourses such as the River Trent as well as surface water monitoring at certain locations around the Scheme. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>The Examining Authority's consideration of the application during the six-month examination, and the Secretary of State's decision on the application for development consent, will fully consider all the potential impacts of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWAH-W	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>It is the view of Protect Newark's Green Spaces, and one that I support, that the current public consultation is flawed and is taking place before essential information is made available.</p> <p>I believe more time is needed to explore and make people aware of the probable consequences of this proposal to their own health and well-being – as well as biodiversity if adopted as it stands.</p> <p>I would urge you to do this by entering into a dialogue in local public forums rather than have further on paper 'consultations which inevitably exclude anyone who is not comfortable with letter writing and lobbying.</p> <p>It is imperative in the Interest of public health in future and for those of us with already existing respiratory health issues, that you listen to what we have to say and act.</p> <p>I therefore request that the consultation be expanded, it's period be extended and implementation stayed until such time as you can demonstrate to us how public health and biodiversity will be protected and improved rather than made worse by your proposals.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received. The statutory consultation included in-person public consultation events.</p> <p>If the Scheme development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>The Examining Authority's consideration of the application during the six month examination, and the Secretary of State's decision on the application for development consent, will fully consider all the potential impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on Population Human Health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme during construction and operation.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity during operation and construction, including designated sites, Habitats of Principal Importance, Non-Habitats of Principal Importance, habitats of ecological value and the protected species they support. Further information is detailed in Appendices 8.1-8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The consultation period needed to be longer to allow National Highways to conclude all of the outstanding surveys, and there are many. How can we be asked to comment without the facts or do National Highways have these facts but have not shared with the residents of Winthorpe?	2B	N	Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Surveys have continued since the statutory consultation to inform each Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) chapter as necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>), and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period of 28 days as defined by the Planning Act 2008 for statutory consultation. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The Examining Authority's consideration of the application during the six month examination, and the Secretary of State's decision on the application for development consent, will fully consider all the potential impacts of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RVWV-1	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	No info regarding how close the new bypass will be to Winthorpe Road Newark where I live - all very unclear	2B	N	<p>The <i>General Arrangement drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation showed the location of the dual carriageway widening as well as other features including the A1/A46 Crossing. Updated General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) have been submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RVWV-1	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Provide detailed map including where the new road will be in relation to Winthorpe Road	2D		
ANON-559H-RVWZ-4	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	A model of the proposals would have been much easier to understand. I think that this should have been seen as a priority as many find difficulties in understanding maps especially when they are not to scale. No speed limits indicated.	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to a model of the Scheme. A <i>Fly-through video</i> was produced for the statutory consultation which provides an indication of the size and scale of the Scheme in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure. The Applicant also produced <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> depicting the Scheme from various locations along the route. The <i>Fly-through video</i> and <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> are still available to view on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road that has been modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p> <p>The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement with average speed cameras would be installed to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	It was very disappointing that there was no ground level illustration of the new Winthorpe roundabout - a real blow to residents who need to see how it will look from Gainsborough Road and from the village, not just the view from a field beside the A1 or a flyby visualisation.	2I	N	No ground level illustration was produced as part of the statutory consultation materials; however, a <i>Fly-through video</i> of the Scheme was produced which provides an indication of the size and scale of the Scheme in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure. The <i>Fly-through video</i> and <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> are still available to view on the Scheme webpage.
BHLF-559H-RWWP-U	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	Pleased changes to original plan have been adapted. Don't feel able to visualise how the scheme will be when finished - not having access to modelling etc.	2B	N	A <i>Fly-through video</i> was produced for the statutory consultation which provides an indication of the size and scale of the Scheme in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure. The Applicant also produced <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> depicting the Scheme from various locations along the route. The <i>Fly-through video</i> and <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> are still available to view on the Scheme webpage.
BHLF-559H-RW6C-D	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	Pages 30/31 are the most relevant and I must admit that I do not know what the figures quoted relate to, are they daily, weekly or annually?	2B	N	The Applicant acknowledges that an oversight was made with regards to the fact that the forecast traffic flow diagram on pages 30 and 31 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> did not indicate that the figures related to daily traffic counts. Following the statutory consultation, an updated version of this document was published on the Scheme's webpage. More information relating to traffic forecasts is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNJ-C	Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	On the 'Forecast traffic flow differences..' map on Page 30 of the booklet ... 1. ...it could be made clearer what the numbers refer to (numbers of vehicles per annum, average journey times in minutes per year..? ). 2. ... the impact of the Southern link road, if any, could be made clearer.	2I	N	The Southern Link Road, which is being delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council, will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road will ease congestion on the existing routes through Newark-on-Trent and provide the main access through the southern area of the town. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.  Traffic modelling carried out for the Scheme forecasts that in the Do Minimum scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	I am also concerned that some environmental impact information is not available at the time of consultation e.g. fish surveys from the River Trent.	2C	N	Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme. This included the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures which were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time and was informed by the latest environmental survey data that was available. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.  The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.  If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.  Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impacts on fish as a result of the Scheme, including at the River Trent. Walkover surveys to assess fish habitat were considered however, information collected from the extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, great crested newt, otter, water vole, aquatic invertebrate, modular river physical habitat surveys and condition assessment surveys were instead used to understand the presence of suitable habitat for fish. The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to establish a baseline of species and habitat present across the Scheme (such as fish

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>spawning sites) and to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Canals and Rivers Trust, Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. Section 8.11 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) details the assessment of likely significant effects following the implementation of mitigation measures. Fish surveys would not provide additional information to alter the assessment or mitigation. Further justification for why fish surveys were not undertaken is provided within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/6.6</b>) assesses the impacts on river and sea lamprey in greater detail (qualifying features for the designation of the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar), as the River Trent intersects the Scheme and is a known migratory route for lamprey. No residual significant effects are anticipated on the movement of protected species.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to reduce impacts on fish are outlined in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Such measures would include construction of outfalls on the River Trent outside fish spawning season and electro-fishing being undertaken as part of fish rescue prior to sheet piling at Windmill Viaduct - northbound and works to Slough Dyke. Any sheet piling or dewatering would be undertaken under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works outside the coarse fish spawning season (avoiding between 15 March to 15 June).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) ultimately notes a slight adverse not significant effect on fish during the construction of the Scheme with mitigation in place, reducing to neutral once the Scheme is operational.</p>
ANON-559H-RVWV-1	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Not enough detail on the route so difficult to say about impact	2C	N	<p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i> of the route, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings providing information relating to the Scheme's route. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard for Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>), and where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>If the Applicant's development consent application is accepted by the Examining Authority, the Examining Authority's consideration of the application during the six month examination, and the Secretary of State's decision on the application for development consent, will fully consider the design of the Scheme and all the potential impacts of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQW-V	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I am looking forward... I hope to seeing a detailed plan and having the opportunity to ask questions and I answers at our village meeting.	2H	N	<p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting detailed information regarding the layout of the Scheme. This included a <i>Fly-through video</i> of the route and <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings which are still available to view on the Scheme's webpage.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>Following the development consent application, details of any updates to the Scheme will be published on the Planning Inspectorate's website.</p> <p>For any direct queries regarding the Scheme, the Consultee can contact the project team using the direct Scheme email address: A46newarkbypass@nationalhighways.co.uk</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDQ-9	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I would also like more information on the interaction of the new road with the A1 and A17 and in particular the impact as traffic to the ports increases. Until this information is available, the consultation appears flawed.	N/A	N	<p>Traffic modelling outlined in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) predicts a decrease in traffic using the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts as a result of the Scheme, due to the presence of the new bridge crossing the A1 removing traffic from the roundabouts. This would significantly reduce delays and improve journey times for traffic travelling to and from the A17 in both directions, including HGVs.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken shows that traffic flows are likely to increase on the A17. However, driver delay is expected to decrease with the Scheme, with the most significant decrease happening on the A17 northbound approach of Friendly Farmer Roundabout.</p> <p>No specific developments have been included in the traffic modelling but there is background growth which would include HGV growth. Any rerouted port traffic onto the A46 as a result of the Scheme has been included in the traffic forecasts.</p> <p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The Applicant considers the information within the consultation materials to be factual based on the information that was available at the time.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFX-J	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Happy in general, but needs more information in the summaries about how traffic will flow at the A1/A46 junction. It is too difficult to find anything in all the other documents.	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment from the Consultee with regards to information on the A1/A46 junction movements. Information was included on pages 22 to 25 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> on this area of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the information presented in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> focuses on how the Scheme links to the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts and does not provide a full explanation of the different traffic movements at the A1/A46 junction.</p> <p>Each movement at the A1/A46 junction is as follows:</p> <p><b>A1 southbound to A46 northbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be no change from the A1 south exit slip road to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• In order to travel north on the A46, vehicles would need to use the new link road between the Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> <li>• Vehicles would then join the A46 heading north via the Winthorpe Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A1 northbound to A46 northbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be no change from the A1 north exit slip road to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts before using the new link road to access the Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would then join the A46 heading north via the Winthorpe Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A1 southbound to A46 southbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be no change from the A1 south exit slip road to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts before using the new A46 southbound entry slip road that connects to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• The new entry slip road would use the existing A46 carriageway</li> </ul> <p><b>A1 northbound to A46 southbound</b></p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be no change from the A1 north slip exit road to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would join the A46 southbound using the new entry slip that connects to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A46 northbound to A1 northbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles would exit the A46 northbound using the new exit slip road that connects to Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the section of carriageway travelling under the Brownhills Underbridge towards the Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would access the A1 northbound using the existing entry slip road that connects to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A46 northbound to A1 southbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles would exit the A46 northbound using the new exit slip road that connects to the Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the section of carriageway travelling under the Brownhills Underbridge towards the Brownhills Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the Brownhills Roundabout and the Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would access the A1 southbound using the existing entry slip road that connects to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A46 southbound to A1 northbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles would exit the A46 at the Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would use the new link road that connects Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer roundabouts</li> <li>• Vehicles would navigate the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts</li> <li>• Vehicles would access the A1 northbound using the existing entry slip road that connects to the Brownhills Roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>A46 southbound to A1 southbound</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles would exit the A46 at the Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Vehicles would use the new link road that connects Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer roundabouts</li> <li>• Vehicles would access the A1 southbound using the existing entry slip road that connects to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> </ul> <p>As noted, the existing road layout that requires road users to access the A1 northbound (via Brownhills Roundabout) as well as southbound (via Friendly Farmer Roundabout) has been retained. Traffic modelling carried out as part of the Scheme shows that the new bridge crossing the A1 would create a reduction in traffic using the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts thereby adding extra capacity and reducing congestion.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGY-M	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	The material is all good news. Where is info about cost, journey time, noise , pollution, carbon and landscape	21	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment that the consultation materials appear to only include information relating to 'good news'.</p> <p>The consultation materials, including the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> set out the details of the Scheme, which included the potential impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant considers that the information provided an accurate summary of both the positive and negative impacts associated with the Scheme, enabling consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments.</p> <p>Information relating to carbon, noise, pollution and landscape was included within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> as part of the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) undertakes an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Information relating to the latest cost estimate of the Scheme was shown on the Scheme webpage throughout the statutory consultation. It is currently anticipated that the Scheme will cost between £550,000,000 and £650,000,000. More information regarding the latest cost estimate is detailed in the Funding Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/4.2</b>).</p> <p>Information relating to journey times was included on page 29 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> produced for the statutory consultation which states that on average, a 30% reduction in journey times for traffic using the improved section of the A46 is anticipated. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Lacking information about negative impacts</p> <p>No information on alternative options</p> <p>No information on calculation methodology of costs and benefits</p>	21	N	<p>Alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. An options consultation was held between December 2020 and February 2021 which sought the local community's views to inform the decision on the preferred route. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022. Information relating to the alternatives considered during the development of the Scheme is detailed in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Information relating to the options consultation and preferred route announcement is detailed in Chapter 2 (Options consultation) and Chapter 3 (Ongoing consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The <i>Consultation Brochure</i> provided a high-level summary of the Scheme. Page 5 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> noted that further information was contained within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information provided an accurate summary of both the positive and negative impacts associated with the Scheme, enabling consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken to understand the likely environmental effects associated with the Scheme, with the outcomes presented in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This has identified measures to be implemented across all the environmental topics to minimise adverse environmental effects in the first instance, and to mitigate any unavoidable impacts of the Scheme during both construction and operation.</p> <p>The statutory consultation materials contained information regarding the overall cost of the Scheme, however there was no information set out at that time regarding the calculation methodology of costs and benefits. The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>I believe that in order of the consultation to be valid local people need to be provided with the key details from the outset.</p> <p>I note that photographs and artistic representations without foliage cover of the impact of the project were not available initially and when impressions were available they were not of sufficient extent or detail to gain an accurate view.</p>	21	N	<p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. This included a customer friendly <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i> of the route, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings providing information relating to the Scheme's route. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i>. These Scheme were produced following requests from stakeholders and made available online and at consultation events from 16 November 2022. The <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> were for illustration purposes only and showed the Scheme based on the preliminary design proposals at statutory consultation.</p> <p>In addition, a <i>Fly-through video</i> was produced for the statutory consultation which provided an indication of the size and scale of the Scheme in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the visualisations of the Scheme to have been appropriate for statutory consultation.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. These are presented in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the proposed Scheme within its setting. The photomontages present both the Scheme at Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and at Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening), during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Farndon Footpath FP5</li> <li>• View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> <li>• View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>• View south from Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVJ-M	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>From the very start the consultation process has been extremely feeble, initially with very little information and with far too short a timescale in which to respond. It has only been since the Think Again group was set up that I have felt Highways gave any due consideration to the effects the scheme will have on Winthorpe residents.</p> <p>Consultation materials were poor and lacked detail.</p>	2I	N	<p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i> of the route, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings providing information relating to the Scheme's route. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the statutory minimum period of 28 days as defined by the Planning Act 2008 for statutory consultation. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>A targeted non-statutory consultation took place from 17 March to 16 April 2023 providing an opportunity for prescribed consultees, landowners and community stakeholders who could be impacted by or interested in updates in six areas of the Scheme, to provide their feedback.</p> <p>A further targeted statutory consultation took place from 8 September to 6 October 2023 providing an opportunity for newly identified persons with an interest in land to provide their feedback on the Scheme as presented during the previous statutory consultation and subsequent targeted non-statutory consultation. Further information relating to these consultations is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Consultation - general	The whole consultation scheme is being rushed through without the full facts known.	2H		
ANON-559H-RW89-5	Consultation - general	Not clear that many other options have been considered. Alternatives have not been encouraged from public during scheme development.	2B	N	<p>Alternative options were investigated at a previous stage of the Scheme. An options consultation was held between December 2020 and February 2021 which sought the local community's views to inform the decision on the preferred route. This was followed by a preferred route announcement in February 2022. Information relating to the alternatives considered during the development of the Scheme is detailed in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Information relating to the options consultation and preferred route announcement is detailed in Chapter 2 (Options consultation) and Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVU-Y	Consultation - general	In the overview you wrote that the A46 around Newark is the only remaining single carriageway on the trunk road. There is also a stretch from Hykeham towards Lincoln that is not a dual carriageway.	2I	N	<p>This information is taken from the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> publication. The statement considers the Hykeham Roundabout as the point that road users get to Lincoln, the Applicant has considered the comment raised in order to make future publications clearer when referring to this area of the strategic road network.</p>
ANON-559H-RWBN-4	Consultation - general	I am not sure that enough people will be aware of the consultation process. I was lucky enough to get a postcard but work colleagues who travel the same stretch of the A46 as me for their commute were unaware of the consultation.	2I	N	<p>The two target areas for distribution of consultation materials were initially adopted for the options consultation in 2020. In consultation with the local authorities as part of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i>, it was confirmed that the same distribution areas would be used</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	Consultation - general	The consultation document has been sent to people in the immediate Newark area but the impact of the A46 spreads much wider. we live in Tuxford and would use Newark for more than we do if it was more accessible. As it is easier to get into Worksop or Rutford.	2H		for the statutory consultation. The distribution areas are shown in Figure 4.3 of Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWTY-1	Consultation - general	The information should have been better publicised in the towns and villages around Newark. I was amazed that I was unaware of the scheme until recently.	2I		The two target areas were based on who the Applicant considered would be most affected by the Scheme taking into account visibility, noise levels and the proximity of the options to existing properties.
ANON-559H-RW67-1	Consultation - general	It is a great pity that this scheme was not more publicised in the national and local media (e.g. BBC East Midlands Today). I only came across the information by chance, at Newark Library.	2I		Addresses within the inner distribution area were sent all the consultation information along with copies of the statutory <i>Consultation Brochures</i> and <i>Consultation Response Forms</i> , as well as a follow-up information postcard. Addresses within the outer distribution area were sent an information postcard promoting the statutory consultation and setting out details of where information was available to view. In addition, information posters with details about the consultation were displayed at public locations in close proximity to the Scheme.  Under the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant has a statutory duty to promote the statutory consultation. The Applicant recognises that people who live and work beyond the identified distribution areas may also have an interest in the Scheme. To give these individuals and organisations an opportunity to participate, the Applicant used a variety of publicity methods to share information with a range of audiences including the use of social media, website updates, press releases and newspaper notices. Evidence of this is shown within Annex J of the Consultation Report Annexes ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b> ).  Section 47 and Section 48 notices were published in both local and national newspapers on the following dates:  <b>Section 47 and Section 48 notices</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newark Advertiser and The Nottingham Post – 13 October 2022</li> <li>Newark Advertiser and The Nottingham Post – 20 October 2022</li> </ul> <b>Section 48 notice</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Times and London Gazette – 20 October 2022</li> </ul> Evidence of the newspaper notices is shown within Annex F and Annex K of the Consultation Report Annexes ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b> ).  Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RW6R-V	Consultation - general	Process- could have started earlier and lasted longer. Initial publicity poor. Materials- very good  Timescale- materials received through the post on 7th November, already two weeks into the consultation period.	2I	N	The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.  As part of the local community consultation, 8,979 consultation packs, providing information about the Scheme and the statutory consultation, were posted to addresses within the inner distribution area on 21 October 2022 as shown within Figure 4.3 of Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b> ).  The Applicant notes the comment regarding the date that the consultation materials were received in the post. The date that consultation materials were delivered was reliant on the postal service process.  The Applicant allowed for any potential delivery delays by posting materials ahead of the statutory consultation period and provided a total of 47 days for responses to be received. This allowed the Consultee more than the minimum statutory requirement of 28 days to respond to the statutory consultation.  Under the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant has a statutory duty to promote the statutory consultation. In addition to the consultation packs posted to the local community, the Applicant used a variety of publicity methods to share information with a range of audiences.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>This included the use of social media, website updates, public information posters, press releases and newspaper notices. Evidence of this is shown within Annex J of the Consultation Report Annexes (TR010065/APP/5.2).</p> <p>Section 47 and Section 48 notices were published in both local and national newspapers on the following dates:</p> <p><b>Section 47 and Section 48 notices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newark Advertiser and The Nottingham Post – 13 October 2022</li> <li>Newark Advertiser and The Nottingham Post – 20 October 2022</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 48 notice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Times and London Gazette – 20 October 2022</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of the newspaper notices is shown within Annex F and Annex K of the Consultation Report Annexes (TR010065/APP/5.2).</p> <p>Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (TR010065/APP/5.1).</p>
ANON-559H-RWEW-G	Consultation - general	This is my first time filling in a survey - usually I do not see these postcards. Not sure if huge numbers do respond, but if not, possibly have a stand in town for a while...	21	N	<p>Under the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant has a statutory duty to promote the statutory consultation. In addition to the consultation packs posted to the local community, the Applicant used a variety of publicity methods to share information with a range of audiences. This included the use of social media, website updates, public information posters, press releases and newspaper notices. Evidence of this is shown within Annex J of the Consultation Report Annexes (TR010065/APP/5.2).</p> <p>On 9, 19 and 30 November 2022, consultation events took place at Newark Town Hall and using an engagement van in Newark Market Place. Members of the project team were present to answer questions relating to the Scheme. These events were advertised in the channels used to promote the statutory consultation (as listed in the first paragraph of this response).</p>
ANON-559H-RW77-2	Consultation - general	Documents provided not impartial and limited time allowed for responses.	21	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out. A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards. The Applicant considers the information within the consultation materials to be factual based on the information that was available at the time.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDB-T	Consultation - general	- completely agree with the letter from 'protect green spaces' - I could not quite put my finger on it, but your colourful brochure seemed somehow unreal	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment with regards to the 'Protect Newark's Green Spaces' group and assumes the letter being referred to contains the same content that was within the statutory consultation response from this group. The Applicant has shown regard to this response under Response ID reference: BHLF-559H-RWDC-U within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (TR010065/APP/5.2).</p> <p>Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNA-3	Consultation - general	Took quite a while to find this online version of the form.	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to the link to the online version of the <i>Consultation Response Form</i>. The Scheme webpage contained multiple links to the online <i>Consultation Response Form</i> including a link at the top of the webpage.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	Finally, finding the way to respond on the website is clearly for people under the age that I am at: it says: complete the online version of this response form following the link at the bottom of this page, there are 14 links at the bottom of the page with no indication of the correct one or what to do with it when finished.	21		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	I believe all the environmental impact information should be in the public arena before the consultation closes. I also found it extremely difficult to extract key information from the lengthy documents which frequently used acronyms. This is difficult for the lay reader. A straightforward summary of environmental and health impacts in an easy to read format would help with this.	21	N	<p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The statutory consultation helps to inform the final design of the Scheme as well as to allow the Applicant to fully understand the associated impacts. This is an iterative process and is why the complete assessment was not available during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards. A <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> was provided for the statutory consultation and included a summary of all the relevant information relating to environment including the population and human health impacts. This was included within the consultation materials available on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p>
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Consultation - general	I think the first consultations were badly timed due to Covid and Christmas and again the date for this one is close to Christmas when people are busy and have other things to think about.	21	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment with regards to the timing of statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>Statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i> is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding the options consultation taking place during the Covid-19 coronavirus pandemic. The Applicant put measures in place to ensure that the options consultation was accessible despite the pandemic. These measures are detailed within the <i>Approach to Public Consultation 2020</i> and <i>Report on 2020 Public Consultation</i> documents which are available to view on the Scheme webpage.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6E-F	Consultation - negative Feedback/ Experience	We also found the mobile van in the Lord Nelson car park was simply a series of ill captioned maps, with all staff engaged for long periods in discussions with single residents, and no chance to ask questions or have the maps explained to us.	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments on the Consultee's experience at the Lord Nelson event. The event being referred to by the Consultee was a public information event that took place before the statutory consultation period as part of the ongoing engagement that took place between the preferred route announcement and statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook five targeted public information events during this time at key residential locations in the vicinity of the Scheme. These events invited residents to meet the project team, see up to date information about the Scheme design development and ask questions to project specialists.</p> <p>The plans used at these events were still in a draft format therefore may have been perceived as being poorly captioned, however staff were available to answer questions and explain what was being shown on the plans.</p> <p>The Applicant plans public events so that there is a sufficient number of staff available to engage with members of the public. It can often be difficult to estimate the popularity of an event and the number of visitors that will attend and at what time. Due to the nature of these</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>events some individual conversations can take longer than others, however event managers do aim to ensure all event visitors are spoken to and have had their questions answered.</p> <p>During the statutory consultation, a total of 14 consultation events took place where staff were available to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>As well as events, throughout the development of the Scheme the Applicant has had a dedicated Scheme email address available for questions to be sent to as well as a Customer Contact Centre telephone number that can be used to ask any questions about the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	Process is rushed, staff at the consultation events have a smug and sneering attitude to residents.	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments relating to the Consultee's experience at consultation events.</p> <p>During the statutory consultation, a total of 14 consultation events took place where staff were available to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>As well as events, throughout the development of the Scheme, the Applicant has had a dedicated Scheme email address available for questions to be sent to as well as a Customer Contact Centre telephone number that can be used to ask any questions about the Scheme.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFA-U	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>The consultation documents are heavily loaded in their language and very leading in promoting the project – this is not a balanced consultation. For example:</p> <p>p.5, 'improvements' proposed as part of the scheme – they are not necessarily improvements. For whom and for what criteria?</p> <p>p.6, 'connected' – more highways are not likely to be useful</p> <p>p.6, 'great news for the local economy' – there is no evidence to suggest that more traffic volumes improves the economy</p> <p>p.6, a single carriageway is not a 'gap' in the network – a bottleneck performs a useful role in stopping too much traffic flow</p> <p>p.6, traffic jams may not be eliminated if there is much latent traffic demand – there is no mention of induced traffic</p> <p>p.6, road traffic casualties are not 'incidents' – this plays down the severe nature of road deaths and injuries. Increased traffic volumes will not make road safety better. What is the traffic safety record on this stretch of road – probably very good if traffic is flowing slowly?</p> <p>p.9, environment objective – why focus on biodiversity and noise? Surely noise will increase with increased traffic? Why not consider CO2 emissions, levels of inactivity (NCDs) related to inactive travel?</p> <p>p.31, shows the increased traffic estimated from the scheme – this has to be assessed relative to environmental and social equity goals (national/regional/county/town)</p>	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regards to the language used within the consultation materials. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the Scheme to be an improvement on the existing section of the A46 single carriageway in this area. The Scheme will deliver journey time savings as detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), benefitting both local and long-distance traffic. In addition, the Scheme will deliver economic benefits as detailed in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme would also improve safety by reducing accidents on this section of the A46. Information relating to the previous year's accidents including previous accident figures as well as the forecasted reduction in slight, serious and fatal casualties is also included within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including and increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling and routes. More information is detailed in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the use of the term 'incident' in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i>. It was not the intention of the Applicant to downplay the severity of road traffic casualties by using this wording. The word 'incident' was selected as it allows for a range of contextual factors, including those used to categorise contributing factors in government collision data, to be encompassed. Furthering this, since the 2021 UK road casualty data was released by the Department for Transport, the word 'accident' is no longer utilised in published government data and as such an alternative term was used. This is reflected in the 'incident' data provided at consultation by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to connectivity. The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> aims to make the network safer and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to economic improvements. Details of the economic case for the Scheme, including local economic benefits, are included within Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the reference to a 'gap' in the network. This term is referring to the A46 around Newark-on-Trent being the single greatest stretch of single carriageway in the route between Gloucestershire and Lincoln. Much of this road is already high-quality dual carriageway, and by filling in key sections, a coast-to-coast highway can be created without need for major new road building across open countryside.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment with regards to the role a bottleneck can perform in controlling traffic flow. In the context of the existing A46 single carriageway between Farndon and Winthorpe, the current congestion at peak times has been recognised as causing problems elsewhere on the wider network such as Great North Road, Kelham Road, the A17 and the A46 junction with the A1.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken as part of the Scheme accounts for induced traffic demand. Traffic modelling has been carried out to predict the likely growth of traffic and analyse the effects of the Scheme. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> predicts an increase of traffic on the A46. In a Do Minimum scenario, the Transport Assessment concludes that the higher demand would result in long queues forming. The design of the Scheme would improve traffic flow through the road network and assist with the higher demand originating from the increase of traffic on the A46.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise and vibration related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme and these would vary in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on climate, and specifically considers the greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Scheme as well as the Scheme's vulnerability to climate. Mitigation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ensure the Scheme design is resilient to future changes in climate have been embedded into the Scheme design. With this mitigation in place no significant effects on climate are predicted during construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
					<p>capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction, including on access to services health and social care; and access to green space and recreation.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) which considers the impact of the Scheme, on different groups with protected characteristics. To assess this, the Equality Impact Assessment draws on the findings of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), particularly Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) and other Environmental Statement chapters such as Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration). Effects relating to noise and air quality as a result of increased traffic during operation of the Scheme are assessed to be neutral.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGG-2	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>I have been unable to find the PIER. It is not linked at the top of your scheme webpage unlike all the other documents.</p> <p>There is no text to explain where the PIER is available. I contacted your call centre on 14 November and was told I would be called back, but have not received anything.</p> <p>Having referred back to the Section 48 notice, it does not say where on the webpage the documents can be found.</p> <p>This therefore doesn't comply with the amended APFP regulations 2020.</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges comments on how the consultation process has been carried out and how directions to documents could be made clearer. All documents associated with the Scheme, including the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>, were available under the 'Documents' section on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>The Section 48 notice includes the Scheme webpage address and indicated that this is where consultation materials could be found. It stated:</p> <p><i>'Copies of other consultation documents and plans will be available online and for inspection only at consultation events where you can also speak with the project team and share your views. Printed copies of consultation documents can be supplied on request, but there may be a charge applied in certain cases, to cover the cost of printing and postage.'</i></p> <p>Details were also included on page 14 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> outlining where more information could be viewed, including on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>Printed copies of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> were also available for inspection at public consultation events and could also be posted to individuals upon request.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that it has met the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments relating to the call centre and has fed this back to the Customer Contact Centre to look into why this matter was not resolved at the time.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>The consultation document didn't contain sufficient detail. It would have been much better if you had stated that there was more information on the web site, and given details of which information linked to which part of the consultation document.</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out.</p> <p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information relating to the impacts of the Scheme that was available at the time of the Scheme's development, to enable the consultees to provide informed feedback. This included a <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly-through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions at selected locations</i> as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings.</p> <p><i>Page 14</i> of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> provided information on where further copies of consultation materials were available including online.</p> <p>Printed copies of all consultation materials that were online were also available at consultation events and could be posted upon request as an alternative to the information available online.</p> <p>The <i>Consultation Brochure</i> included information regarding the key impacts of the Scheme in relation to traffic flows and network performance, walking and cycling routes and potential environmental effects during the construction and operational stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further information and data relating to environmental impacts and mitigation were available within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> documents.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Stakeholder engagement	<p>There to be an open communication channel to raise questions, concerns, feedback to National Highways throughout the entire process (from stages 3. Preliminary consultation to 7. Close Out)</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant will have an open line of communication available (throughout all stages of the Scheme) for any external queries to be raised. For any direct queries regarding the Scheme, the Consultee can contact the project team directly using the project email address:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Stakeholder engagement	Will community meets/ updates take place to keep residents updated?	2H		A46newarkbypass@nationalhighways.co.uk. This email address is also provided on the Scheme webpage.
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Stakeholder engagement	There is no information on how regularly National Highways going to inform local residents on the developments (assessment results, etc.) through pamphlets.	2I		The Applicant will provide regular updates on the Scheme throughout construction using the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as newsletters and public information events. The aim of this community engagement is to ensure that the Applicant can address any community concerns and identify ways to generate benefits and mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.  The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Stakeholder engagement	Continue to consult with the village. If money becomes an issue make sure the environmental issues are still addressed and not seen as 'add-on' luxuries. Thanks for the information thus far and the opportunity to comment.	2I	N	The Applicant will have an open line of communication available (throughout all stages of the Scheme) for any external queries to be raised. For any direct queries regarding the Scheme, the Consultee can contact the project team directly using the Scheme email address: A46newarkbypass@nationalhighways.co.uk. This email address is also provided on the Scheme webpage.  The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .  The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information of these engagement methods. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNZ-V	Stakeholder engagement	Whilst satisfied that the proposed improvements to the A46 bypass are necessary and will ease the flow of traffic through Newark, there are still some aspects of the plans which could be added.  The Think Again group which have had an excellent impact in the village and are supported by a large number of the village inhabitants. I support any other improvements they recommend.	2B	N	The Applicant notes the comments with regards to the engagement undertaken with the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group. Further information relating to engagement with this group can be found in Chapter 3 (ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> .  In response to the statutory consultation, the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group have outlined their main concerns surrounding the local impacts of the proposed Scheme including the road layout, safety, environmental impact and Public Rights of Way.
ANON-559H-RW3P-Q	Stakeholder engagement	However, notwithstanding my comments above we wholeheartedly support the work of Think Again Group and how it is doing the very best for our Village.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Stakeholder engagement	Its clear you have listened to residents and the Think Again village group and made satisfactory progress but the devil remains in the detailed execution to come.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	Stakeholder engagement	I support the work that has been undertaken by Think Again and feel that they have added significantly to the design going forward.	2C		
ANON-559H-RWFR-C	Stakeholder engagement	The Winthorpe action group 'Think Again' have been very pro-active with regard to ensuring the residents of the village are kept abreast of all developments and we fully support the actions they have taken. Going forward we will continue to be supportive of their campaign to ensure the village benefits as fully as possible from this project.	2H		
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Stakeholder engagement	We would like to thank you for taking on board the suggestions made by Think Again and look forward to continued communications between NHE and the local community groups.	2I		
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Stakeholder engagement	None, apart from we fully support the representations of our local Think Again Group which have already been made by them, and those which they will continue to make. As we are happy that they are attempting to champion the best interests of our Village.	2I		
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Stakeholder engagement	Pleased that meetings have been held with the Think Again campaign. Hope that consultations continue throughout.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Stakeholder engagement	The village Think Again campaign has rejected the thoughts, worries and concerns on our behalf. We fully support their involvement with National Highways and hope that the interaction continues.	2I		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW7H-K	Stakeholder engagement	I am concerned that a number of homeless people who are camping in the area between nether lock and the Nott/ Lincoln railway line will be 'cut off'. if access is closed during construction.	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Newark and Sherwood District Council's homelessness team specifically about the impact of the Scheme on this area. Information relating to ongoing engagement with stakeholders is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will monitor any impacts on this stakeholder group as the Scheme progresses and will continue to discuss this issue with Newark and Sherwood District Council in regular meetings with them.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Traffic forecasts	Your plans put more traffic on local roads that run through small villages	2B	N	<p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after the Scheme's opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads. Significant decreases are predicted on roads through Newark-on-Trent including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road. The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings and the volume of traffic flow decreases are presented in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWT8-Z	Traffic forecasts	I have heard conflicting comments about the volume of through traffic that will stay on the a46 thus reducing demand on the "local" roundabout structure. How much will traffic reduce on local infrastructure?	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Traffic forecasts	seek to reduce the amount of traffic using the A617 as the bridge at Kelham is totally unsuitable for modern lorries and the volume of traffic.	2D	N	<p>The traffic modelling forecasts that the traffic flows are not expected to significantly increase on the A617 as a result of the Scheme. Any increase is due to the grade separation of Cattle Market Junction removing congestion at the current roundabout, meaning more local traffic may use Cattle Market Roundabout to access Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The traffic modelling forecasts that there are forecast to be significant time savings on the A617 approach of Cattle Market Roundabout, as a result of the Scheme, which is due to the proposed grade separation at this junction.</p> <p>As the A617 is a local authority road, any measures regarding weight restrictions or restrictions on HGVs using the Kelham bridge would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority for the area.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMC-4	Traffic forecasts	Kelham bridge is not suitable for the traffic it carries at present and will not cope with an increase in traffic	2D		
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Traffic forecasts	Currently the volume of traffic on the A617 is too high for the road which is the main route from Newark A1 - Mansfield and the M1. These improvements could increase traffic to the A617 which is already too busy.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3H-F	Overall Scheme	The A617 to Mansfield is a terrible road that has long needed serious investment. If you have such a big budget spend some money there. A weight restriction is needed on Kelham bridge, if two HGVs meet nose to nose on the bridge, it is absolutely terrifying if you are on the footpath either walking or on your bike. Someone will get killed there eventually. Route the lorries along the A616.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW9C-G	Congestion	bottleneck at Kelham bridge can tail back to the roundabout	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Traffic forecasts; Walkers; cyclists and horse-riders	Your scheme will cause EXTRA traffic especially HGV vehicles. It is already dangerous to walk on the pavements in the village and I personally have been nearly hit by lorries whilst walking my dog on 5 occasions (4 on the corner near Brodgate Lane and once on the bridge). It is unsafe to cross the road most of the time and the lorries often mount the pavement on the tight bends.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Congestion	Traffic will still be along through Kelham due to hold ups at Grade I listed bridge (which is damaged often) so will be no quicker to get to Newark	2I		
ANON-559H-RWV7-1	Traffic forecasts	The Scheme seems to absolutely fail at doing its main objective of being a bypass for Newark. According to the estimates provided, traffic along the bypass will increase, but also the traffic on the B6166 through Newark will increase significantly. The bypass is an objective failure if it is increasing the traffic through Newark and no thought has been given to address the significant change in character to the impacted areas of the B6166 by increasing traffic.	2B	N	<p>The objectives, detailed in Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), that are being met as part of the Scheme are to improve the capacity of the single carriageway section of the A46 and associated junctions adjacent to Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) indicates that there is forecast to be no increase in traffic on the B6166 Lincoln Road in 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic). The Applicant acknowledges there is forecast to be an increase in traffic flow of around 8% by 2043. While an increase on the B6166 is forecasted, this occurs due to the A46 becoming a more attractive route. The traffic modelling that has been carried out comparing the Do Minimum scenario (without the Scheme) with the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme) shows that there is an increase in traffic along the A46 in both directions due to increased capacity and time savings as a result of the Scheme. Detailed information can be found in the Chapter 7.2 (Forecast Strategic Network Performance) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This includes assessing impacts upon local landscape character. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the scheme, with proposed planting aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors. The design and species selection has been informed by the <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> published by</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Newark and Sherwood District Council as well as site visits. Planting that would be provided is also key in aiding screening of the Scheme and to help soften its presence within the receiving environment and has been informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). Multidisciplinary teams all fed into the design to mitigate impacts on various receptors (e.g. heritage, ecology and landscape).
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Congestion	You wasted over 1 year with the last improvement to the Cattle Market island (just painting the white lines would have had same effect or better).	2I	N	The Applicant notes the comment with regards to previous improvements completed on Cattle Market Roundabout, this was not undertaken as part of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Traffic forecasts	The scheme has limitations in that it only improves the immediate area of the roads accessing the A46 and the A46 itself is widened alongside Newark.	2I	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (TR010065/APP/7.1) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (TR010065/APP/7.2) sets out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The key objectives of the Scheme are to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would directly contribute to the UK's, regional and local government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. This includes but is not limited to, noise and vibration, biodiversity, population and human health and air quality.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9N-U	Congestion	The different departments need to get together to better plan the effect on other roads besides the A46. Why not ban HGV vehicles on the bridge at Kelham?	2I	N	As the A617 is a local authority road, any measures regarding weight restrictions or restrictions on HGVs using the Kelham bridge would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the highway authority for the area.
BHLF-559H-RWD9-H	Land ownership; Traffic forecasts; Overall scheme	<p>Our clients control land at Owthorpe Road in Cotgrave, which they are promoting for employment development through the emerging Greater Nottingham Plan process. The site measures approximately 32.6 hectares ('ha') in area and [redacted] consider it can accommodate circa 1 million sqft of employment floorspace. It lies almost adjacent to the A46, separated only by the alignment of the former A46, prior to its rerouting. On that basis, [redacted] consider that the site, if brought forward for development, would benefit from strong access to the strategic highway network via the adjacent junction of the A46.</p> <p>[Redacted] are in favour of the principle of the highway improvements presented within the consultation material and wish to place on record their support for the scheme.</p> <p>Improvements to the existing route have the potential to stimulate economic growth along the A46 Corridor.</p> <p>According to the Midlands Connect Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor – Proposals for an Economic Development Strategy (May 2019), the A46 Corridor is one of the UK's most important trade routes, stretching for 155 miles from the M5 at Tewkesbury in Gloucestershire to Grimsby in Lincolnshire (and on to Hull via the A15). It is home to 5.5 million people and 2.9 million jobs, with an economic output of £115 billion a year (equivalent to 9% of the English economy).</p> <p>[Redacted] outlined within recent representations to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan 'Call for Strategic Distribution Sites', that the A46 Corridor was too easily discounted as an 'Area of Opportunity' within the Nottinghamshire Core and Outer Housing Market Area Logistics Study. It was discounted on the basis that the A46 could not be considered comparable to primary target areas (namely the M1 spine and its surrounds) on the basis that the route was not dualled. [Redacted] argued that plans were in place to upgrade this route and those presented could allow for the A46 Corridor to be considered an 'Area of Opportunity' either during this Development Plan making process, or a subsequent one.</p> <p>Earlier infrastructure improvements, including to the A46, have already established the A46 Corridor as an area with significant growth potential in the advanced manufacturing, automotive, aerospace, agricultural, logistics and textiles sectors. The works proposed and detailed within this consultation will further bolster the credentials of the A46 Corridor as a</p>	N/A	N	<p>The traffic modelling uses the Department for Transport growth forecasts to forecast flows in the future and takes into account the growth of HGVs.</p> <p>The modelling forecasts there to be no significant delays along the Scheme section of the A46, with the Scheme in place, which would allow for some extra growth in HGVs.</p> <p>A Development Uncertainty Log has been produced. This document contains information on future planned developments in close proximity to the Scheme and how these have been accounted for in the traffic forecasts. This Uncertainty Log was cross checked with the relevant local planning authorities and updated in line with the latest planning approvals, adding further residential and employment developments near the existing A46 corridor.</p> <p>The growth forecast and the additional volumes accounted for within the Uncertainty Log therefore provide capacity for future economic growth and opportunity for employment development, in line with the Scheme objective to accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent and the wider area.</p> <p>Further information regarding the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>suitable and attractive location for strategic distribution and/or other forms of employment development.</p> <p>[Redacted] support extends to the reduction of congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent thus improving journey times and reliability and welcomes the benefits to be derived from the progression of the scheme in terms of highway capacity and the reduction in volume of traffic on surrounding local routes. However, they wish to ensure that National Highways plan appropriately for the opportunities for increased economic development which may derive from the dualling of this section of the A46.</p> <p>As set out above, one of the major reasons why the A46 Corridor was not taken forward as an Area of Opportunity for employment development, was due to the absence of continual dualling. As this proposal seeks to rectify this, it is likely that the A46 Corridor will become a key location for strategic distribution and other forms of employment development and therefore [redacted] consider that the upgrade proposed should plan for the increased presence of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) on this part of the network, at the pre-construction stage rather than once the upgrades are complete. Consideration of this likelihood at this stage would reduce the need for further upgrades or amendments to be made to the route post-completion of the works.</p> <p>In summary, [redacted] are supportive of National Highways' aspirations to upgrade the A46 but wish to encourage consideration of the improvements alongside the potential for increased HGV usage of the upgraded route as a result of increased economic development potential in the area. This would avoid the need for additional upgrades to be required in the future.</p>			
ANON-559H-RWS3-T	Traffic forecasts	The Cattlemarket junction in the proposal is well layed out and looks like it will provide more than enough capacity for traffic at its location. It doesn't look like the brownhills and friendly farmer roundabouts will receive much improvement but is understandable considering the A46 traffic will bypass this.	2B	N	<p>The traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP.7.4</b>), predicts that at Cattle Market Roundabout delays reduce with the Scheme. Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts are predicted to see less traffic flow and no significant delays and as such, significant improvements are not required here.</p> <p>A new A46 slip road would be constructed to link the northbound A46 to the existing Brownhills Roundabout. This slip road would incorporate a new roundabout to provide access to the adjacent properties on Winthorpe Road and to provide a link to Brownhills Roundabout. A new bridge, the A1/A46 Crossing, would be constructed to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) forecasts that due to the A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFX-J	Congestion; A1/A46	I am happy with the Farndon and Cattle Market sections but I can't see how the A1/A46 interchange will significantly reduce congestion. I have read about the modelling but I think it needs more explanation.	2B	N	Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RW7W-2	A1; Congestion	I am concerned that there are no changes to the A1 sliproads/junction at all. I understand the new overbridge should significantly reduce traffic levels, but at the moment it seems like the slightest thing at the junction brings the mainline A1 to a standstill especially on the southbound carriageway. I am worried about the impact of the roadworks - when the recent ish junction improvements were done it ground the A1 to a halt most days.	2B		<p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) shows that the new bridge crossing the A1 (to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) would create a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and add extra capacity.</p> <p>Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads. During construction there are minimal works to be done on the existing Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and therefore the impact on the junction should be negligible.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions in order to understand how the new flows and turning movements at these junctions</p>
ANON-559H-RWS4-U	A1; Congestion	Option 2 seems best in my opinion. The only thing that bothers me is, will it make it better for the vehicles to get off the a1 south to access the a17 and a46 ,to lincoln and sleaford . i have seen queues as far back as north muskham .	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW6X-2	A1; Congestion	The only real hardship for all road users is on leaving the A1 on the south bound carriage-way, especially at peak periods. these plans do not appear to address this.	2I		
BHLF-559H-RWME-6	A1; Congestion; Road layout	one key issue you haven't touched on are the slip roads off both A1 south and north. They become heavily congested daily at most times of the day. You could argue that once you improve the roundabout layouts traffic will flow better and ease congestion	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWME-6	A1; Congestion; Road layout	but we are 6 years away from this. A simple extension of the slip roads existing. The A1 would mean that traffic could queue safely without the current land manoeuvring causing daily incidents. Unfortunately many of these turn out to be serious incidents.	2C		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	A1; Congestion; Road layout	3. your traffic flows along the A1 show 53,600-42,400 = 11,200 vehicles turning into Newark/A46. therefore, the current fairly short slip roads of the A1 would benefit from longer filter land under the A1 bridges north of Brownhills. this is currently a very dangerous area when congestion occurs on the A17 roundabout.	2B		would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually.
ANON-559H-RWEF-Y	A1; Congestion; Road layout	Please do something on your plan for the A1 south slip road onto the A46 roundabout- it's just not long enough to absorb queuing traffic and inevitable blockages and accidents occur. Gridlocking at this point slows everything down in the least dangerous scenario- multiple pile ups and deaths at the worst.	2B		This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queuing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Brownhills Roundabout to optimise their operation such as changes to signing and road markings.
ANON-559H-RWEQ-A	A1; Brownhills Roundabout; Congestion; Road layout	I had a major RTA in august which resulted with a HGV lorry smashing into my car on the a1 and turning my car upside down. Because of my swift responses I saved my own life but my car was flipped in the air and upside down so it's affected me massively. It's because the round about near brownhills was congested at 8.30am and resulted in the a1 slip road queing and so then the congestion was queing on the a1!! Pure neglect from the highway agencies for years and people are dying in that area! Something needs doing not only with the a46 but the slip roads on the a1 as they are far too short?? When is the is getting sorted as I can't see that in your proposals for the a46 improvements?	2B		The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.
BHLF-559H-RWWX-3	A1; Congestion	The reason for being dissatisfied is the slip road an A1 south at Winthorpe Roundabout. It is very dangerously short when trying to leave the A1 south, it quickly fills and leaves long queues parked on the A1 stationary with HGVs thundering down and having to divert to the fast lane, there has been a great number of fatalities here. Its almost always blocked by road traffic accidents on a Friday afternoon with a 10 mile queue	2B		
ANON-559H-RWMW-R	A1; Congestion	my main concern is the access to the A1 south and Newark mainline station during busy times. I do not believe you have addressed the inbound from Lincoln/Winthorpe congestion issue at the winthorpe end where the A46 crosses the A1 and commuters access the A1 south or travel into Newark for the London commuter trains. I believe the scheme makes this worse; you should at least aim for a current status quo.	2H	N	Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing (to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) would create a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and add extra capacity.  The improved capacity through the two roundabouts would allow traffic to gain entry to Lincoln Road more easily and then travel to the railway station and Newark town centre. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWGZ-N	A17/A46/A1; Traffic forecasts	I do feel that the bigger picture should have been taken into consideration, meaning the A1 and the A17 with the A46. If you take traffic away from the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts it would make sense. You could do this by KNOWHOW (Currys) and the Newark industrial estate having their own entrance and exit on and off the Ai. This would dramatically reduce the volume of lorries using the existing roundabouts.	2B	N	The Applicant has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the A1/A46 Crossing (to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) would create a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and add extra capacity. As a result of this, Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts are predicted to see less traffic flow and no significant delays.  Further information relating to traffic forecasts is presented within the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWBM-3	Congestion; Road layout	Proposed junction of new A46 onto A1 North looks a mess. Why using more roundabouts and existing slip road? This will surely lead to congestion, possibly backing up onto new bypass, at time of high load e.g. M1 north shut around Nottingham and traffic diverted A46 at Leicester to A1 at Newark.	2B	N	The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction.  An additional roundabout has been constructed on the new A46 northbound exit slip road to allow access to the adjacent properties and to allow connectivity to the Brownhills Roundabout.  The existing road layout that requires road users to access the A1 northbound from the Brownhills Roundabout has been retained as well as the road layout at the A1 exit slip road.  Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ) shows that the A1/A46 Crossing (to accommodate the new A46 alignment bypassing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts) would create a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and add extra capacity, therefore not impacting the existing A1 exit slip road.  The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation modelling of the forecast traffic movements at the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction to understand how the new flows and turning movements would impact its operation, the outcome of this modelling forecasts that congestion at the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction is not predicted to impact the operation of the A46.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					With regards to the example provided by the Consultee of 'high load' caused by diverted traffic impacting the A46 in this location, events of this nature have not been considered in the traffic modelling due to the varying nature of these scenarios making it a complex and uncertain undertaking within a traffic model. The Applicant has instead modelled a business-as-usual day.
ANON-559H-RW61-U	A1; Congestion	A local bus operator mentioned that the queues on the A1 approaching the A46 junction, both directions but southbound in particular, are a major safety concern as slow moving traffic builds in the nearside lane and approaching traffic is forced to slow as traffic changes lanes to avoid it. He was content that the scheme will remove this issue.	2H	N	<p>With the introduction of the new A1/A46 Crossing, all existing A46 mainline traffic would no longer travel through the Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout.</p> <p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme, prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>The existing road layout that requires road users to access the A1 northbound from the Brownhills Roundabout has been retained as well as the road layout at the A1 exit slip road.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout.</p> <p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, forecasts that due to the A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions to understand how the new flows and turning movements at these junctions would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout to optimise their operation such as changes to signing and road markings.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on the A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the mainline A1.</p>
ANON-559H-RW74-Y	Congestion	I was originally in favour of improving this final single-carriageway stretch of the A46, but now have serious reservations. I am not sure that this construction project will solve congestion issues as much I initially thought it would. I think the presence of the Farndon roundabout will mean that there are still significant queues.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling includes the year the Scheme opens to traffic (2028) and 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic (2043). The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads through Newark-on-Trent including the B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings and the volume of traffic flow decreases are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Additional measures, such as traffic lights and a third lane around the north/south existing A46 route has been added as part of the Scheme design at Farndon Roundabout, the road markings show the additional lane, and the signal stop lines and can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Signals would be full time on the widened A46 arms of Farndon Roundabout and lane sensors would be used where appropriate to help manage traffic flows during peak and off-peak times. These measures would slow traffic, allowing for a consistent control of flows both</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					through and into the roundabout and would provide inter-green gaps for traffic to enter the roundabout from Newark-on-Trent and Farndon.
BHLF-559H-RWTW-Y	Speed limit	I don't know why you are considering a 50mph section on the northern stretch, why slow down the traffic when creating a dual carriageway to make it easier to bypass the town.	2B	N	<p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p> <p>The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons to mitigate the hazards associated with the constrained highways geometry in this area.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3T-U	Congestion	Traffic flow needs careful monitoring at Farndon and Winthorpe to negate congestion	2B	N	<p>The Applicant will complete a Post Opening Project Evaluation one year after opening to compare the expected impacts of the Scheme with the outturn impacts, after construction has been completed and the Scheme is open to road users.</p> <p>The outcome of the Post Opening Project Evaluation would be published on the Applicant's Scheme webpage.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWW8-3	Congestion	I have a small concern that currently traffic hold-up on the Bypass will be passed from the CattleMarket Junction along to the Winthorpe Roundabout heading East and along to the Farndon Roundabout heading west.	2B		<p>The Scheme aims to accommodate future predicted traffic demand and improve traffic flows at Farndon Roundabout, adding an additional lane and traffic signals, and at Winthorpe Roundabout, developing it into a through-about.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZ4-2	Congestion; Road layout; Traffic lights/signals	It's very confusing. Will still have a build up of traffic, the traffic signals will make congestion worse!	2B		<p>Traffic modelling undertaken shows that there are no significant delays at the Farndon or Winthorpe roundabouts following the grade separation of Cattle Market Junction. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWQA-6	Congestion	You need to ensure that you have a contingency to minimise negative impact on the stretch between North Muskham and Newark. Pushing the problem of traffic out of town (if the impact on traffic levels on the Muskham-Newark stretch is accurate) will create problems elsewhere.	2B	N	<p>The traffic modelling predicts that in 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic) there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the A616/B6325 between North Muskham, and Newark-on-Trent, and a decrease on the A1. However, the model predicts that there is forecast to be no significant delays along this stretch with the increase in flows predicted.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RW7P-U	Congestion	The scheme will do nothing to alleviate congestion within Newark town and will only cause problems with our natural environment during a time when we need to be reducing disruption to our environment to help alleviate global warming.	2C	N	<p>One of the Scheme's objectives is to improve journey times along the existing A46 and its junctions between Farndon and Winthorpe. Traffic modelling completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) considers traffic models for the year the Scheme opens to traffic (2028) and 15 years later (2043). Results of this modelling showed that delays along this journey would significantly reduce, and the network would cope with much higher demands as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW94-1	Congestion	it's not just the bypass that is affected. The whole of Newark is a nightmare most times of the day.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Congestion	In addition, only time will tell how the scheme, which is heavily A46-focused, improves or otherwise, the horrendous traffic conditions in and around Newark.	2I		
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Traffic forecasts; Congestion	Ridiculous waste of time, money and resources. It will make traffic in and around Newark far worse than it is now.	2B		<p>Modelling shows that most of the traffic increase is forecast to be travelling along the A46 to bypass Newark-on-Trent. The Scheme's implementation would lead to a better flow of traffic and a reduction in congestion. Modelling recognised that some roads within Newark-on-Trent are forecast to experience increased traffic, however, despite this increase in traffic, the model still shows an overall reduction in delays on roads through Newark-on-Trent.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Construction; Traffic forecasts	According to the map in your consultation material pg. 31, the construction work on A46, which was originally aimed to decrease traffic into Newark town, will actually increase traffic on the B6166 (Lincoln Road, North Gate) all the way to B6326 (Great North Road) .	2B		<p>The increase in traffic along part of the B6166 from Great North Road to Brownhills Roundabout is due to vehicles rerouting from the centre of Newark instead of using Cattle Market Junction as the reduction in congestion at Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout makes this more attractive.</p> <p>Traffic would be travelling along the A46 to bypass Newark-on-Trent and therefore not enter the town. However, some roads in the town would experience an increase in traffic. Despite this, the traffic within the town would benefit from the Scheme as the modelled reduction in delays would lead to better traffic flow and overall, a reduction in congestion.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) as part of its development consent application, this provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.</p> <p>A phased approach to construction of some sections of the Scheme, particularly at the new and modified junctions, would be adopted to maintain traffic movements during the construction programme. The phasing at the junctions would be determined by the temporary traffic management requirements and the need to minimise disruption to the local surroundings, environment, residents, businesses, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Construction traffic would not go through the centre of Newark and would access the site entry points directly from the existing A46 or from the nearest route from A46 junctions without passing through the centre. Access to the new road construction and viaduct works at Nether Lock (Work No. 56 and Work No. 58 to 68 as shown on the Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>) would be assessed via Trent Lane and Maltkins Lane.</p> <p>Construction traffic for these areas would access along Lincoln Road from the Brownhills Roundabout and would not be permitted to travel through the town centre. Information regarding the construction programme, associated works and compounds can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Further information regarding construction traffic can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6C-D	Congestion; Newark Castle level crossing	You are no doubt aware that Newark itself frequently suffers severe traffic jams and it is of grave concern that you quote an extra vehicles entering one of the worst bottlenecks at the dreaded level crossing by Castle station. It is probably the worst problem the town has, and it seems ludicrous that it is not being attended to when an enormous amount of money will be spent 'just down the road'. It is not only the Great North Road becoming blocked by the deadlock promotes the whole central network of the town frequently. I appreciate that it is not part of your scheme, but it will still affect the Cattle market Junction despite your efforts.	2B	N	<p>Local traffic accessing Newark-on-Trent town centre is forecast to increase on Great North Road. The annual average daily traffic flow on the section of the B6326 Great North Road immediately south of the Cattle Market Roundabout is forecast to increase from 13,400 in the Do Minimum scenario, to 17,800 in the Do Something scenario in 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic), an increase of 4,400 vehicles per day (+33%). However, traffic modelling predicts a reduction in delays and congestion along Great North Road towards the Cattle Market Junction as a result of the new grade separated Cattle Market Junction with the A46.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFM-7	Newark Castle level crossing	Ensure that tailback from the level-crossing does not impinge on traffic flow around Cattlemarket roundabout (is the extra crossing-approach lane included in the scheme sufficient?)	2B		<p>The Scheme would provide a new grade separated junction at Cattle Market Junction, with the widened A46 elevated to pass over the existing Cattle Market Roundabout. The existing roundabout would be enlarged beneath to provide increased capacity.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEZ-K	Newark Castle level crossing	Traffic Flows and Journey Times My only area of concern is the predicted increase by 4,500 to 21,400 at the grade level crossing next to Castle Station. When the barriers are down for any length of time (and that length of time has become greater since NR relocated signalling to Derby) the whole of the town locks up (this is no exaggeration) This problem will only become exacerbated. I suppose some things have to "give".	2H		<p>The traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme includes the Newark Castle level crossing. The traffic modelling indicates an improvement in conditions on Great North Road as a result of the upgrade to the Cattle Market Junction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXT-Z	Newark Castle level crossing	We are hoping the planned scheme will relieve the congestion to our town centre and will make it easier to get to the railway station crossing without queueing back from the marina.  You have to allow extra time if you have a train to catch.	2B		<p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and modelling is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Newark Castle level crossing	*Traffic on Great North Road*  The HE traffic model as presented in the consultation brochure shows a predicted large and significant increase in traffic using Great N Road in/out of Newark.  This road is frequently affected by the railway crossing barrier down time (when they are not striking) leading to traffic queues around the town centre. Rather than the A46 project helping and improving this issue and helping traffic in the town centre it is actually going to make the situation far worse by adding 4,500 additional daily movements onto Great North Road. The queues for the railway barriers will be longer and the A46 project will lead to worse traffic around the town centre not less. It will impact on the vitality and viability of the historic retail centre, already in decline as common with many towns. On this issue alone the project will be detrimental to Newark, its economy and history.	2B		<p>Improving the level crossing itself is not required by the Scheme, as the Scheme does not worsen or change the existing situation in relation to crossing operation and safety. Therefore, the Scheme is not required to mitigate the current delays caused by the level crossing. Newark and Sherwood District Council have advised the Applicant that they are discussing improvements to the crossing with Network Rail.</p>
ANON-559H-RW8F-J	Newark Castle level crossing	Widen the road passing Newark Castle Station, adding a second inbound lane to alleviate queues at the level crossing.	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWXX-4	Newark Castle level crossing	Feel the link from Newark to the Cattle Market island is inadequate with all the traffic and potential development in the area. The local railway line needs a bridge, to convey traffic to the island.	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWWF-H	Newark Castle level crossing	Would be interested to learn more about the level crossing proposals; but otherwise have no further comments	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGE-Z	Overall scheme; Congestion; Newark Castle level crossing	The sooner you start building work, the quicker Newark will be relieved of the congestion that it suffers. It was a pity that nothing could be done about the railway	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWWN-S	Newark Castle level crossing	<p>I was disappointed to see the design didn't include a solution to the traffic problem over the railway crossing near the castle. Having spoken to someone at one of the consultation days. I realise the railways would have to have been involved.</p> <p>I feel a golden opportunity has been missed to solve this once and for all. Either over the railway into Newark and a construction out through Tolney Lane or Kelham Road out of town. It would take some thought but could be achieved I'm sure, or a viaduct for the railway raising the station and platforms up making traffic free flowing underneath.</p> <p>Both would be costly I know, but what price the cost of towns folk on their commute, pollution (air quality), mental health (through congestion) and road safety in the town</p>	2B		
ANON-559H-RWWN-S	Congestion; Newark Castle level crossing; Road layout	<p>There are some benefits to the scheme, but there are also several disadvantages, some of which are serious detriments.</p> <p>The changes to the flow of traffic and safety on the A46 seem sensible, particularly the section around Brownhills and the A1.</p> <p>I live close to the Cattle Market Island, which is also very close to the town centre, and as I know this area well, I have some more detailed comments about this section of the Scheme.</p> <p>Great North Road is already a busy road into Newark, and the consultation document (p30-31) suggests that the traffic on this road will increase by around a quarter. We need much more detail about how this is to be mitigated. This is a residential area, with a station, shops, car parks, small businesses and the local council offices. Many pedestrians and cyclists use the area in addition to motor vehicles, so it is critical that this area becomes safer not more dangerous.</p> <p>I have serious concerns about the following, so please provide more information about:</p> <p>(i) What is going to happen regarding the congestion caused by the level crossing? This is currently disruptive to the whole town as well as occasionally to the A46. You state on p 21 of the consultation document that plans 'would be developed', but it is critical that any plan to change the Cattle Market junction factors in a proper plan to deal with this.</p> <p>(ii) What will be the impact on the Great North Road/Kelham Road junction? This is already a difficult junction for road users turning right out of Kelham Rd into Newark, where accidents have taken place. The plans appear to show that in the new Scheme there will be two lanes in each direction at this point. If nothing else changes, this will mean that it is frequently impossible to turn right out of Kelham Road.</p>	2B	N	<p>With regards to the Consultee's comment relating to the existing traffic on Great North Road and congestion caused by Newark Castle level crossing, an additional lane has been provided within the Scheme design from Cattle Market Roundabout down to Kelham Road.</p> <p>This is to account for the predicted growth in traffic using the route, shown in traffic modelling, that would have happened under both Do Minimum (without the Scheme) and the Do Something (with the Scheme) modelling scenarios. Further details on forecast modelling can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>This is to provide additional space and prevent queuing caused by Newark Castle level crossing extending through the Cattle Market Roundabout. The access to the lorry park would be moved south and signalised with central islands added to allow pedestrians and cyclist to cross the road. The speed limit along this section of carriageway would be reduced from 60mph to 30mph for additional safety.</p> <p>Further details of the Scheme design can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The speed limits of the Scheme are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comment relating to the Great North Road/Kelham Junction, traffic modelling undertaken has shown that the junction at Kelham Road is not affected by the Scheme, and no works are proposed here.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMK-C	Congestion	I would like to know how the proposed works will affect traffic congestion on Farndon Road. having lived on Farndon Road for 19 years, I have seen that every time there is a traffic problem on the A46 Newark Bypass, a great deal of traffic increase. HGV's divert down Farndon road, sometimes making it impossible to get into the town by car without accepting a very long queue.	2B	N	<p>Traffic modelling predicts a significant reduction in traffic using Farndon Road as more vehicles are forecast to reroute onto the widened A46 instead of travelling through the centre of Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Traffic modelling for 2028 (year the Scheme is open to traffic) indicates that there is forecast to be a reduction in the average daily traffic volumes using Farndon Road from 9,100 vehicles in the Do Minimum scenario (without the Scheme) to 4,400 in the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme), a reduction of around 4,700 vehicles per day (-52%).</p> <p>At the Farndon Roundabout, an additional lane and traffic signals would be added to improve traffic flow at the junction. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXX-4	Road layout; Congestion	By ensuring small roads and local "cut-throughs" are left untouched, allowing local population to use these when traffic build up is heavy.	2D	N	The Scheme only improves the existing A46 bypass between the Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts into a dual carriageway. The local roads would not be physically altered as part of the Scheme.  Further information relating to the Scheme design are provided within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWSA-8	Congestion	Will assist residents of North Muskham as we are regularly 'trapped ' in our village by traffic. Fridays we can take 30-60 mins to get to Newark - a 5 minute journey.	2B	N	The traffic modelling forecasts that there would be less delay at Cattle Market, Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts, improving the journey time to Newark-on-Trent from North Muskham. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWSV-W	Congestion	Looks like it will help with the congestion	2B	N	The Scheme would provide more capacity on the existing A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after the Scheme's opening). This would make the existing A46 a more attractive route for road users and would encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent.  Current traffic model forecasts predict that the Scheme would reduce traffic flow on most local roads through Newark-on-Trent including B6326 London Road, Barnaby Road, Beacon Hill Road, Beckingham Road, Drove Lane, Farndon Road and Fosse Road.  The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings and the volume of traffic flow decreases are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWSE-C	Traffic forecasts; Congestion	this improvement is long overdue, it will minimise traffic from looking for alternative routes when the current single lane carriageway is gridlocked and hopefully improving the flow of traffic in the town	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8F-J	Congestion	Upgrading the bypass, and in particular bridging the roundabouts, will reduce congestion throughout Newark and on the two roads heading west from the centre of Newark. This was obviously necessary from the first day I drove on the upgraded Newark to Widmerpool stretch of the A46. All objections that I heard against the Newark to Widmerpool upgrade were purely for selfish financial reasons, and should have been discounted decades (and hundreds of fatalities, millions of lost hours and hundreds of millions of pounds lost to the local economy) before the work finally commenced. It would have been far cheaper to compensate those individuals than the cost of delaying improvements	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSF-D	Congestion	This is long overdue. The congestion on Fridays and Saturday mornings especially is terrible and often queuing from The Cattle Market roundabout past the Farndon roundabout onto the dual carriageway. In frustration people then try to go through the town centre which then also gets blocked up.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWTJ-J	Congestion	It will stop the whole of the town coming to a stop on a Friday night when people are on their way home or going away for the weekend.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW68-2	Congestion	please get it done! the sooner the better! let's get rid of the amount of congestion in and around Newark. There are times (particularly Fridays) when I avoid A46 like the plague.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWZ9-7	Congestion	The scheme is long overdue. Once complete, I hope that the traffic congestion leading from Nottingham toward the A1 is a thing of the past.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWF9-K	Congestion	I regularly travel to Newark to/from Collingham and am strongly in favour of the scheme to improve the A46 Newark bypass. Major improvements are particularly required around the Brownhills, Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts. Congestion at these junctions not only significantly increases medium/long distance journey times throughout the region, but also has a major impact on local traffic, with roads into and around Newark regularly becoming gridlocked.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW9P-W	Congestion	It is needed to 'ease' congestion especially Fridays which are a nightmare. As a pensioner who has relatives in Derby I use the road to visit but coming back sometimes it can take twice as long. I look forward to the improvements with expectations of contentment knowing it will not be helter skelter! Thank you	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3J-H	Congestion	I'm sure there will be a few issues as the work goes along. That's to be expected.  With the use of flyovers/bridges this will help to let traffic flow easily with less congestion for Newark.	2C		
ANON-559H-RW61-U	Congestion	The scheme is well suited to resolving the issues that have plagued the A46/ A17/ A1 almost since the by-pass was opened, and have become significantly worse over the course of the past 10 years.  Through journeys on the A46 (south to north in particular) suffer the worst delays. Journey times through the area are anything up to 45-60mins longer at peak times than in 2000, the scheme as presented is expected to reduce journey times and hopefully back to those of 2000. The arrangement of grade separated junctions is strongly supported.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Congestion	In terms of improving traffic flow and relieving congestion it seems workable. In fact how the situation affects me as it stands now is not down to heavy traffic per se but rather impatient, intolerant and dangerous drivers who gave me a headache when I had a car and continue to give me one now I use a bicycle.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWS2-S	Congestion	Anything that avoids the mistakes of previous road 'improvements' is a massive boost to Newark and its surrounding villages. The existing A46 bypass had short term and limited benefit to the area, as traffic was much lower due to the single carriageway roads connecting	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		Lincoln to Widmerpool. It was extremely short sighted to make the Newark bypass single carriageway, when it was initially built. At the time, it must have been a planning consideration that eventually the A46 would be dualled from Lincoln to Widmerpool. In effect, that would connect the A1 to the M1 via dual carriageway. As soon as the dueled sections opened from Lincoln to Widmerpool, traffic chaos frequently returned to the Newark area again! Accidents or road closures on either of those two main roads cause gridlock in and around Newark, which has historically been a bottleneck for traffic. Add into the equation the fact that the A617, the A616 and the A17, all head into Newark meeting at the A46/ A1. All three are major coastal routes from the midlands during the summer months and the A17 a major route for HGVs going to and from the Ferry ports at Felixstowe and Harwich. Any previous road improvement planning missed the target by a country mile, if it was the intention to reduce the severe traffic problems that this area faces on frequent occasions.  The proposed new plan looks like it will resolve many of the traffic issues that cause those problems.			
ANON-559H-RWE8-H	Congestion	It all looks very promising and hopefully will proceed smoothly.  At the moment if the A617 has a problem (eg flooding on the Kelham Road) and traffic is diverted onto the A616 there are huge traffic queues and tail backs for often for miles and it can take over an hour to get from Kelham to Newark - that is without road works!	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWM8-S	Congestion	Realised road links desperately need addressing...Newark ring road is unpredictable and often gridlocked.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWA3-8	Congestion	I agree that the current ring road around Newark is not fit for purpose and causes major disruption	2I		
ANON-559H-RWSB-9	Congestion	I think it will make things a lot quicker for people during rush hour. However I am not usually effected by this.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGB-W	Consultation – positive feedback	Having seen the flythrough presentation at your information van recently and had the details explained I am very impressed with the design and can clearly see the benefits this will bring to my journeys through this part of the A46.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBY-F	Congestion	Required for Newark and A46 traffic movement which can be horrendous at times.	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWQQ-P	Congestion	Only that this has taken far too long. I have travelled the A46 from warwick on a regular basis. A brief halt at a roundabout south of coventry. A clear run along the M1 passing Leicester and Nottingham to come to a complete standstill at Newark.	2I	N	The Scheme would make the existing A46 safer for road users as well as reduce closures, congestion, and delays. The traffic modelling forecasts that the journey time along the widened A46 would decrease along with delays at the junctions surrounding Newark-on-Trent. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNK-D	A17/A46/A1	inadequate provision for HGV traffic off A17W wishing to join A1N. Drove Lane unsuitable/unsafe for inevitable short cut to Winthorpe roundabout. poor provision for HGV traffic off A46N trying to join A17E: too many roundabouts.	2B	N	Traffic modelling forecasts a decrease in traffic using the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts as a result of the Scheme, due to the presence of the A1/A46 Crossing removing traffic from the roundabouts. This would significantly reduce delays and improve journey times for traffic travelling to and from the A17 in both directions, including HGVs. There is a forecast to be a marginal decrease in the number of HGVs on Drove Lane as a result of the Scheme, with daily flows reducing from around 200 to 100 in 2028.
ANON-559H-RWNK-D	Traffic forecasts; A17	greater awareness and provision required of/for high volume of HGV traffic to/from A17	2H		Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> . The roundabouts are deemed suitable for HGVs use and are designed to cater for these.
ANON-559H-RW3D-B	Traffic forecasts	I understand that they are moving the lorry park from Newark up to the showground which is going to increase heavy traffic driving past the village all times of the day.	2C	N	The traffic movements relating to the lorry park's current location on Great North Road are included within the traffic modelling.  In relation to the Consultee's comment about the relocation of the lorry park, a Development Uncertainty Log has been produced by the Applicant. This document contains information on future 'certain' or 'more than likely' planned developments in close proximity to the Scheme and how these have been accounted for in the traffic forecasts. This can be viewed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .  The modelling does not account for a potential change in the location of the lorry park, as at the time of modelling the potential relocation of the lorry park was uncertain.
BHLF-559H-RWT9-1	Traffic lights/signals; Congestion	Traffic lights at roundabouts will help traffic flow.	2B	N	Traffic signals have been included within the Scheme to improve traffic flow. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWMB-3	Congestion; Environment - general	Traffic flow will cause less environmental impact.	2C	N	The Scheme aims to reduce congestion and deliver better environmental outcomes as a result. Further information regarding environmental impacts can be found in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWM5-P	Road layout	Accessing the A46 North to Lincoln from Newark town centre would appear to be less free flowing than the current arrangement provides with the dedicated slip at the Friendly Farmer roundabout. Access into Newark from the A46 Lincoln also appears to be more convoluted than the current arrangement.	2B	N	Traffic modelling shows that delays along the A46 North to Lincoln should reduce and that there should be a reduction in traffic in Newark-on-Trent town, improving the journey from Newark-on-Trent town to the A46 North.  The route into Newark-on-Trent town from Lincoln along the existing A46 would change with the Scheme due to changes at Winthorpe Roundabout and the new Friendly Farmer Link Road.  These changes would accommodate forecast traffic flow and help improve journey times. Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RW31-R	Traffic forecasts	Need to anticipate additional increases of road traffic at this stage.	2B	N	Traffic modelling has been carried out to predict the likely growth of traffic and analyse the effects of the Scheme. This includes a Development Uncertainty Log which contains information on future planned developments in close proximity to the Scheme and how these have been accounted for in the traffic forecasts. This Uncertainty Log was cross checked with the relevant local planning authorities and updated in line with the latest planning approvals, adding further residential and employment developments near the existing A46 corridor.  Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Traffic forecasts	If you make more roads you'll just get more traffic. Check your statistics it's true. Get us off the road for our health sake please	2C	N	One of the key objectives of the Scheme is to address traffic congestion challenges on the existing A46 around Newark-on-Trent, including improvements to walking and cycling facilities through safer, enhanced routes.  Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> , forecasts an increase in traffic on the A46. Without the Scheme, the Transport Assessment concludes that this higher demand would result in long queues forming. The design of the Scheme would improve traffic flow through the road network and assist with the higher demand originating from the increase of traffic on the A46.  The Scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit including the interrogation of personal injury accident data to consider whether there are any potential safety risks in the areas where the Scheme would increase traffic levels. The Road Safety Audit is summarised in Chapter 4 (Road Safety) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .  During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> a Traffic Management plan will be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network.  The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> submitted with the application.
ANON-559H-RWBJ-Z	Traffic forecasts; A1; Speed limit	Your forecast traffic flows on A1 Northbound show as reducing with the new scheme, this seems unlikely.  Newark is currently a cut through, with traffic trying to avoid delays at junctions, as an added disincentive the scheme could include a maximum speed limit of 30mph in all of Newark and Coddington roads.	2B	N	Current traffic modelling forecasts relatively small changes in traffic flows on the A1 around Newark-on-Trent as a result of the Scheme. In 2043 the Scheme is forecast to result in a 1% increase in traffic flows on the section of the A1 to the south of Newark-on-Trent, a 1% reduction on the section between the A46 and Great North Road and a 3% increase on the section to the north of Newark-on-Trent.  The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>All local roads would retain the speed limits currently in place on the existing road network except for a short length on Great North Road south of Cattle Market, which would be reduced from national speed limit to 30mph.</p> <p>The speed limits of the Scheme are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>). Any further changes to speed limits on side roads would come from the local highway authority.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Traffic forecasts; Traffic lights/signals	My concerns to the proposed preliminary design are...information and traffic simulations need to be provided for traffic flow and traffic light sequencing.	2B	N	<p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and the modelling process is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>). Traffic modelling assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme opens to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043). The junctions included as part of the Scheme design performed well for both years. Information relating to traffic signal timings is also provided within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWN4-P	Traffic forecasts	How did you calculate traffic forecasts in the medium-long term?	2B	N	<p>The traffic model has been developed to analyse the impact of the Scheme on traffic flows and journey times on the road network. Models and traffic forecasts were produced for the following years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2019 (base year)</li> <li>• 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic)</li> <li>• 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening)</li> <li>• 2061 (the horizon year - this represents the last year included in the National Trip End Model data sets which forms the basis for traffic forecasts)</li> </ul> <p>The model has a focus on the area immediately affected by the Scheme, but it also covers the whole of Great Britain. This is because the Scheme model is based on a wider regional traffic model which contains all roads of A and B classification in detail and covers the wider Midlands/North areas, while the whole of England is included in coarse detail outside the Midlands/North areas. It includes a representation of the road network and looks at where the demand for trips starts and ends, split into five user classes.</p> <p>The model is used to inform traffic forecasts the Scheme for three modelled years: 2028, 2043 and 2061. Two key scenarios are compared within each forecast year, a scenario without the Scheme (Do Minimum scenario) and with the Scheme (Do Something scenario).</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and modelling process is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQX-W	Traffic forecasts	<p>looking at future traffic flows and future growth and expansion in the northeast. What time in future plays its park in your planning?</p> <p>- is it 30 years?</p> <p>- is it 50 years +</p> <p>page 30 doesn't reflect this!</p>	2H	N	<p>The traffic model has been developed to analyse the impact of the Scheme on traffic flows and journey times on the road network. Models and traffic forecasts were produced for the following years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2019 (base year)</li> <li>• 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic)</li> <li>• 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening)</li> <li>• 2061 (the horizon year – this represents the last year included in the <i>National Trip End Model</i> data sets which forms the basis for traffic forecasts)</li> </ul> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and modelling process is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Traffic forecasts	Please provide details of current (2022) traffic levels across all roads, so we can put in context the anticipated traffic volumes, with and without the scheme (Overview brochure, P31)	2H	N	<p>The Do Minimum scenario shows what traffic flows would be like in the forecast years without the Scheme, and the Do Something scenario shows what traffic flows would be like in the forecast years with the Scheme. These two scenarios are directly comparable and show what the traffic would be like with and without the Scheme. The 2022 flows are not able to be provided as they have not been reported on. Models and traffic forecasts were produced for the following years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2019 (base year)</li> <li>• 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic)</li> <li>• 2043 (15 years after the Scheme opening)</li> <li>• 2061 (the horizon year – this represents the last year included in the <i>National Trip End Model</i> data sets which forms as the basis for traffic forecasts)</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Further information relating to traffic forecasts and the modelling process is available within Chapter 7 (Network Performance) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RW7K-P	Overall scheme; Traffic forecasts; Speed limit	Can the estimated time saved be confirmed please and can you show accurate timings, can a reduce speed limit be put into the equation too.  I now believe that the time saved will be minimal but the cost will be phenomenal and will continue to rise during this difficult economic situation that England is currently experiencing.  I strongly suggest that the scheme should be rejected.	2B	N	The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .  The journey time savings and other factors are used to assess the benefit cost ratio of the Scheme, if this is above 1, as is the case for the Scheme, then it shows that the benefits outweigh the cost. Further information relating to this is available within the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> .  Simply reducing the speed limit on the existing A46, as suggested by the Consultee, would not improve journey times as the links between junctions are impacted by slow moving vehicles and the junctions themselves are major bottle necks for both A46 through traffic and local traffic crossing or joining the A46.
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Traffic forecasts	The policy in principal is welcome but this solution misses a few key points. I'd be really interested to see proper traffic analysis figures - the ones in this set of documents are meaningless.	2B	N	Further information relating to traffic forecasts is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> which has been submitted as part of the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Traffic forecasts; A17; Drove Lane	Can you confirm what %age of the current traffic heading East round Newark continues onto the Showground roundabout? I'm concerned that A17 bound traffic will continue on the bypass, come off at the Showground roundabout and drive down Drove Lane to access the A17. This is not a safe route for high volumes of traffic but drivers will suss out it will miss the jams through multiple roundabouts.	2B	N	The traffic modelling indicates that in 2028 just over 70% of traffic continues east after the Brownhills Junction exit slip road on the existing A46 to Winthorpe Roundabout. The traffic modelling forecasts show that traffic using the A17 from the existing A46 use the Brownhills Junction and Friendly Farmer Roundabout route rather than using Drove Lane to access the A17. The traffic modelling predicts that there would be a reduction in traffic on Drove Lane.  Further details of the traffic modelling carried out is available in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWEG-Z	Congestion	I'm afraid that the proposed scheme design whilst improving many aspects of the current layout will create certainly one and potentially two new hotspots for delays, resulting congestion and risk of accidents.	2B	N	One of the Scheme's key objectives is user safety. Safety measures would be provided throughout the Scheme to reduce accidents. These measures include the compliance with relevant <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> standards, including the width of carriageways, speed limits dependant on carriageway geometry and traffic lights. The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWGM-8	Road layout	Please build in a bus stop within the local link road to allow public access to Showground	2B	N	The scope of the Scheme does not include the implementation of bus stops. The provision of additional bus stops would be dependent on the county council's consideration and implementation.
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Road layout	Can a bus stop be considered to access the Showground	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Overall scheme	We need to focus on less private vehicle more public transport and less extended roadways and it's horrendous destruction of our local green spaces	2B	N	Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on an Alternative Modes Assessment that was carried out on the Scheme, which suggested that the existing public transport network does not generally offer comparable alternatives to cars for most movements. Small traffic flows were distributed over a large area and therefore are not suited to be catered for by public transport.  Therefore, a review of the largest public transport flows (represented by local bus services) suggested that there was no obvious non-highways intervention that could cater to any substantial proportion of these flows.  Possible solutions for the Scheme were identified by the Applicant through collating evidence relating to network performance issues and engaging with local stakeholders.
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Overall scheme	investment in public transport in the area to discourage short journeys into Newark	2D		
ANON-559H-RWGJ-5	Overall scheme	Don't do it use the money to improve our public transport and environment	2D		
ANON-559H-RWG1-C	Overall scheme	I would like to see the project cancelled with investment re-routed to excellent high quality local public transport, cycle ways, safe walk routes, 15 minute communities and analysis to existing roads and road infrastructure to improve problems in Newark. This should happen as part of a wide ranging national strategic plan.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWMF-7	Overall scheme	Ultimately, capacity will just be filled by more motorists. I'd rather the money be spent on improving public transport links, which will actually reduce congestion by getting cars off the road.	2H		



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNA-3	Overall scheme	This is a totally unnecessary proposal. Study after study has shown that all this will do is induce higher demand for motor traffic in the area. Given the choice I would prefer to do the majority of my trips which utilise this section of road (from/to the above address to near Woodall Spa using the A46 / A17) via a decent public transport system. That is the direction that the country's infrastructure investment should be made. It is simply madness to continue to spend resources and emissions on inefficient, energy intensive modes of transportation.	2H		<p>The Scheme aims to improve the existing A46, improving safety and journey times. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) indicates that the improvement on the existing A46 would reduce the amount of traffic on other local roads as more traffic would utilise the improved, widened A46.</p> <p>Buses would benefit from these highway improvements and be able to deliver more efficient and reliable services on both the strategic and local road network.</p> <p>The A46 is a strategic route, and as such, one of the aims is to improve journey times for motorised vehicles. However, the Scheme includes significant improvements to walking and cycling routes around Winthorpe and creates good links to Newark Showground from Newark and Winthorpe. Further information regarding these can be found in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant's statutory remit is to manage and maintain the strategic road network, and the delivery of the Scheme seeks to enable traffic to stay on strategic routes, therefore reducing delays and congestion. The problems along the existing A46 need road improvement solutions consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, as pursued via the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> for upgrading the existing A46 to a high-quality dual carriageway between Lincoln and Gloucestershire. Much of this road is already high-quality dual carriageway, and by filling in key sections, a coast-to-coast highway can be created without need for major new road building across open countryside. The single greatest gap in this route is the A46 at Newark.</p> <p>The Scheme is identified as a capital enhancement in the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), set out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is not responsible for the implementation or management of public transport facilities in the area of the Scheme. Alternative transport measures (including rail improvements) would make little headway in addressing the problems on the existing A46; instead the proposed road improvement is needed to address the problems and deliver the objectives set for the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Overall scheme	However you could also seek to reduce traffic by improving local cycling routes and increasing public transport. Buses to Averham have reduced significantly in the last 10 years due to privatisation and austerity cuts and their service is now very poor.	2D		
ANON-559H-RW9B-F	Overall scheme	The first opportunity to increase East - West rail traffic by bridging the London to Edinburgh railway was lost when the first Newark bypass was built. It would be interesting to know how much, if any, thought was given to including an East - West railway bridge as part of the proposed works. This would improve railway connectivity in both directions and allow scope to move traffic from road to railway in accordance with government policy. To minimise the impact- don't do it.	2D	N	<p>Any future changes to the East Coast Mainline are not included as part of the Scheme, however the Scheme design does not prevent a future grade separation of the Nottingham to Lincoln Line over the East Coast Main Line from taking place as the corridor has been retained between the widened embankment for the existing A46 and the existing railway.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with representatives from Network Rail on relevant design issues relating to nearby railway assets and to support the development of a Statement of Common Ground, which will be submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the examination.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Overall scheme	*Lack of joined up thinking*  It is vital that the scheme does not prevent the future building of a railway flyover at Crankley Point. The East Coast Main Line is itself a nationally important transport asset and its capacity is constrained by the current flat railway crossing. Space is needed not just for the actual flyover but for its construction. Network Rail need to provide public assurance that they are happy the A46 plans do not prevent their own plans. The Secretary of State Transport also should not be signing anything off without such assurance.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW3C-A	Overall scheme	There doesn't seem to be any reference to the train lines that passes through the route. How does this proposal affect any expansion or alterations of local junctions? Will the proposed changes to the east coast main line / local line junction be included in this project?	2H		
ANON-559H-RWE4-D	Overall scheme	Better quality rail (frequencies & stock) from Newark to Nottingham and Lincoln!	2D	N	The frequency and stock of trains is beyond the scope of the Scheme. The Scheme's key objective is to upgrade the section of the existing A46. Any decisions regarding rail schedules would come from the local rail operator.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQ5-T	Speed limit	50 mph max on all sections	2B	N	<p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by and included within the Scheme. Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) outlines the speed limits and illustrations are provided on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p> <p>The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry in this area.</p> <p>The Friendly Farmer Link Road between Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout would be 50mph, with the speed limit of Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout and the link between them also being 50mph to match.</p> <p>All local roads have been designed to retain the speed limits currently in place on the existing road network except for a short length on Great North Road south of Cattle Market which would be reduced from national speed limit to 30mph. Any further changes to speed limits on side roads would come from the local highway authority.</p> <p>Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided between Cattle Market and Winthorpe to enforce the 50mph speed limit.</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling was undertaken using traffic data based on the speeds detailed above. The modelling demonstrated that there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area during operation of the Scheme and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>While it is true that in general higher speeds result in higher noise levels, a low noise running surface is effective at mitigating noise at higher speed due to there being a more significant component of wheel/surface interaction noise than engine noise at these speeds, and therefore the effect of higher speeds on noise is reduced. Low noise running surfaces would therefore be provided as a form of noise mitigation measures for the Scheme, as well as the above mitigation measures.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction and during operation, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWGX-K	Speed limit	The entire stretch from Farndon to Winthorpe should be restricted to a 50mph speed limit to allow a safe area for foot crossing points and traffic lights.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWEK-4	Speed limit	I should like to see recognition for all of the bypass to be governed at 50 mph. Restriction at 50 mph from Winthorpe to Cattle Market islands will only cause frustration to traffic road users. Therefore, the remaining bypass from Cattle Market island through to Farndon roundabout Will encourage greater speeds than currently allowed.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWNC-5	Speed limit	Critically important that a 50mph limit is imposed between Cattle Market and Winthorpe junctions.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGM-8	Speed limit	Limit speed to 50 mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe roundabouts to reduce both noise and particulate pollution to winthorpe village	2B		
ANON-559H-RWNE-7	Speed limit	I believe that the road speed limit should be 50 MPH between the Cattle Market and Showground roundabouts at least if not all the way from the start of the scheme (Lord Ted roundabout).	2B		
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Speed limit	The length of the improved road should be subject to a 50 MPH speed limit from the Cattle Market roundabout to the Winthorpe roundabout, to minimise noise pollution to domestic properties that are on both sides of the road, near this section. Newark and Winthorpe! Fast traffic creates higher noise levels therefore this is an important consideration. Maintaining flow in this case is far more important than increasing and maintaining speed up to the National Limit!!	2D		
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Whilst the revised design is most welcome, there are still elements that we are concerned about, or would like to be enhanced. 1. The road alignment between Cattle Market and Winthorpe roundabout, shown on the General Arrangement drawings, features three horizontal curves of 367, 500 and 471 m radius without significant central reservation widening. Such road parameters imply an 85 kph design speed but, although it has been suggested to us that a 50 mph limit will be applied there has been no confirmation of this feature. As pointed out in the think again report 'The Design and Operation of the Proposed Upgraded A46 Newark By-Pass in the section between The Cattle Market Junction and Winthorpe Junction', design and operation of the road to this standard in the spirit of the 'Self Explaining Road' would go a long way to addressing many of our worries about noise and pollution. Enforcement of any such speed limit by an Average Speed camera system would be necessary along with better planting along the roadside.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Speed limit	My concerns to the proposed preliminary design are...the 50 MPH maximum speed limit to be fully stipulated and guaranteed before work approvals are given. Average speed enforcement cameras to be agreed the A46 from Winthorpe roundabout to the Cattle market roundabout (to the Farndon Roundabout would be even better).	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Speed limit	Speed limits need agreement	2B		
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Confirm that the speed limit between Winthorpe Roundabout and Cattle market roundabout will be no greater than 50mph (point S proposal, P25). (Environmental – noise and air pollution, especially considering proximity of Winthorpe Primary School).	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWTC-B	Speed limit	I do not understand why 50mph between Cattle market and Winthorpe if the road is a dual carriageway? This is a long section of road + the aim is to reduce traffic waiting + decrease journey times, thsi does not make sense when the rest of the A46 is either 60 or 70mph.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RWW1-V	Speed limit	I would like to see a limit to speed of vehicles which will help order drivers to safely move from one area to another.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWSM-M	Speed limit	Lower speed limit	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWQ5-T	Speed limit	50 mph limit would reduce noise and increase safety	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Speed limit	No speed limits indicated. I am concerned about the road becoming a 'race track'. could average speed cameras be anticipated?	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWBJ-Z	Speed limit	as above reduce Newark and Coddington speed limit to 30mph and new dual carriageway to 60mph	2D		
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Speed limit	can speed limit be lowered to 40mph onto A1133 from roundabout?	2H		
BHLF-559H-RWAY-E	Speed limit	Speed limit may be required on A1133 / Winthorpe junction. This is already quite a difficult junction and we are concerned that car speed may increase due to the improved roundabout layout.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWBJ-Z	Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Air quality	Speed and noise are correlated, the single carriageway is presently 60mph, dual carriageway would be 70mph with associated noise increase. Please consider a 60mph limit on the dual carriageway - this would reduce pollution both from exhaust fumes and from noise at the same time as saving fuel for drivers and UK economy and limited impact on journey time.	2C		
BHLF-559H-RWZR-Z	Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Air quality	There's obviously going to be a lot of lorries going to and fro. I suggest you impose an additional speed limit on them so as to not kick up so much dust and reduce noise. An allowance should be made in time and money lost by slowing down these vehicles for the sake of the environment.	2D		
ANON-559H-RWBJ-Z	Speed limit	From a safety perspective having traffic lights on 70mph carriageway is unusual - potential accidents due to unexpected severe braking - I suggest max 60mph limit on all approaches to traffic light zones proposed	2H		
ANON-559H-RW9V-3	Speed limit	The improvement of the Winthorpe roundabout is likely to result in traffic heading towards Gainsborough speeding even more than it currently does, past the entrance to Winthorpe. There have been several near misses at this road junction, as traffic attempts to join the main road. As the road is currently derestricted, i. e. 60 MPH, then a limit of 40MPH should be imposed for safety reasons.  Although this could be a matter for the County Council, the road improvement being proposed will directly affect this problem. Perhaps this is something to be taken up with NCC?	2H	N	The Scheme is forecast to have minimal impact on the A1133 and users would utilise the route in the same way they do at present. The request to change the speed limit on the A1133 falls under the remit of Nottinghamshire County Council who are the highway authority for the area.
BHLF-559H-RWMP-H	Road layout	the roads are too narrow, poorly signposted and highlighted. There are few measures to reduce car speed.	2B	N	It is assumed that the Consultee is referring to existing local roads that cross the A46. All local roads would retain the speed limits currently in place on the existing road network except for a short length on Great North Road south of Cattle Market, which would be reduced from the national speed limit to 30mph.  The Scheme does not impact the existing local roads and therefore any further changes to speed limits for, signposting and widths of local roads would be a decision made by Nottinghamshire County Council who are the local highway authority for the area.
ANON-559H-RWV2-V	Traffic forecasts; Overall scheme	No traffic survey has been carried out to justify this massive expense.	2H	N	A number of traffic surveys were commissioned in order to assess the current performance of the road network and to assist in the development of traffic models. These traffic surveys include Automatic Traffic Count and Manual Classified Traffic Counts ranging from 2016-2022.  In 2022, journey time, queue length and level crossing surveys were carried out to gain a better understanding of the current network performance.  Further information relating to traffic surveys is available within the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4) and information regarding the need for the Scheme can be found in the Case for the Scheme (TR010065/APP/7.1) and the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4).

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWQP-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Scheme objectives states under 'customer' .... 'improved facilities for cyclists,.' I note some referenced to 'maintaining pedestrian and cycle Facilites' no sign of improving. No mention of provision for cyclists on proposals to cattle market roundabout and certainly no mention of 'improved facilities for cyclists' to meet your own objectives.</p> <p>'build it and they will come' - get drivers onto bikes and they become part of the solution rather than the problem that they are part of. its currently to dangerous for sensible people to cycle in and out of Newark.</p>	2B	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes have been provided.</p> <p>The improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assessed the impacts of the Scheme on cyclists. It concluded that construction of the Scheme was likely to have a temporary significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 as a result of the 24-month diversions in place. During operation of the Scheme, the assessment found that there was likely to be a significant adverse impact on users of National Cycle Network 64 due to the new 105m permanent diversion.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWQP-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>you are providing more tarmac for more vehicles which is needed to move traffic – Great</p> <p>However more cars will come to clog it up as is ever the case</p> <p>A concerned effort to move individuals from 4 seat cars to bike, scooters, e bikes or on foot is needed. This needs planning so these other forms of transport have safe passage and don't feel like 2<sup>nd</sup> class citizens</p>	2H	N	<p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assessed the impacts of the Scheme on cyclists. It concluded that construction of the Scheme was likely to have a temporary significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 as a result of the 24-month diversions in place. During operation of the Scheme, the assessment found that there was likely to be a significant adverse impact on users of National Cycle Network 64 due to the new 105m permanent diversion.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT7-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>There are established paths for walkers and cyclists from Newark along the East Trent to South Clifton where I live. To maintain usage and encourage Active Travel it is critical that the A46 upgrade takes the opportunity to improve access from Newark.</p> <p>The A46 upgrades must ensure that path lighting is improved and safety of cyclists and walkers/pedestrians are a priority of the upgrade. The current proposals seem to make it more difficult for walkers and cyclists adding corners, underpasses and a crossing on a busy slip road. These elements of the proposed upgrade should be re-considered to ensure the changes do not discourage Active Travel.</p>	2B	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking and cycling provisions that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes have been provided, including a route across the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout and a new link from Hargon Lane to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society. The engagement with this partnership was partly responsible for introducing the walking and cycling route across the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>Lighting would be provided adjacent to some of the new walking and cycling routes, including along Winthorpe Road, between Winthorpe Road Estate and Winthorpe. Routes such as the combined access track/footway/cycleway connecting between the old A46, Hargon Lane and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the A1133 would not be lit due to the light pollution this would cause to Winthorpe village, and as it is part of a Public Right of Way network which are not traditionally lit.</p> <p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Newark-on-Trent to Winthorpe and onwards along East Trent to South Clifton. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road. The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWF9-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>In addition to using the existing road network as a motorist, I am a member of Collingham Cycling Club and regularly use the traffic-free route between Winthorpe and Newark via the underpasses under the A1 and existing Newark bypass. Whilst in support of the scheme generally, the current design in fails to satisfy the stated objective to "build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected".</p> <p>The existing design has the current traffic-free route between Winthorpe and Newark for cyclists and pedestrians interrupted by a new northbound off-slip from the new elevated A46 dual carriageway. Not only is the resulting diversion of the traffic-free route to a new roundabout longer, but it involves having to cross the new slip road which will carry a significant volume of traffic. The design can in no way be described as an improvement for pedestrians and cyclists, and in fact makes the existing arrangement significantly worse for these road users. The existing traffic-free route should be maintained via the inclusion of a short additional underpass beneath the new slip road, similar in nature to the existing underpasses.</p> <p>As a local recreational cyclist, I regularly have to ride through Newark town centre to access routes to the south of the town. Provision for cyclists through the town centre is poor, the routes are busy with motor vehicles and the road surfaces are poor. The improvement to the A46 Newark bypass represents a once in a generation opportunity to create a dedicated north-south cycle route to bypass the town centre. Despite the nominal width required, the dualling of the existing bypass does not currently include a cycle path. The absence of this provision in the existing design again results in it failing to meet the scheme objective to "build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists".</p>	2B	N	<p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction, which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road. The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the route is longer from the existing A1 subway to the existing A46 subway and is 105m longer than the original route. A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users. Stakeholder engagement and consultation also identified safety concerns in relation to lengthening the distance travelled within the underpass due to concerns it could lead to anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of the Scheme is to improve the capacity of the existing A46 carriageway. Due to constraints such as geography, existing infrastructure (for example, river crossings of the A46, crossings of the railway line and bridges of Cattle Market Roundabout and the A1), the Scheme location within a floodplain, and property boundaries, it is impractical to provide a full-length cycle track for the entire length of the Scheme.</p> <p>The following improvements have been made, which aim to improve overall walking and cycling connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWF3-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Writing as both a motor vehicle user and cyclist, I can't understand the logic in the proposed cycling paths.</p> <p>The current A46 underpass is the only partially safe access to Newark from the north as a cyclist and the proposed route not only lengthens this but also compromises it's safety by adding in a new section alongside motor vehicles.</p> <p>I fully appreciate that the new road and route needs to be undertaken but please see this as an opportunity – a huge opportunity – to improve the roads for all users, not just motor vehicles. For such a nominal amount of additional space, cycle paths would be greatly beneficial for access to and through the town. I can wholeheartedly say that with better cycling connections to the town, it would encourage me to leave my car at home and cycle the 7 miles into town more, meaning less traffic, less carbon emissions and crucially less congestion.</p> <p>The current proposals for cyclists definitely do not improve the road for cyclists and walkers and in not doing so, would be a greatly missed opportunity to encourage more people to travel in this way – whether for work or recreation.</p>	2B	N	<p>Due to constraints such as geography, existing infrastructure (for example, river crossings of the A46, crossings of the railway line and bridges of Cattle Market Roundabout and the A1), the Scheme location within a floodplain, and property boundaries it is impractical to provide a full-length cycle track for the entire length of the Scheme.</p> <p>As far a reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes have been provided, including a route across the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout and a new link from Hargon Lane to Newark Showground and to networks south of the existing A46.</p> <p>Signalised crossings would be provided to all routes at Cattle Market Junction and to the south with a new access to the lorry park with a central island and crossing points to gain access from the western side of Great North Road.</p> <p>New shared use, walking and cycling routes would be provided at locations which provide an opportunity to improve existing routes and improve overall connectivity, therefore improving active travel opportunities.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFQ-B	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>The biggest disappointment is the lack of cycle path / safe route options around the bypass.</p> <p>I would likely to particularly highlight that the existing cycle path between winthorpe and Newark avoids crossing any major roads (going under the A46), the new design forces cycles to cross the A46 off ramp (to A1 North) which strikes me as a big health and safety concern and actually makes the junction worse for cyclists.</p> <p>Many cities/towns use bypass opportunities to improve/add cycle routes. It's disappointing not to see this here.</p>	2B		<p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>At Winthorpe Road, a new shared-use walking and cycling route would be provided at ground level to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided at Brownhills Junction which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road. The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The route from the existing A1 subway to the existing A46 subway would be 105m longer than the original route. A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users. Stakeholder engagement and consultation identified safety concerns in relation to lengthening the distance travelled within the underpass between Winthorpe and Newark-on-Trent. The Scheme design was amended to allow for better lines of sight and space for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFR-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The scheme as proposed isolates even more than present Winthorpe Village with regard to pedestrian access. The proposed changes to the pedestrian way linking us to Winthorpe Road has increased considerably in distance and has introduced a hazardous crossing of the proposed A46 exit slip road. The proposal for pedestrian access to Collingham and the Showground offers little benefit to the village.	2B	N	At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road.
BHLF-559H-RW6Q-U	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	My main concern is for walkers/cyclists trying to cross the new slip road near to the traveller camp/dog kennels just before the A1 underpass. Can we ensure there is a safe area to cross as it is a very popular route. It will need a new zebra crossing at least.	2B	N	The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.
ANON-559H-RWER-B	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I have concerns regarding the footpath/cycle route 64 which I note is being re-routed, but once I have crossed under the new A46 bridge, how is one able to cross slip road N, just before the new roundabout & return onto the existing route/ A1 underpass up to Winthorpe?	2B		The Winthorpe Road walking and cycling route would remain accessible throughout the construction period and be segregated from the construction works. This is detailed in

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		IMO this road will remain very busy with traffic into the Industrial estate, McDonalds & A17 Eastbound traffic etc. The footpath/ cycle route 64 is under constant use & also serves some children attending Winthorpe school.			<p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and secured in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The route from the existing A1 subway to the existing A46 subway would be 105m longer than the original route. A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement and consultation identified safety concerns in relation to lengthening the distance travelled within the underpass between Winthorpe and Newark-on-Trent. The route is open and lit to make it a safe environment for users, therefore crime and fly tipping would be unlikely to occur.</p> <p>Due to severance of Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and Winthorpe Footpath FP3 by the existing Winthorpe Footpath FP2 would be connected by a new route, connecting Winthorpe Roundabout, Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3, Hargon Lane, and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. New signalised crossings would be provided at locations where the new shared use route crosses a carriageway.</p> <p>The loss of some of the agricultural land alongside Winthorpe Road cannot be avoided due to the design of the Scheme at Brownhills Junction and the A46 dual carriageway. However, a 30m length of the existing Winthorpe Road would be retained. The existing walking and cycling route would be realigned around the new Brownhills Junction layout providing a combined walking and cycling route segregated from the highway.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme as described above, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I have concerns about the footpath/Sustrans cycle track under the A1 and onwards from Winthorpe to Newark and its proximity to a very busy roundabout both for children walking to school and the very many pedestrians and cyclists.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVC-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I have concerns that the cycle / footpath access from the north of Newark to Winthorpe is inadequate - specifically the need to cross the carriageway at the 'Brownhills Roundabout'. This is an important leisure route and my experience would be that it can be an extremely important route to the north of the town, particularly to Brunel Drive. Brunel Drive is a busy industrial area handling large volumes of traffic including HGV's.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	From the proposal all traffic heading East along the A46, except through traffic for Lincoln will come off and through the Brownhills roundabout. So all A1 ( north and south ), all A17 and all Newark east traffic passing through. Currently the cycle underpass allows a safe passage from Winthorpe to Newark. This will be replaced with a crossing over the A46 slip – a very poor choice as this will be busy with the amount of traffic as above.	2B		
BHLF-559H-RW98-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	How will the residents of Robert Dukeson Avenue and Winthorpe Rd walk to Winthorpe- as this is currently a popular route for walkers going under the A1 and A46	2B		
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>As a local resident, walker and cyclist I will offer a few comments on certain aspects of the design and in particular at the end of Winthorpe Road.</p> <p>*Winthorpe Road underpass and NMU path*</p> <p>The designs for the foot/cycle route to Winthorpe have changed hugely since the last consultation.</p> <p>Firstly the retention of the existing A46 underpass along with the landscaping, trees and bunds on the south side is welcomed and makes sense.</p> <p>This route is of strategic value for cyclists and walkers and part of the national cycle route and Trent Valley Way. At present it is practically traffic free apart from the odd car going to the kennels or caravan site. Children play along there including the families at the caravan site (which is now going to be formerly approved and allocated as a permanent gypsy and travelers site in the Newark Local Plan) They learn to ride bikes. Dogs are walked. Groups of cyclists pass through on mass, not just individually. Residents walk/cycle to work using it. It also offers a small piece of open space for local residents which will be lost. There are also young children and parents who walk from Newark through to school within Winthorpe. They can do that because it is safe and direct.</p> <p>The plans will be very detrimental and partly sever this link, introducing a series of new obstacles to simply getting between Newark, Winthorpe and the countryside beyond.</p> <p>Firstly, it is approx 150m distance between the point where the current A46 underpass link meets the old Winthorpe road (point A) and down to the caravan site and kennels (point B). Its straight, direct and almost traffic free. It is however not lit.</p> <p>The proposal is now for a convoluted path turning east to go under the new elevated section of the A46, then around the new roundabout, then involving a pedestrian crossing of the A46 off slip and finally a path back to point B outside of the caravan site and kennels. This new route would be roughly double the length at some 300m- a considerable and unacceptable diversion. Rather than being almost traffic free NMUs would have to walk beside a busy road and then have to wait to cross the A46 off slip where all traffic from the A46 going onto the A1 or A17 will be coming off.</p> <p>The path will also be quite concealed as it runs between the current underpass and the new under bridge which has real potential for crime and disorder and fly tipping.</p> <p>The combination of the doubled distance, the need to cross a busy slip road and the lack of passive surveillance of parts of the route make this design intolerable as a diversion to the national cycle network and public rights of way network.</p>	2B		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Simply put, non motorized users will be far worse off, inconvenienced, put at safety risk and at fear of crime/ASB. It creates a physiological severance when it is so indirect.</p> <p>The route for these NMUs therefore needs redesigning urgently, even through the provision of a second underpass under the new elevated A46 in order to keep the route on the direct line through to Winthorpe and beyond. This will actually be more visible and safer as it will be likely to be used just as frequently as now, whereas the proposed design will deter such users. Please also seek advise from Notts County Council rights of way and Sustrans to get this right.</p>			
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The provision of the public rights of way and NMU routes to be fully explained and explained by all. There are some serious safety concerns particularly the proposed new public right of way crossing the A46 eastbound exit slip road and [redacted ] roundabout.	2B		
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The scheme understandably and necessarily provides for users of motor vehicles, although many if them will be negated by the expected increases in traffic that it will generate. However, provision for non-motorised users (Cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders) will be harmed, particularly to the north of Newark (Winthorpe Road and the Brownhills/Friendly Farmer roundabouts area) and journey times, particularly for pedestrians, will be significantly increased.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWG6-H	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The Scheme design is much improved from the initial options. However, we still need more clarity on the pedestrian routes that are being altered and provide essential access to those children who attend Winthorpe Primary School on foot. We also need to have guarantees that these routes remain accessible throughout the work accommodate the new road.	2B		
ANON-559H-RWV9-3	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>The cycling infrastructure proposed at the Cattle Market is inadequate, there is NO way a cyclist on the road can access it when coming from Newark, without becoming a pedestrian, waiting for a clear moment in the traffic to cross the road, to join the cycle path, then at the other end become a pedestrian again to cross the road to continue the journey on the road (you don't design like this for motor vehicles, it is not appropriate to design like this for other road users, who have the same right to use the road).</p> <p>The failure to provide cycling (other road users) facilities on both sides of the roundabout with a project of this size is unjustifiable, it has / is an aim of successive governments to get more people to cycle, providing disconnected flawed facilities that potentially increase the risk to vulnerable road users, does not meet that aim.</p> <p>Your cycling infrastructure at the A1 crossing appear to be useable and well thought out.</p>	2B	N	<p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and by providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road. On Great North Road the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross. Routes cannot be provided around both sides of the junction as they would impact on traffic flows causing delays. The new entrance to the lorry park has two crossing points to allow cyclists to cross safely to the eastern side of Great North Road and access the route around Cattle Market Roundabout.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme as described above, reference should be made to General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDY-H	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Safe pedestrian and cycling between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabout.	2B	N	<p>A 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts. This would travel via the existing footbridge over the A1 slip roads, the existing crossing of the A17 and a new route to the east of the Shell Service Station. This would provide a safe route for walkers and cyclists, removing the existing requirement for walkers and cyclists to cross the existing unsafe crossings of the A46 in this location.</p> <p>The route would also link into new walking and cycling routes around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground, and a new signalised crossing of the existing A46 between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts that provides access to Winthorpe via a new route that passes beneath the new proposed A1/A46 Crossing.</p> <p>This can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWWC-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	As my home close to A46 I not want difficulty crossing from Brewards Whard walking as I need to cross to go into Morrisons and Precint hairdressers, general dentist etc. All walking do not wish further to walk in bad weather I am elderly.	2B	N	The Applicant understands that the route being described is between Brewers Wharf and Morrisons (crossing Bar Gate). This route is not affected by the Scheme and routes would remain as existing.
ANON-559H-RWGM-8	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Please add a route connection to Thoroughfare Lane to allow full circular walk of village to be I and route to school.	2B	N	Hargon Lane would provide a connection from Winthorpe village (Gainsborough Road) to a new shared use walking and cycling route, which connects Newark-on-Trent, Winthorpe and Newark Showground. Due to existing property and land boundary constraints and the alternative route available from Hargon Lane, a new walking and cycling route on Thoroughfare Lane is not being included as part of the Scheme design.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWBT-A	Traffic lights/signals	Pedestrian traffic lights near the A1 a17 A46 are totally unnecessary	2B	N	Traffic signals, used as part of pedestrian crossings, are required to provide a safe crossing point for all user groups due to the high levels of traffic on them. These signals are required to provide a safe crossing point on the dual carriageway between the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts for walking and cycling user groups.
BHLF-559H-RWAY-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	- We would like the footpath / walkway route alongside the A46 to extend / link up with Thoroughfare Lane in Winthorpe. This would be a good development for the school.	2B	N	Hargon Lane would provide a connection from Winthorpe village (Gainsborough Road) to a new shared use walking and cycling route, which connects Newark-on-Trent, Winthorpe and Newark Showground. Due to existing property and land boundary constraints and the alternative route available from Hargon Lane, a new walking and cycling route on Thoroughfare Lane is not being included as part of the Scheme design.  For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWNT-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	It's unclear from the drawings what the provision for cyclists will be - use of the terms 'NMU' and footpath aren't clear, particularly the Winthorpe to Brownhills stretch.  I am a cyclist for my main mode of transport, and live off Drove Lane to the east of the A46. There is no viable cycle route into Newark along the A46 currently, and this should be improved as part of the upgrade.  Secondly, it might be out of scope, but there is opportunity to vastly improve active travel routes between Newark town centre and the Showground as part of the infrastructure works.	2B	N	NMU stands for 'non-motorised user'. For clarity this has been replaced by walking, cycling and horse-riding, including mobility impaired users, within the application for development consent.  A new 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided from Drove Lane to the A46 between the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that links into the existing walking and cycling routes that continue on to Newark Town Centre. This would travel via the existing footbridge over the A1 slip roads, the existing crossing of the A17 and a new route to the east of the Shell Service Station. This would provide a safe route for walkers and cyclists, removing the existing requirement for walkers and cyclists to cross the existing unsafe crossings of the A46 in this location. This also provides improved access for active travel users from Newark Town Centre to the Newark Showground.  For an overview of the Scheme as described above, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RW6Z-4	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Can walking / cycling access to the showground from Winthorpe be incorporated in the plans?	2B	Y	Since the routes shown at statutory consultation, the Applicant has provided a new walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane in Winthorpe village to Winthorpe Roundabout where it then crosses to the east to join Drove Lane and the first Newark Showground entrance.  For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	No provision for safer pedestrian / cycle access across junction from A1133 Langford heading towards showground - an opportunity missed.	2B	Y	Since the routes shown at statutory consultation, the Applicant has provided a new 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane including a crossing point on the A1133, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground. Due to the existing property and land boundary constraints and the alternative route available from Hargon Lane, a new walking and cycling route on Thoroughfare Lane and along the A1133 is not being included as part of the Scheme design.  For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
BHLF-559H-RWW8-3	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	1. There appears to be no particular provision for cyclists at the CattleMarket roundabout when getting from Newark town to the A616 and A617 and visa versa. There are cycle paths provided each side but not through the junction.	2B	N	At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road. All routes are 3m wide walking and cycling corridors.  For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWB3-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	As a driver I think the designs are good. As a cyclist I am sorry to say that cycling seems to be a mainly an after thought. There is an excellent taffic free route under the A1 and A46 at the moment which takes cyclists from Winthorpe to the centre of Newark. The link between the two underpasses is removed in the new design with a long loop back on to a main road	2B	N	Due to constraints such as existing infrastructure (for example, river crossings of the A46, crossings of the railway line and bridges of Cattle Market Roundabout and the A1), the Scheme location within a floodplain, and property boundaries, the horizontal alignment of the Scheme generally follows the existing horizontal alignment of the A46. It is therefore

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>cycle path (which will quickly fill with edge debris) - 'a dash and hope' dangerous crossing at the end of the slip way and then a loop back again to the underpass. I dont see why the cycle route has to suffer because of this new development - the cycle route needs an additional underpass under the new road. It is a well established and popular route and seems to be getting degraded and made more dangerous. Also - why is there no cycle path around the new road ? The designers managed to incorporate this into the whole of the eastern bypass around Lincoln - surely there is at least a justification to link the winthorpe roundabout to the cattle market roudabout with a dedicated cycle path. In addition there is a new cycle lane along the A1 from Winthorpe - this feeds into a crossing across the dual carriage way close to the friendly farmer roundabout - crossing this road is incredibly dangerous and unsafe for cyclists - again this needs an underpass or bridge.</p>			<p>impracticable to provide a full-length cycle track for the entire length of the Scheme. New shared use, walking and cycling routes would be provided to improve existing routes and improve overall connectivity, therefore improving active travel opportunities.</p> <p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road. The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The route from the existing A1 subway to the existing A46 subway is 105m longer than the original route. A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users. Stakeholder engagement and consultation identified safety concerns in relation to lengthening the distance travelled within the underpass between Winthorpe and Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The crossing of the existing A46 near Friendly Farmer Roundabout would be signalised so that it is safe for walkers and cyclists. The signalised crossing at this location provides a safe crossing point without the need for a bridge or underpass. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVT-X	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Apart from maintaining the current cycle path nothing under the A46 nothing has been mentioned regarding a cycle lane on the new sections heading either north or south. Please expand information in more detail.</p>	2B	N	<p>The level of information shown during the 2022 statutory consultation were preliminary and reflected the Scheme proposals at that time.</p> <p>Due to constraints such as existing infrastructure (for example, river crossings of the A46, crossings of the railway line and bridges of Cattle Market Roundabout and the A1), the Scheme location within a floodplain, and property boundaries, the horizontal alignment of the Scheme generally follows the existing horizontal alignment of the A46. It is therefore impracticable to provide a full-length cycle track for the entire length of the Scheme intervention. New shared use walking and cycling routes would be provided to improve existing routes and improve overall connectivity, therefore improving active travel opportunities.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWGF-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Access to Winthorpe from the bottom of Winthorpe Road, via the existing A46 underpass under the newly proposed flyover and the existing A1 underpass. This route needs to be adequately lit (street lighting) as is used by children attending Winthorpe Primary School on a regular basis. The school offers a breakfast club and after school clubs facilities so children can be walking this route during the darker winter evenings.</p> <p>As it is also a national cycle route ensuring this is wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians and clearly marked as such. We note the roundabout slip road will have pedestrian traffic lights, this is imperative to ensure the safety of all using this access route. Children to school, cyclists, dog walkers, residents of Winthorpe accessing Newark and locals accessing the public house and community centre and church in Winthorpe. This is a very busy route and needs to be fully maintained in a safe manner not only after the duelling but also during the construction works. Safe access must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The newly proposed Winthorpe roundabout - needs further consideration for use by pedestrians, cyclist's and horse riders. Under its current proposal it looks unsafe for this group of users, I cant imagine trying to cycle from Winthorpe across to the showground under its current design its junctions are too big to navigate safely.</p> <p>I hope the proposed pathways both Winthorpe side and showground side are fulfilled as documented. This would actually improve current pedestrian access in which you struggle to cross the A46 bridge over the A1 due to volume of traffic as well as having to walk through the garage forecourt as current routes do not work safely. Its encouraging to hear that they are trying to tie up further cycle and pedestrian routes around the friendly farmer, currys, area. With more business being opened in this area improved access from Newark and surrounding villages will help growth in this area. People should be able to access the area without having to drive, in a safe manner.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Scheme would provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street lighting would be provided along the route described by the Consultee</li> <li>The route would be 3m wide to accommodate walkers and cyclists and would be signed as a shared facility</li> <li>The route would be retained during construction and segregated from any construction activities</li> </ul> <p>A walking and cycling route would be provided around the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout connecting the Newark Showground entrance and also Hargon Lane. Due to the nature of the Scheme and the limited demand for equestrian use from the surveys undertaken, the roundabout does not provide for equestrian use. Survey details are provided within Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3). Walking and cycling routes would be provided along both sides of the Friendly Farmer to Winthorpe corridor, providing access to all areas including the Newark Showground to be easily accessed.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1), assessed the impacts of the Scheme on walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. It concluded that construction of the Scheme was likely to have a temporary significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 as a result of the 24-month diversions in place. During operation of the Scheme, the assessment found that there was likely to be a significant adverse impact on users of National Cycle Network 64 and Trent Valley Way due to the new 105m permanent diversion.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>*Access and crossings for NMUs*</p> <p>The underpass at Farndon, the crossing at the Cattlemarket roundabout and the Winthorpe road underpass are all crucial routes for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>At the cattlemarket junction can the second NMU crossing to the west of the A46 be pulled back slightly towards the Great N Road so to create a more direct route for pedestrians and cyclists continuing towards Muskham? Also for safety, there is a danger of drivers accelerating off the roundabout and up the A46 on-slip only to see a red light too late. It needs to be safely designed and more visible nearer to the roundabout.</p>	2B	N	<p>The location of the walking and cycling route across the northbound entry slip from Cattle Market is to provide space for vehicles to stop without queuing back onto the roundabout when the crossing stops traffic.</p> <p>The length would be reviewed at detailed design stage and pulled back, if possible, to make the route more direct. The location also allows vehicles leaving the roundabout time to see a red light and stop safely.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVM-Q	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>*Newark Showground access*</p> <p>Access for cyclists and walkers to Newark showground is currently very poor and dangerous.</p> <p>The plans show there will be a pedestrian and cycle path running along the eastern side of the A46 beside the showground. This is welcomed, but it must link through to/from Newark at Lincoln Road and not be a dead end. It needs to run from Drove Lane down to the petrol station-then either around or behind the petrol station to meet the A17 where there is an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing (which could be upgraded). From there there is an existing pathway and footbridge over the A1 slip roads to Lincoln Road.</p> <p>There is a short stretch of shared path between the A1 bridge and the corner of Brunel Drive/Lincoln Road, which is extremely poor, degraded and narrow. It is very well used by workers at Curry's. Cyclist are crossing the grass causing erosion because it is so poor. Please - either as part of the A46 project or separately can this be resurfaced and widened. It will then link into the crossing near to KFC and into the recently improved cycle way running down the west side of Lincoln Road. It's the missing link to curry's and should also form part of the route to drove land and the showground.</p>	2B	Y	<p>Since the routes shown at statutory consultation, the Applicant has provided a new 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground.</p> <p>A new 3m wide walking and cycling route would also be provided from Drove Lane to the A46 between the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that links into the existing walking and cycling routes that continue on to Newark Town Centre.</p> <p>This would travel via the existing footbridge over the A1 slip roads, the existing crossing of the A17 and a new route to the east of the Shell Service Station. This would provide a safe route for walkers and cyclists, removing the existing requirement for walkers and cyclists to cross the existing unsafe crossings of the A46 in this location. This also provides improved access for active travel users from Newark Town Centre to the Newark Showground.</p> <p>The A17 crossing is an existing un-signalised crossing for which the local authority are responsible for. Usage is expected to increase slightly as the existing route across the existing A46 has 2-3 users per day when surveyed. Should use increase significantly in the future due to reasons not caused by the Scheme then the local authority would need to install additional provisions which may include a signalised crossing.</p> <p>Improvement to the walking and cycling route between the A1 bridge and Brunel/Lincoln Road cannot be justified by the Applicant as the Scheme has no impact on this route, it would</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					need to be addressed by the local authority if the existing situation is not suitable. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) submitted with the development consent application.
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	2. wouldn't it be a good idea to ban pedestrians and cyclists on the dual carriageway section of the bypass for safety reasons as there are good alternative routes through Newark town and riverside footpaths and cycleways	2B	N	Cyclists would not be prohibited from the dual carriageway. Signage would however be provided to encourage walkers and cyclists to use the existing designated walking and cycling routes and those that have been provided as part of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWNS-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>As a resident that live in between the A46, B6326 (Kings Sconce) and frequently use the roads that lead to town (such as B6326), the design that National Highways is proposing is extremely concerning, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Safety of pedestrians, cyclist The proposition by National Highways to ensure public rights as seen on pg. 32-33 of the pamphlet pertains only to temporary solutions. However, the work on A46 will permanently increase traffic on already busy roads, such as Lincoln road, North gate, Bar Gate and Great North road. With the increase in traffic in these roads, I am especially concerned about pedestrian safety around the two train stations, which does not have sufficient zebra nor pelican crossings - especially around Newark Northgate train station. What is National Highways' permanent solution to pedestrian safety for residents that will use the roads in and out of the Newark Town, where traffic would increase due to the work on A46?</p>	2B	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route will continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road. This would improve the safety of the walking and cycling route to Newark Castle Station</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>With regards to Lincoln Road, the results of the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4) indicate that there would be very little change on this location in 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and a slight increase in 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic).</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4) that have been submitted as part of the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW9S-Z	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	We like to walk around the whole area so we would like to see more facilities for walkers along the route.	2B	Y	Since the routes shown at statutory consultation, the Applicant has provided a new 3m, the Applicant would also provide a new walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout where it then crosses to the east to join Drove Lane and the first Newark Showground entrance. This would also provide a circular route with the route that passes beneath the A46 alongside the A1.
BHLF-559H-RWAY-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	- Very interested in the route / safety of our pupils who walk / cycle to school from the Lincoln Road Estate via the underpass. We would like to ensure that this route remains viable and safe long term and during construction.	2B	N	<p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided, replacing the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent, including Lincoln Road Estate area.</p> <p>A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction, which would allow for safe crossing of the A46 north bound exit slip road.</p> <p>The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing cycle path to the north-west of Winthorpe Road and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The existing routes described by the Consultee would be maintained during construction, details of which can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and secured in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT7-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Construction	In addition it seems that during the construction phase the path/cycleway/bridleway to the East Trent villages will be closed. Such closures must be kept to an absolute minimum and alternate safe routes provided during construction.	2B	N	<p>The only walking, cycling or horse-riding route to be temporarily closed during construction is located alongside the River Trent at Windmill Viaduct. A diversion route would be included within the development consent application. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWQD-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Construction	I want to know what will happen to the cycle path from Newark north to Winthorpe during the construction process.	2B	N	<p>This cycle route would remain open. The route would be segregated and fenced off to prevent access and interaction with the construction sites. Although the route alignment would vary during each stage of construction to allow the different element to be built, access would be maintained.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Referring to the Non-technical summary, paragraph 2.2 states that the scheme will "improve facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable users", I would dispute this. Paragraph 4.9 (Operation) states "the scheme has the potential to reduce severance resulting in a benefit for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable users". I consider that this potential has not been realised	2C	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW7H-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	A major factor in buying my house was the easy access to lots of public rights of way. as the owner of a lively german shephard. I am concerned that the construction will severely curtail my dog walking options.	2C	N	<p>The only Public Right of Way to be temporarily closed during construction is located alongside the River Trent at Windmill Viaduct. A diversion route has been included within the development consent application. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWT7-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Encourage Active Travel to reduce vehicle use by local residents which will reduce environmental impact.	2C	N	As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes have been provided.
ANON-559H-RWF3-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	As above, an improved proposal for cyclists and walkers would massively contribute towards an incentive resulting in fewer cars, congestion and as a result carbon emissions.  This is by no means a replacement for the environment impacted by the new road but would at least partially offset it, whereas the current proposals do the opposite.	2C		<p>The following improvements have been made, which aim to improve overall walking and cycling connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I live in Averham. We are very close to Newark but walking or cycling to Newark can only be achieved by using the busy narrow pavement alongside the very busy road. It is noisy and full of pollution and unsafe and unpleasant.	2C	N	<p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity, which includes improving facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users. The objective of this being to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network.</p> <p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road and the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross.</p> <p>The improvements however are limited to the extents of the Scheme, so do not include any further improvements along the A617 to Averham.</p>
ANON-559H-RW6T-X	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Continuation of 2a. I am concerned regarding footpaths from the village to cross the A46. Are they going to be safe? Will you be using pedestrian controlled traffic lights.	2C	N	The Applicant can confirm that the crossing of the Brownhills Junction northbound exit slip road would be signalised. A further safe route would be provided across the A1133, around Winthorpe Roundabout to Drove Lane.
ANON-559H-RWSJ-H	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The provision for pedestrians and cyclists looks very poor and needs serious work.	2D	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWT7-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Limit closures of existing paths	2D	N	<p>The only Public Right of Way to be temporarily closed during construction is located alongside the River Trent at Windmill Viaduct. A diversion route has been included within the development consent application. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes would be provided. The only footpath stopped up would be Newark Footpath FP14 which is diverted around the improved facilities around Cattle Market Roundabout. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes during construction and operation, and did not find any significant impact associated with the diversion of this route.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNW-S	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>I am most concerned that you propose to close one of our local footpaths. The path you refer to on p32 of the consultation document as footpath 14, is an extremely useful path, well used by local people. We use it to access local facilities, recreation and services at Newark Rugby Club and Kelham. The place where it crosses the A46 is not ideal but this should be improved with a proper crossing, e.g., a footbridge, rather than complete closure. Apart from this crossing the footpath is pleasant off-road route.</p> <p>Your proposal to close this path would, for example, triple the length of time taken to walk from the Cricket ground to the rugby club (currently a 10 min walk would become a 30 minute walk). The new route would also be completely on road-side paths.</p>	2B	N	<p>Due to the dualling of the A46, Newark Footpath FP14 in the vicinity of the A46 needs to be stopped up and diverted through Cattle Market Junction as it is not safe to cross a dual carriageway at-grade without a signalised crossing.</p> <p>A footbridge at the existing location would not be feasible due to the visual impact and cost. Following a review of survey data, Newark Footpath FP14 is currently a low usage path, with an average of 11 recorded users per day during the survey period. The surveys are detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review Report) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>This route would be diverted along Kelham Road to Cattle Market Junction using the existing walking route on Kelham Road, whereby new signalised crossings would provide a safe route between the sports grounds on the northern side of the A46, and Newark-on-Trent on the southern side of the A46.</p> <p>The diversion would be approximately 40% longer than the existing route when measured from the intersection with the A616 and A617. Walking routes alongside highways are common and not unsafe and the diverted route is much safer than the existing at-grade crossing of the A46. Temporary diversions can be found in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the scheme on the local population</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes during construction and operation, and did not find any significant impact associated with the diversion of this route.  Further information on walking and cycling routes within the Scheme can be seen within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	seek to reduce the amount of traffic using the A617 as the bridge at Kelham is totally unsuitable for modern lorries and the volume of traffic. However you could also seek to reduce traffic by improving local cycling routes and increasing public transport. Cycling and walking unpleasant due to pollution, noise and lack of safety measures.	2D	N	One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity, which includes improving facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing and new routes are affected. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users. The objective of this being to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network.  Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on an Alternative Modes Assessment that was carried out on the Scheme, which suggested that the existing public transport network does not generally offer comparable alternatives to cars for most movements. Small traffic flows were distributed over a large area and therefore are not suited to be catered for by public transport. Therefore, a review of the largest public transport flows (represented by local bus services) suggested that there was no obvious non-highways intervention that could cater to any substantial proportion of these flows.  The Applicant is not responsible for the implementation or management of public transport facilities in the area of the Scheme. Alternative transport measures (including rail improvements) would make little headway in addressing the problems on the A46; instead, the proposed road improvement is needed to address the problems and deliver the objectives set for the Scheme.  At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road and the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross. The improvements however are limited to the extents of the Scheme, so there would be no further improvements along the A617.
BHLF-559H-RWFS-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	remove the illegally built electric gate at the end of Crees Lane that stopes access to the footpath	2D	N	This feedback has been shared with Nottinghamshire County Council during the A46 Active Travel Working Group.
BHLF-559H-RWZ7-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Proposed new footpath/ farmers track p24 which is to be used by farmers, walkers, cyclists etc. Please ensure disabled access for wheelchairs and mobility scooters and also more with pushchairs. Maintain current mature trees here. Ensure 'under path' from this track is pleasing to the eye and well lit.	2D	N	The new walking and cycling routes would be suitable for travel by wheelchair, mobility scooter users and those with pushchairs. However, it should be noted that although reasonable care would be taken to ensure new routes are accessible for all, it is not possible to ensure the suitability and accessibility of all existing routes adjoining the new routes.  Mature trees would be retained where possible unless they are causing an obstruction to construction or are deemed to be a safety hazard, new hedgerows and trees are being planted as part of the Scheme.  The route would not be lit as it is part of an unlit Public Right of Way network that has been extended and linked to the south from Winthorpe. Lighting this route would create light pollution in Winthorpe village and it is part of a Public Right of Way network which are not traditionally lit.
BHLF-559H-RWT9-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	safer and easier cycle options. we use bikes (pedal) a lot but not on the A46 due to safety. Linking Newark to villages through safer crossings for bikes and pedestrians would encourage use (eg. we would cycle to the rugby club but can't cross the A46 safely.	2D	N	As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.
ANON-559H-RW8G-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Proper cycle paths.	2D		The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> </ul>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road.</li> <li>The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWF3-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Cycle paths alongside the road and trees / greenery creating a divide	2D	N	<p>Where possible this has been accommodated in the design, a good example is the new route to the north of the A46 between Winthorpe and the A1/Friendly Farmer which is a fully segregated walking and cycling route.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme, by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWND-6	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	There is an opportunity to provide a link footpath/cycle track through Thoroughfare Lane towards the Winthorpe roundabout and onwards to The Showground. There also needs to be consideration about a safe public footpath that transverses the A46 from Winthorpe to Coddington.	2D	N	<p>Hargon Lane would provide a walking and cycling connection from Winthorpe village to a new shared use route, which connects Newark-on-Trent, Winthorpe and Newark Showground. Due to existing property and land boundary constraints and the alternative route available from Hargon Lane, a new walking and cycling route on Thoroughfare Lane is not being included as part of the Scheme design. The link to Coddington would be provided by the new walking and cycling route beneath the A46 and the new signalised crossing across the existing A46 to the A1 slip road footbridge.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The scheme does provide an opportunity to improve the existing cycle track along the B6166 Farndon Road and upgrade the existing footpath along the A617, a following sections and other possibilities as noted in the	2D	N	<p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity which improves facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Along the route there is one permanently stopped up Public Right of Way with other routes impacted slightly due to the Scheme. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by walkers and cyclists, the objective being to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network.</p> <p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road and the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Improvements along the A617 would require additional land purchase and the removal of vegetation and surveys undertaken demonstrated that the usage was low and the cost and environmental impact could not be justified. Improvements along Farndon Road would need to be considered by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Scheme is unable to justify making changes to the route as it has no impact or connection with it.
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	As mentioned above, there is an opportunity to provide active travel routes between Newark town centre and the showground. Currently this provision is limited at best (no safe direct walking and/or cycling route) - there is massive potential long term environmental benefits from reduced emissions by enabling active travel for the many events held at the showground, as well as reducing congestion on surrounding roads, including the A46.	2D	N	<p>A 3m wide walking and cycling route would also be provided from Drove Lane to the A46 between the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that links into the existing walking and cycling routes that continue on to Newark Town Centre. This would travel via the existing footbridge over the A1 slip roads, the existing crossing of the A17 and a new route to the east of the Shell Service Station. This would provide a safe route for walkers and cyclists, removing the existing requirement for walkers and cyclists to cross the existing unsafe crossings of the A46 in this location. This also provides improved access for active travel users from Newark Town Centre to the Newark Showground.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMX-S	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	a separate cycle/ walking lane along the full length of the bypass	2D	N	<p>Due to constraints such as geography, existing infrastructure (for example, river crossings of the A46, crossings of the railway line and bridges of Cattle Market Roundabout and the A1), the Scheme location within a floodplain, and property boundaries it is impractical to provide a full-length cycle track for the entire length of the Scheme.</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional routes would be provided, including a route across the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout and a new link from Hargon Lane to Newark Showground and to networks south of the existing A46.</p> <p>Signalised crossings would be provided to all routes at Cattle Market Junction and to the south with a new access to the lorry park with a central island and crossing points to gain access from the western side of Great North Road.</p> <p>New shared use, walking and cycling infrastructure would be provided at locations which provide an opportunity to improve existing routes and improve overall connectivity, therefore improving active travel opportunities.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWMW-R	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	the winthorpe end pedestrian crossings could be looked at to ensure they are at junction points and not mid road stage, as this will help traffic flow.	2D	Y	<p>As a result of feedback from statutory consultation, the design of Winthorpe Roundabout has been amended and a walking and cycling route would now be provided around Winthorpe Roundabout and the crossings are closer to the entries and exits to Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen in the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWEY-J	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	All along the Trent is in need of cycle ways/bridle-ways and footpaths into Newark at currently these are none existent!!	2E/2F	N	Improvements within Newark-on-Trent and outside of the Order Limits are not being progressed as part of this Scheme.
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The existing bridleway (BW 6) along the east side of the Trent currently stops at the A1 overbridge, it should be possible to extend this to Holme Lane, at least for pedestrians, by consultation with the land owner. I understand that this is the Piscatorial Federation and that	2E/2F		The Applicant notes the comment with regards to Newark Bridleway BW6. Discussions have taken place during the A46 Active Travel Working Group with regards to improvements to routes outside of the Scheme's Order Limits, which includes Nottinghamshire County Council

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		some compensation might be possible by re-allocating the riverside construction compound as an anglers' car park.			as a group member. The location where the existing Bridleway BW6 terminates at the A1 is not impacted by the Scheme and is outside of the Order Limits.
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Consideration needs to be given to the effect on footpaths; Footpaths 5 and 6 currently pass through the proposed compensation area and may need protection or diversion to avoid flooding	2G	Y	The flood plain compensation areas have reduced in footprint since statutory consultation and Farndon Footpath FP5 and Footpath FP6 are no longer affected.
BHLF-559H-RW96-3	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Riverside walks	2G	N	The Applicant notes that this comment was left in response to proposed floodplain compensation areas presented in the statutory consultation. Existing riverside walks are retained, the only walking, cycling or horse-riding route to be temporarily closed during construction is located alongside the River Trent at Windmill Viaduct. A diversion route would be included within the development consent application. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	5. if flood mitigation measures are needed between Kelham and Averham would you ensure that consideration is given to extending The Newark to Kelham cycle path through to Averham as this is currently a very dangerous length of road to cycle on as traffic along the A617 has massively increased since the A46 Newark-Lincoln road was dualled.	2G	N	<p>One of the key objectives of the Scheme is to improve the capacity of the existing A46. New walking and cycling infrastructure would be provided at locations which directly interact with the A46. The Kelham and Averham cycle path is outside the scope of works of this Scheme. Nottinghamshire County Council are the local highway authority and improvements, if required, would be their responsibility.</p> <p>Improvements along the A617 to Averham would require additional land purchase and the removal of vegetation. Surveys undertaken demonstrated that the usage of this route was low and the cost and environmental impact could not be justified.</p> <p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals therefore providing safe access to the A617. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road and the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW3Z-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	A missed opportunity. Yes, Newark is a bottleneck and we need to dual the road. It should have been dual when built. But the scheme should also be seeking to reduce traffic especially local traffic by much improved cycling, walking pathways and increased and cheaper public transport. We can only reduce climate change by encouraging less car use not by increasing the road capacity to accommodate more cars and lorries. More joined up thinking and a scheme that builds for future please.	2H	N	<p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity which improves facilities for walking, cycling and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected. Along the route there is one permanently stopped up Public Right of Way with other routes impacted slightly due to the Scheme. Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users, the objective being to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network.</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RWT7-Y	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	While I recognise that the main purpose of this upgrade is to improve motorised traffic flows it is very important that other parts of the community are considered like walkers, cyclists, and horseriders and the upgrade does not disadvantage this group or make Active Travel less safe or more difficult.	2H		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Applicant has engaged with local active travel representatives as part of the A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme. This group included Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society to consider their suggestions for improved provision.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
BHLF-559H-RW6F-G	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	I would like to see improved cycle access into and around Newark. I want to see evidence of this in the proposed scheme or in addition to the proposed scheme.	2H	N	<p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has engaged with local active travel representatives as part of the A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme. This group included Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society to consider their suggestions for improved provision.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWGV-H	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Please include in the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public footpath from new service road at Winthorpe roundabout along west side of A1133 to link with Thoroughfare Lane (running alongside primary school) in order to allow pedestrian access to Winthorpe roundabout and complete village walking circuit. (Improved public amenities).</li> <li>2. Service road along A46 between Winthorpe roundabout and A1 should be also available for public walkway (but with restrictions to prevent unauthorised motorised bikes or vehicles). (Improved public amenities).</li> </ol>	2H	N	<p>Hargon Lane would provide a connection from Winthorpe village (Gainsborough Road) to a new shared use walking and cycling route, which connects Newark-on-Trent, Winthorpe and Newark Showground. Due to the existing property and land boundary constraints and the alternative route available from Hargon Lane, a new shared use walking and cycling route on Thoroughfare Lane is not being included as part of the Scheme design.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>Measures will be considered during detailed design stage to restrict unauthorised vehicles from using the walking and cycling route between Winthorpe and the A1.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVN-R	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>It would be an ideal time to construction of a foot bridge between Winthorpe and the Show Ground. This would benefit both the Winthorpe community but also people using show ground and those who may be working on that side of the A46.</p> <p>The foot bridge could be at the end of Hargon Lane.</p>	2H	N	<p>Winthorpe Footpath FP2 historically linked Winthorpe to Newark Showground but was formally stopped up prior to the Scheme. The following routes would be provided to address this existing severance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• a new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46, including Winthorpe Footpath FP3</p> <p>A new pedestrian bridge would not be provided in this location due to space constraints, the required length of the bridge, visual impact and high associated cost, alongside relatively low predicted usage.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The provision for NMUs north of the Friendly Farmer roundabout is poor and will result in increased journey times, particularly for pedestrians following FP 2 and 3. The path alongside the new link road between the FF and Winthorpe roundabouts needs to be upgraded to a combined footpath and cycleway (Preferably to LTN 1/20) to provide a link to Drove Lane and future developments on the Showground site.	2H	N	<p>The following walking and cycling routes would be provided to address connectivity around Winthorpe and improve journey times to the Newark Showground and Newark-on-Trent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new proposed A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46, including Winthorpe Footpath FP3</li> </ul> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be Local Transport Note 1/20 compliant. Where Local Transport Note 1/20 is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) will be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVP-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The General Arrangement drawings do not show how the Winthorpe Footpaths 2 and 3 will continue from Long Hollow Way towards Coddington. In fact, we notice that your drawings do not even acknowledge the existence of Godfrey Drive in this location.	2B	N	<p>The General Arrangement plans produced for statutory consultation utilised current Ordnance Survey mapping as the background and Godfrey Drive had not been added to these at the time of initial publication.</p> <p>The Applicant has added the start of the routes from Long Hollow Way onto the plans, this would then connect onto the existing route and continue towards Coddington.</p> <p>The updated Ordnance Survey model file was made available in June 2023. Godfrey Drive now appears in this updated model and on the drawings. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWFK-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Make sure pedestrians/cyclists have appropriate access to get from A616 into Newark, across redesigned cattle market roundabout.	2H	N	<p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road where the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RW9M-T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Although I am submitting this as a private individual, I am secretary of the local group of Cycling UK and am party to the objection being sent by the A46 Active Travel Partnership and support the points made in this objection.	2I	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment relating to the consultation response submitted by the A46 Active Travel Partnership.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard to the A46 Active Travel Partnership response within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWA7-C.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWAW-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Further to reviewing your proposals for the A46 bypass works at Newark, I would be grateful if you would give some consideration to my comments below:</p> <p>I regularly use the Sustrans 64 to commute by cycle from Collingham to Newark. On page 22 it appears you are proposing to re-route the Sustrans route by linking it with the proposed roundabout for the northbound traffic exiting the A46 into the north of Newark.</p> <p>The previous Sustrans route avoids any such traffic and while it is unlit it is relatively safe. The new route it appears would put cyclists into potentially heavy traffic and could easily put the safety and wellbeing of cyclists at risk. I have copied Sustrans in on this message I feel they should have the opportunity to review your proposal <a href="https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-roads/east-midlands/a46-newark-bypass/">https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-roads/east-midlands/a46-newark-bypass/</a></p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Sustrans during the Scheme development.</p> <p>A new walking and cycling route would be provided to the new Brownhills Junction Roundabout and road links. This would cross the Brownhills Junction exit slip road via a new signalised crossing. This would preserve the Trent Valley Way (Sustrans 64) connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. Lighting would be provided on Winthorpe Road, between Winthorpe Road estate and Winthorpe.</p> <p>The Trent Valley Way route from the existing A1 subway to the existing A46 subway is 105m longer than the existing route along Winthorpe Road. The route is within an open bridge structure and is separated away from the carriageway by 1.5m next to a road that would only be used by vehicles accessing the boarding kennels facility and turning around to return to Brownhills Roundabout.</p> <p>A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would be an unpleasant environment and would deter users.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVG-H	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>At one of the presentation sessions given by National Highways, I was told that the footpath/cyclepath between Newark and Winthorpe would be lengthened by 400m as a result of re-routing it. That's a long way for the infant/junior age children and their parents who walk to Winthorpe school and back every day from Winthorpe Road estate, and an annoying extra 400m for adults who use it to get to Newark on foot. Also this pedestrian/cycle route is currently completely separate from any major traffic and in this scheme it will be alongside and crossing traffic. Children, remember, going to and from school. Could this new roundabout and footpath/cyclepath not be reconsidered and made more practical and safe for all concerned?</p>	2B	N	<p>At Winthorpe Road, a new walking and cycling route would be provided to preserve the existing Winthorpe Road connection from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent. A signalised crossing would be provided on the new Brownhills Junction, which would allow for safe crossing of the exit slip road. The new walking and cycling provision would connect into the existing to the north-west of Winthorpe Road, and allow a safe route from Winthorpe, under the A46 and onwards towards Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The route would be 105m longer than the existing route, a direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWMZ-U	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>1. I presume cycle access will be maintained across the cattle market roundabout to the cycle path to kelham</p>	2B	N	<p>At Cattle Market the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road where the existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross. For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNK-D	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>dangerous at-grade crossings at Winthorpe roundabout. collisions are inevitable pedestrian crossings on high speed dual carriageways are inherently dangerous - with or without lights. deaths and shunts highly likely. Bridges might be more appropriate. cf A50 in similar situations</p>	2B	N	<p>Traffic signals would be provided to reduce the risk of collisions and separate the traffic movement between each phase at Winthorpe Roundabout. A signalised crossing would be provided across the roundabout to connect Winthorpe to Newark Showground and provide a safe crossing of the dual carriageway. It would also provide a safe crossing route for walkers and cyclists between Drove Lane and the A1133.</p> <p>A new pedestrian bridge is not being provided in this location due to space constraints, the required length of the bridge, visual impact and high associated cost, alongside relatively low predicted usage.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWM4-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Somehow require maintenance for safe pedestrian use of all sidewalks and crossings where roads feeding into Newark cross or go under/over the new road sections.</p>	2D	N	<p>Requirement 4 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> requires that the Applicant prepare a Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan. The Third Iteration Management plan will contain detailed plans relating to the operational and maintenance phase of the Scheme.</p>

**N.5 – Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 - Community Groups**

N.5.A: Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Introductory text	<p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>When the proposals for the dualling of the A46 Newark Bypass were published in November 2020 residents of Winthorpe became concerned over the effect it would have on the village and wider parish of Winthorpe. A group of residents came together in December of 2020 as 'Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group' with the purpose of protecting the interests of our community where we would be affected by the road development. Think Again is an independent group, not directly affiliated with Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council.</p> <p>As stated clearly in the group's constitution, it is not opposed to the development of the scheme, which is recognised as being both necessary and widely supported by many national and local organisations. Our purpose is to negotiate with the Applicant National Highways and their appointed agents to get the best outcome for Winthorpe in the design and construction of the A46 Bypass.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the introductory text provided by the Consultee. Further information relating to engagement with this Consultee can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Further details of engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Road layout; Landscape and visual effects; Cultural heritage; Speed limit;	<p>2. THE SCHEME</p> <p>The November 2020 publication 'A46 Newark Bypass Option Summary Report' revealed two/ proposed route options, 1 and 2. On examining these routes, Think Again members raised various of objections regarding them.</p> <p>For route option 1 they felt that the curve over the A1 bridge brought the road very close to properties at the south end of Winthorpe. Furthermore, the proposed flyover bringing traffic from the Friendly Farmer roundabout to the north-east bound A46 carriageway would be very intrusive for residents of the Spinney, both in terms of the light and noise pollution from HGVs climbing over the flyover bridge, but also in the large visual intrusion close to their properties.</p> <p>For route option 2 the dual carriageway location even closer to the village, crossing the Winthorpe Parklands and resulting in the demolition of two properties, was also unacceptable. The effect of the design requiring eight lanes of highway, with unrestricted speed, was also very disturbing. At the same time, concerns of the effect of the road in heritage and environment were voiced, but it was decided that Think Again should try to influence the route design in a positive way, hoping that this would help alleviate some of these other issues.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments with regards to the previous options presented as part of the Scheme's development.</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives for the Scheme alignment which informed the current design. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides a description of the alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant, the specific characteristics of the alternatives studied, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Introductory text; Road layout; Stakeholder engagement	<p>In April of 2021 Think Again submitted an engineered design for an alternative route which was titled Option 3. Images of the submitted plans are shown below (Page 3 of report).</p> <p>The salient features of this design were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The siting of the new road on the alignment of the existing from the service stations to Winthorpe roundabout.</li> <li>• Moving the A1 crossing curve further away from Winthorpe properties using a highway curve of 510m radius. This tighter curve, implying a design speed of 85 kph, was justified by the observation that the proposed curves at Cattle Market and Robert Dukeson Avenue were already tighter than 510 m.</li> <li>• Connecting A1, A17 and A46 traffic to and from the Lincoln direction by means of a single carriageway, two lane, link road between the Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts.</li> <li>• The preservation of both of the service stations proximate to the main route. In Option 1 the Esso station would have been demolished, in Option 2 both remained but were not accessible by through A46 traffic.</li> </ul> <p>In June 2021 Highways England, via their agent [redacted], responded to our proposal in Technical Note HE551478-ATK-GEN-XX-RP- CH-000004 Revision C02, also reproduced as Appendix C in the November 2021 'Staged Overview of Assessment Report' HE551478-ATK-GEN-XX-PC-CX-000005.</p> <p>The response in this Technical note revealed that:</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Option 3 that was provided by the Consultee as part of the ongoing engagement that has taken place.</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives for the Scheme alignment which informed the current design. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides a description of the alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant, the specific characteristics of the alternatives studied, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects. This includes an overview of the Consultee's proposed Option 3, identifying aspects of that option incorporated into the design.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook a qualitative assessment to evaluate Option 3 provided by the Consultee. As a result of the assessment the Applicant was able to implement a number of the suggested principles highlighted by the Consultee, and included these within the developing Option 2 design (known as Option 2 Modified). This is further detailed in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP6.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 50 mph (85 kph) design speed was proposed in the initial design between Cattle Market and the Winthorpe Road underpass to allow for the required tight curvature.</li> <li>It was the intention to retain 120 kph design speed between this point and the Winthorpe roundabout.</li> <li>A 510 m highway curvature for this speed, even if allowed as two steps below Desirable Minimum, would require such highway widening for sightlines that some of the benefits of Option 3 would be negated.</li> <li>No comment was made on the adequacy, or otherwise, of the single carriageway Link Road.</li> </ul>			
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Road layout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Options consultation	<p>In November 2021 National Highways published their Staged Overview of Assessment Report (SOAR). In this they reviewed the evidence received during their pre-consultation consultation.</p> <p>Amongst the general commentary the Option 3 proposal from Think Again was reviewed in sections 7.6.21 to 26.</p> <p>Favourable comments were made, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Option 3, as proposed by the Think Again group is similar in nature to the Option 2 Modified (see below)'</li> <li>'The assessment of Option 3 is therefore considered to be covered by the assessment of Option 2 Modified and is a viable option.'</li> </ul> <p>The report revealed the new Preferred Route (Figure on Page 4 in report), Option 2 Modified, shown below:</p> <p>In essence this is very similar to Option 3, notably moving the new road onto the existing and utilising a single carriageway Link Road.</p> <p>However Think Again still had some concerns in relation to Winthorpe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Link road was sited on the existing south-west bound carriageway and the north-eastbound carriageway was to be constructed on virgin ground closer to Winthorpe.</li> <li>The highway curve across the A1 was still at a suitable radius for a 120 kph design speed</li> <li>The A1 bridge, whilst further south than before, was still quite close to some Winthorpe properties.</li> <li>The Esso service station would be demolished.</li> </ul> <p>In response to the Option 2 Modified proposal Think Again, in March 2022, published and submitted to National Highways 'The Design and Operation of the Proposed Upgraded A46 Newark By-Pass in the section between The Cattle Market Junction and Winthorpe Junction', in which evidence was submitted to persuade National Highways. The Applicant of the benefits of modifying their design further. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To impose a 50 mph speed limit between the Cattle Market junction and Winthorpe roundabout so as to reduce the pollutant impact of noise, gases and particulates on Winthorpe</li> <li>To move the new highway entirely onto the old, with the new Link Road being constructed to the south-east of the old road so as not to impact on the Winthorpe Parklands.</li> <li>To tighten the curve over the A1 so as to move the bridge still further south</li> <li>To facilitate this design and to control vehicle speeds to design the road to an 85 kph standard and in the manner of a Self Enforcing Highway (National Highways, 'People, Places and Processes, a guide to good design' - 'self-explaining road')</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee with regards to the Option 2 Modified design information, of which details are presented in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Further engagement took place with the Consultee on the issues raised as part of the report produced by the Consultee in March 2022 following the preferred route announcement.</p> <p>The Applicant made further changes to the design following the preferred route announcement, ahead of the statutory consultation which included the following suggestions made by the Consultee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of the existing A46 in its current position between the Esso Service Station and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>A move of the entire alignment south to retain the Esso Service Station and move the alignment away from Winthorpe village</li> <li>Provision of an enforced 50mph speed limit between Cattle Market and Winthorpe Roundabout as a mitigation measure for the steps below desirable minimum in horizontal geometry</li> <li>A single carriageway link road connecting Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts located on the Newark Showground side of the A46</li> </ul> <p>Information relating to the design and layout of the Scheme is detailed within the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>In May 2022 Think Again submitted a further report to National Highways, 'Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Facilities in and around Winthorpe.- Active Travel provision.' In which it addressed the desires of Winthorpe residents that existing facilities for Active Travel infrastructure in our locality would not be adversely affected by the road and, indeed, in accordance with statements made in National Highways' various report, would be actively enhanced.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the report provided by the Consultee and carried out further engagement with the Consultee ahead of consultation on the issues raised.</p> <p>As part of the ongoing design development, additional walking and cycling routes have been added to the Scheme presented for statutory consultation. These removed the north/south severance between Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 that the current A46 provides.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>A generalised view of our desires is shown here (figure on p5 of report). In particular, Think Again was looking for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A re-connection of Winthorpe footpaths 2 and 3 towards Coddington.</li> <li>• A cycling route via Hargon Lane to connect Sustrans National Route 64 to the showground side of the new road.</li> <li>• An extension of the current cycle/ walking route from Newark to the Mastercare location up to the Showground entrance.</li> <li>• Protection against degradation of the Sustrans National Route 64, Trent Valley Way and Trent Vale Trail between Newark and Winthorpe.</li> </ul>			<p>The design also provides a connection to the Sustrans Route 64 and a 3m wide walking and cycling route alongside the Friendly Farmer Link Road to the Newark Showground entrance.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation, a further walking and cycling route has been introduced from Hargon Lane to the A1133 where it passes around the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout to re-join with Drove Lane and the Newark Showground entrance.</p> <p>The design changes noted in the Consultee's response have been incorporated into the design, resulting in a design with reduced impacts on Winthorpe, improved walking and cycling facilities and further retention of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Further information relating to the walking and cycling routes on the Scheme can be seen on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Road layout; Stakeholder engagement; Walkers cyclists and horse-riders	<p>In September 2022 the Draft Preliminary Design of the road, prepared for submission to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the Development Control Order (DCO), was released (Figure on P6 of report): Think Again welcome the many features of this new design which go a long way to addressing the many concerns we posed at the beginning of the process. We feel that this progress has come about through the constructive and cordial relationship we have had with National Highways and [redacted].</p> <p>In this iteration of the design we note:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The siting of the new road between the service stations entirely on the existing carriageways.</li> <li>• The Link Road being sited on the showground side of the new road.</li> <li>• The tightening of the curve leading on to the Winthorpe section, allowing the A1 bridge to be moved further south.</li> <li>• The retention of both service stations.</li> <li>• The provision of the Non-Motorised User (NMU) path between the A1133 and the A1 facilitating the footpath re-connection and cycling connection to the Showground/ Mastercare facilities.</li> </ul> <p>These features reduce the impact of the road on Winthorpe compared with that posed by the original design proposal in 2020.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding changes made to the Scheme design that addressed concerns previously raised by them.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the engagement that has taken place with the Consultee and their efforts to provide constructive comments on the Scheme design.</p> <p>Further information relating to engagement with this group can be found in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>Further details of engagement that has taken place, and areas of agreement and disagreement identified during pre-application consultation with the Consultee, will be recorded within a Statement of Common Ground, which will be developed and submitted to the Examining Authority during the course of the Development Consent Order examination.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Consultation – general; Road layout	<p>Think Again would like to make clear that the section 3.2.15 in the October 2022 PEI Vol 1, describing our interaction with National Highways, is erroneous. The 'solution' as described and attributed to Think Again is that which was submitted by the Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council and has no connection with our 'Option 3' submission. As already indicated, large parts of our Option 3 were adopted by National Highways.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee regarding the solution attributed to the Consultee within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee about the issue raised and has updated Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> to reflect the use of the Consultee's Option 3 proposal as part of the development of the Scheme design.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Road layout; Speed limit	<p>3. ASSESSMENT OF THIS PRELIMINARY DESIGN AS IT AFFECTS WINTHORPE</p> <p>Whilst the revised design is most welcome, there are still elements that we are concerned about, or would like to be enhanced.</p> <p>1. The road alignment between Cattle Market and Winthorpe roundabout, shown on the General Arrangement drawings, features three horizontal curves of 367, 500 and 471 m radius without significant central reservation widening. Such road parameters imply an 85kph design speed but, although it has been suggested to us that a 50 mph limit will be applied there has been no confirmation of this feature. As pointed out in our report 'The Design and Operation of the Proposed Upgraded A46 Newark By-Pass in the section between The Cattle Market Junction and Winthorpe Junction', design and operation of the road to this standard in the spirit of the 'Self Explaining Road' would go a long way to addressing many of our worries about noise and pollution. Enforcement of any such speed limit by an Average Speed camera system would be necessary.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns relating to the road alignment and speed limit of the carriageway.</p> <p>A speed limit would be allocated to each section of road modified as part of the Scheme. These speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>.</p> <p>The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit. Information relating to the use of speed enforcement cameras is detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The speed limits on local roads, including the A1133 which is in proximity to Winthorpe Primary School, would be retained. The only exception being a short length of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market which would be reduced from national speed limit to</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					30mph. For further information relating to speed limits please see the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Brownhills Junction; Landscape and visual effects	<p>2. The newly proposed Brownhills Junction roundabout is described in the documentation as a 'small' roundabout but is shown on the General Arrangement drawings as about 50m in diameter. This is bigger than any of the existing Brownhills, Friendly Farmer or Winthorpe roundabouts. Why does it have to be so big? Indeed why does it have a standard circular form when 99.9 % of the traffic on it will be from the slip road to Brownhills roundabout? The only traffic on the southern sector will be visitors to the [redacted].</p> <p>3. This roundabout and connector to Brownhills Roundabout is shown elevated about 2m above the existing ground level, presumably because of the flood risk. This has raised the level of the main route embankment to a height of 8m at the slip road overbridge and 10m at the A1 bridge. This produces a significant visual impact in the area, notably the new A1 bridge will be 2m higher than the existing crossing.</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns relating to the new Brownhills Junction Roundabout and has carried out further engagement with the group following the statutory consultation on the issues raised.</p> <p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction would retain access into the properties on Winthorpe Road. The new roundabout has an inscribed circle diameter of 60m. This is slightly smaller than the existing Brownhills Roundabout that has an approximate diameter of 70m.</p> <p>The size of this roundabout has been designed in accordance with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 116 - Geometric design of roundabouts</i> and vehicle tracking to allow the number of vehicles forecasted by traffic modelling, including HGVs, to safely turn right at the roundabout from the slip road.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environment Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. It demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. Due to flood risk, the design requires the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction to have a set elevation based upon a hydraulic model of the floodplain developed in consultation with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction has been lowered to the same height as the adjacent A1 but cannot be lowered further as it needs to be above the 1 in 1000 year storm event flood level for safety reasons. The embankments on the approach to the A1/A46 Crossing are up to 10.8m high from the existing ground level. The bridge height of the A1/A46 Crossing has been set as low as possible to cross the A1 and the road level would be approximately 9.6m above the A1.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, which include roadside planting wherever practicable to reduce the impact of the Scheme, by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors.</p> <p>Two Landscape Character Areas (Landscape Character Area 1 Trent Washlands and Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe Village Farmlands) would experience temporary significant adverse effects during the construction of the Scheme and also in Year 1 (2028 the year the Scheme is open to traffic). Fifteen visual receptors would experience significant adverse effects during construction of the Scheme, reducing to six receptors in Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic).</p> <p>When considering the establishment of mitigation planting by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), only the following areas are considered to have a residual significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe Village and Farmlands</li> <li>• Visual receptor No.24 (residential properties at Sandhills Park)</li> <li>• Visual receptor No.40 (users of the Trent Valley Way and National Cycle Network Route 64 on Winthorpe Road)</li> </ul>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	4. Section 8.11.20 of the PEI vol 1 names Sandhills Park as likely to suffer long term significant adverse visual impairment, where the Cattle Market flyover is at an elevation of 8m, but there is no similar concern over the Newark to Winthorpe visual break area. Is there some method of protecting from the flood risk whilst keeping all the roads at a significantly lower level?	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns relating to the impact of the Scheme on the Newark-on-Trent to Winthorpe Open Break (referred to by the Consultee as visual break area).</p> <p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction has been lowered to the same height as the adjacent A1 but cannot be lowered further as it needs to be above the 1 in 1000-year storm event flood level for safety reasons.</p> <p>With regards to the height of the A1/A46 Crossing as part of the Scheme design, the clearance beneath the new bridge is very similar to the existing A1/A46 crossing. However</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>due to the large span of the new bridge required across the A1, the depth is much greater, which raises the road alignment.</p> <p>Safety during construction, and during use for maintenance and visibility, ruled out the introduction of intermediate supports to potentially reduce the bridge depth.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. It demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. The Scheme's flood risk mitigation includes keeping the road elevated road as is consistent with the existing A46 carriageway.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The potential impacts upon the Winthorpe Open Break have been assessed as part of the broader Landscape Character Assessment of Winthorpe village and farmlands, which is considered to have a large adverse effect during construction and 2028 (year the Scheme is open to traffic), reducing to a moderate adverse effect by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Mitigation in the form of planting would be provided to reduce the effect as far as possible.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Brownhills Junction; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Proposals to reduce the height of the roadway between chainage 4900 at Robert Dukeson Avenue and chainage 5600 at the Esso service station:</p> <p>The road elevation in this zone is largely influenced by the construction of the Brownhills/[redacted] roundabout on a 2 metre high embankment in order to counter the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Other influences are the necessary bridge height clearance and bridge deck depths at the A46 north bound slip and the A1 crossing.</p> <p>Thus, if this roundabout was constructed at the existing ground level, the entire road elevation could be significantly lowered in this region. In order to justify this change, the balance of risk and benefits of the change need to be examined. The roundabout is situated in the Environment Agency's designated Flood Zone 2. The definition of this is an annual exceedance probability of flooding between 1% and 0.1%, that is between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year flood frequency expectation.</p> <p>The other element of risk is the harm that would be experienced. In this situation the harm could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to the highway structure</li> <li>• Damage to road infrastructure such as lighting columns and signage</li> <li>• Disruption to traffic flows, including walking and cycling.</li> </ul> <p>It is unlikely that flood water would cause significant damage to the road construction, lighting and signage. Damage to electrical infrastructure could be minimised by siting all switchgear out of, or above, the flood area.</p> <p>Traffic disruption would not be a major concern as there are relatively short diversion routes. Vehicular traffic would still be able to access all routes via the Winthorpe roundabout and a foot/cycle route also exists via the existing A1 footbridge and the new Winthorpe NMU.</p> <p>To assess the actual risk a probability/harm matrix is illustrative (Table on P8 of report). An assessment for this case would be that there is a medium to low probability of flooding but a low level of harm, implying a low risk to the performance of the overall bypass.</p> <p>In this case it is worth questioning whether the large expense of providing the extra materials, land take and work to lift the road above the flood level is justified for such a low risk. If, however, an assessment is made that the risk is still unacceptable, an alternative way of providing protection could be used. The diagram below (P8 in report) illustrates an</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regards to the construction of the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction in a flood zone. The Applicant has carried out further engagement with the Consultee following the statutory consultation on the issues raised.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted in accordance with governmental planning policy and is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. It demonstrates that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The Scheme's flood risk mitigation includes keeping the road elevated road as is consistent with the existing A46 carriageway. As the road is considered Essential Infrastructure, the asset has to be designed with elevation above the floodplain to enable continuous use.</p> <p>The new roundabout at Brownhills Junction has been lowered to the same height as the adjacent A1 but cannot be lowered further as it needs to be above the 1 in 1000-year storm event flood level for safety reasons. The embankments on the approach to the A1 crossing are up to 10.8m high from existing ground level, the A1/A46 Crossing bridge height has been set as low as possible to cross the A1. The road level would be approximately 9.6m above the A1.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees that diversionary routes would be suitable mitigation in the event of flooding, due to the Essential Infrastructure and Trunk Road classifications of the asset. The Exception Test outlined in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the requirements of Essential Infrastructure in further detail. A flood bank would not protect the road adequately, as groundwater flooding would still occur.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>arrangement whereby protection of the roundabout and its associated roads is provided by a flood bank around the area from the slip road to Brownhills roundabout.</p> <p>Preliminary calculations indicate that, whereas a flood bank would take about 3,000 m<sup>3</sup> of fill, reducing the main road, slip road, roundabout and footpath embankments would save about 29,000 m<sup>3</sup> plus the construction of 2 m on every wing wall and bridge abutment.</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals	<p>General Arrangement Drawing Sheet 5 of 8 indicates that there will be a footpath alongside the Link Road to maintain existing NMU access. This seems a retrograde step. It had previously been suggested that a dedicated combined footpath and cycleway would be provided between Godfrey Drive, where the existing cycleway and footpath ends, and the Showground entrance at Drove Lane, sited on the old airfield perimeter track. This would surely be better practice, from a safety and health perspective, than siting it directly alongside a heavily trafficked rural road.</p> <p>No design details have been published for the various Public Rights of Way and NMU routes. Think Again are concerned that, where such facilities are constructed they should be of an acceptable standard, allowing for safe use by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders with sufficient capacity and dimensions to avoid conflict between the various user categories. We would like to ensure that the re-routed section of the Winthorpe footpaths 2 and 3 under the new A46 is also available to cyclists and horse-riders.</p> <p>A feature of the latest design concerning these routes is the at-grade crossing points of the Trent Valley Way on the proposed north-bound slip road and the at-grade crossing of the re-routed Winthorpe footpaths 2 and 3 on the remaining dual carriageway connector between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills. Whilst it has been suggested to us that these will be light controlled, there has been no confirmation of this.</p> <p>From a safety and usability perspective we need these crossings to have at least this level of control. Even with light control in place, further assessment is required to ensure safety of users, particularly given the numbers of children using this route on a daily basis in order to access Winthorpe Primary School.</p> <p>The General Arrangement drawings do not show how the Winthorpe Footpaths 2 and 3 will continue from Long Hollow Way towards Coddington. In fact, we notice that your drawings do not even acknowledge the existence of Godfrey Drive in this location. Consultation with County Council is needed here, and we would like to be engaged in this.</p> <p>Although we have been informally told that the phasing of traffic light control on the Winthorpe Throughabout would expedite the movement of show day traffic from the A46 into the Showground, we have not seen any evidence that such technological control would work.</p> <p>Show day traffic has been a significant contributor to journey time delays on the A46 and feeder roads in the past. Any incident or blockage on the unfamiliar Throughabout could cause a complete seizure in the locality.</p> <p>We also have concerns around the safety of road users if there is a power failure or computer malfunction which affects the traffic lights on the junction. Unlike a normal gyratory roundabout, where drivers can revert to the normal priority rules, it is difficult to see how a Throughabout can function without control. Is there a failsafe mode?</p> <p>The Trent Valley Way, the Trent Vale Trail and Sustrans National Route 64 are significantly re-routed in the latest design. We are very concerned that this might deter users, especially as the proposed pathway is very close to trafficked roads, both in the slip road bridge and at the at-grade crossing.</p> <p>We would welcome some efforts at making this route as attractive to users as possible. We would also welcome some knowledge of how this route will be kept open during the construction phase and, likewise, how access to [redacted] will be maintained throughout the construction period.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments raised by the Consultee and carried out further engagement with the Consultee following the statutory consultation on the issues raised.</p> <p>The new route alongside the Friendly Farmer Link Road would be a combined 3m wide walking and cycling path with a 0.5m offset from the road. This is considered an improvement when compared with the existing route which runs alongside the busier A46 for a longer length and is a lot narrower.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the suggestion from the Consultee with regards to a combined footpath between Godfrey Drive and Drove Lane. It is accepted that a route that is sited on the old airfield perimeter track would be preferable for the reasons mentioned by the Consultee. However after further review of the Scheme impacts, the Applicant concluded that the enhancement along Drove Lane is not needed to mitigate the Scheme impacts.</p> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification would be put in place and appropriate design processes, including risk assessments and a road safety audit, would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. This includes all combined walking and cycling routes having a width of 3m and a suitable gradient so that they are accessible for all road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. The re-routed section of Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 would be suitable for use by cyclists, but not for horse-riders. This is due to the fact that the narrow connecting routes either side are not designed as bridleways.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the crossings of Brownhills Junction northbound carriageway and the A46 between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Brownhills Roundabout would both be signalised as described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. All further necessary assessment would be carried out at the detailed design stage of the Scheme to ensure these are crossings are safe for all road users.</p> <p>The <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation utilised Ordnance Survey mapping data and Godfrey Drive had not been added to this at the time of publication. A new and updated Ordnance Survey model file was made available in June 2023. Godfrey Drive now appears in this updated model and on the latest General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has added the start of the routes from Long Hollow Way onto the plans. Any further improvements to the routes from Long Hollow Way towards Coddington are outside the Order Limits of the Scheme. As this part of the route is not affected by the Scheme, the Applicant is not proposing any further work in this area.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council have been consulted on the above-mentioned elements of the Scheme design walking and cycling routes. The Consultee was consulted separately regarding issues relating to walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the Newark Showground event operators to manage traffic for events. However, the Applicant would install a signal controller that can be adjusted remotely by National Highways and alter the timings at Winthorpe Roundabout to give more 'green time' to Newark Showground traffic entering or leaving the site. This is common practice and has been used for at least two decades. The protocol for the timing changes and when this</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>occurs would be agreed at detailed design stage between the Applicant, Newark Showground owners and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>To improve traffic flows in and out of Newark Showground, the Applicant would provide a new entrance into the Showground from the new Friendly Farmer Link Road and the existing entrance to the bowling club would be a left out only exit.</p> <p>The most likely cause of failure of the signals is a power failure. To mitigate this, a backup battery supply would be provided. If the signals were to fail then traffic management would be put in place to close the through section of the roundabout. It would then operate as a conventional roundabout.</p> <p>The design of the Winthorpe Roundabout has been updated since the statutory consultation. It was updated due to design development, as modelling showed that taking the Friendly Farmer Link Road traffic through the gyratory of the roundabout was more effective than taking the A46 carriageway traffic through the centre of the roundabout.</p> <p>The updated design was included as part of the targeted consultation which was held between 17 March to 16 April 2023. This design performs well in both the opening year of the Scheme (2028) and 15 years after opening (2043). Traffic modelling shows that this is sufficient for the traffic that is forecast to use the roundabout, as evidenced within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The re-routed Trent Valley Way, the Trent Vale Trail and Sustrans National Route 64 would be 105m longer than existing. A direct route could have been provided through a new subway beneath the new A46 and slip road, but public and local user groups contended that this would have been an unpleasant environment and would deter users. All routes would be separated by a minimum 0.5m segregation strip adjacent to the highway to make it a more pleasant environment for users.</p> <p>The route and access to the would remain open throughout construction. The associated Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> provides details on how the environment effects and traffic movements would be managed during construction.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>There are still a few further features that we would like to see included in the final design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The provision of bus stops on the new Link Road in the vicinity of the Showground entrance would help to promote the use of Public Transport for visitors to the Showground. As the route 367 from Newark to Winthorpe, Collingham and Harby will have to be routed on this Link Road, these bus stops would be served by an existing route, providing an extra service for little input.</li> <li>2. The provision of the NMU between the A1133 and the A1, connecting to Hargon Lane, Winthorpe Footpath 2 and Long Hollow Way is a welcome and useful addition to Winthorpe's infrastructure. The addition of a connecting path from Thoroughfare Lane end to the NMU alongside the new section of the A1133 to the roundabout, as shown in the diagram below (P10 of report), would extend the utility of this NMU considerably. Furthermore, since Thoroughfare Lane passes by the entrance to Winthorpe Primary School this would provide an extra facility for parents and children to walk or cycle to the school, especially if the pathway was constructed to a standard enabling prams and pushchairs and was physically isolated from the road. The school have expressed support for this pathway and walking route, as have village residents at Think Again's village meetings on the 23rd of November</li> <li>3. Since we have managed to save the Esso Service Station and its associated shop, Winthorpe would be quite well served if there was some access from the NMU to this shop. Residents would then be able to walk or cycle to get their small item shopping instead of having to drive to Newark or Collingham."</li> </ol>	N/A	N	<p>Bus stops would not be provided as part of the Scheme as these are requested by the bus operating companies when there is demand for a stop. Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council are aware of the request.</p> <p>As noted, a walking and cycling route would be provided between Hargon Lane and the A1133 and this would link to a route around the eastern side of Winthorpe roundabout to Drove Lane and the first main entrance to Newark Showground. Thoroughfare Lane was considered but the Hargon Lane option was selected as it provided a route from the centre of Winthorpe village which benefitted all residents in a similar way.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's suggestion for walking and cycling route access to the Esso Service Station and will explore this option during the detailed design stage of the Scheme. This has not been included at this stage of the Scheme as this requires works to be undertaken by the landowner to ensure a safe walking route through the garage forecourt.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Air quality	<p>4. AIR QUALITY</p> <p>The analysis of air quality remains incomplete with substantial data still to be collected on a number of potential pollutants. Diffusion tube monitoring is ongoing and will provide baseline figures for analysis. It is disappointing that this data is not available for consultation.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The comment relates to the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation which provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Although there is a view to scope out smaller particulate matter (PM2.5) as initial analysis suggests that the larger PM10 particles are unlikely to exceed threshold levels, we support the view of the Scoping Opinion for A46 Newark Bypass and in particular the response from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA). The ES should demonstrate in more detail how this approach will ensure the objective is not exceeded by the Development and that greater analysis of all pollutant effects are considered, even when below the thresholds described in DMRB LA105.</p> <p>As stated by the UKHSA "pollutants associated with road traffic or combustion, particularly particulate matter and oxides of nitrogen are non-threshold; i.e. an exposed population is likely to be subject to potential harm at any level..."</p> <p>Any negative effects on air quality irrespective of magnitude and threshold levels are not acceptable and further details of mitigation would be welcomed as part of the ES. Two properties within the Winthorpe and Langford Parish are already amongst the 12 most impacted receptors in the analysis area.</p> <p>Furthermore, as indicated above regarding footpath usage, some walkways will be adjacent to road infrastructure. Every effort should take place to protect NMUs from air pollutants generated by the road.</p>			<p>required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on air quality.</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken as part of the air quality assessment using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling accounts for all roads within the study area that meet the criteria for assessment. Dispersion modelling to determine the air quality effects includes all roads within 200m of affected roads where they add to total pollution concentrations. Roads modelled within the air quality assessment are presented in Figure 5.4 (Air Quality Affected Road Network) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen at sensitive locations within 200m of the air quality affected road network and include residential properties, schools and hospitals (where present), in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. The air quality objectives are not typically assessed at footpath locations as the short-term (1-hour) air quality objectives are unlikely to be exceeded and members of the public are not reasonably expected to spend one hour or longer at any single location along a footpath.</p> <p>Winthorpe village and Langford are located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore have not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village and Langford.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO<sub>2</sub> or particulate (PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub>) air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any human health receptors within the study area. The maximum modelled concentration for NO<sub>2</sub> in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 31.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>. The maximum modelled concentration for PM<sub>10</sub> in the base year of the Scheme is predicted to be 28.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides detail on why PM<sub>2.5</sub> has not been considered further within the operational phase of the local air quality assessment.</p> <p>In summary, <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds and modelling of particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>) can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. For this assessment, when the maximum modelled road contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> of 4.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> from existing traffic in the base year at modelled receptors is combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded.</p> <p>Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>. Further to this, the greatest change in annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations at modelled receptors in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 3.9 µg/m<sup>3</sup> between the Do Something and Do Minimum scenarios. Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> would therefore be even lower in the opening year of the Scheme, as PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are an order of magnitude lower than nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions which are primarily made up of nitric oxide (NO) and NO<sub>2</sub>. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that the current and future PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are lower than the current target value of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and the Scheme will not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>threshold at any of the human health receptors considered and no further assessment is required.</p> <p>Therefore, no significant air quality effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme and no mitigation measures are proposed.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Cultural heritage; Landscape and visual effects	<p>5. CULTURAL HERITAGE</p> <p>Winthorpe Conservation Area borders the proposed scheme in multiple places and the new A1 overbridge and its environs are within the Conservation Area as currently defined.</p> <p>A number of Listed buildings are in close proximity to the scheme. We are pleased that details of mitigation are included in the latest plans to reduce the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area. However, we believe there are further features necessary to give additional protection to Winthorpe.</p> <p>Table 7.4 summarises key heritage assets that may be affected during construction. Although the Winthorpe Conservation Area, Winthorpe Church of All Saints and its Gate Piers plus the Thompson Tomb are itemised in this list, other Listed buildings as close to the scheme, and closer are not mentioned.</p> <p>Of particular concern is there is no mention of [redacted], a Grade II Listed property in closest proximity to the A1 overbridge. [Redacted] also does not appear in Appendix A (List of Visual Receptors). This is a significant oversight.</p> <p>This property will be affected by noise, vibration, dust and air pollution during construction yet the significance of this is not quantified. The new road will also have significant impact on the setting of this significant property.</p> <p>The south of the village currently has no additional mitigating features detailed, and the effect of existing tree lines and other features are unlikely to give sufficient protection for the new road; we would welcome additional screening to reduce the impact to the Conservation Area, but also give benefits listed elsewhere in this report.</p> <p>It is also noted that the analysis of Table 7.4 states the presence of construction compounds within Winthorpe Conservation Area. We would like to know details of the plans for these compounds, and encourage sympathetic integration within the scheme boundaries and the Conservation Area.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments relating to cultural heritage. Views from the conservation area towards the existing road network are well screened by existing mature trees and hedges.</p> <p>The addition of the A1/A46 Crossing and road section down to the Winthorpe Roundabout is considered to amount to less than substantial harm, in that it would impact only part of the conservation area and part of its setting, and therefore would not amount to substantial harm.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The Scheme is expected to yield negligible change in noise at Winthorpe Conservation Area and the Lowwood area. In general, this is because the A1 would remain the dominant source of noise and the traffic on this road has been predicted to have negligible change. Furthermore, the impacts of the widened A46, despite being closer than its current position, are mitigated by a low noise running surface and noise barriers. The new A46 earthworks also block noise from the A1.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, between Lowwood area and the A1 in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of the conservation area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. Any views of the new A1/A46 Crossing should be reduced to glimpse views.</p> <p>Noise bunds along the A46 would also mitigate against noise impacts to the south, and additional planting here would soften the visual impact of these bunds. Therefore, with this mitigation in place, it is considered that the effect on Winthorpe Conservation Area would be reduced to moderate adverse in construction (including a consideration of different construction activities and the presence of construction compounds adjacent to the conservation area boundary), reducing to permanent slight adverse as a result of construction impacts as planting matures.</p> <p>Operational impacts are assessed as slight, non-significant. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). However, a temporary moderate adverse effect on Lowwood listed building is predicted during construction, reducing to permanent slight adverse as mitigation planting matures. Slight adverse impacts are assessed during operation with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Assessment of all designated heritage assets within Winthorpe Conservation Area have been addressed in Appendix 6.3 (Assessment of Cultural Heritage Effects During Construction of the Scheme) and 6.4 (Assessment of Cultural Heritage Effects During Operation of the Scheme) of Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (<b>TR010065/APP/6.4</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Landscape and visual effects; A1/A46 Crossing; Cattle Market Roundabout/Junction; Brownhills Junction	<p>6. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS</p> <p>The latest design proposals for the road alignment have reduced the impact on the landscape character of Winthorpe's locality compared with earlier proposals. As part of the East Nottinghamshire Sandlands Regional Character Area, Winthorpe is noted for its historic field patterns and hedgerows, of which some will be lost where the A1 bridge and embankments link to the road at the service stations. We would like to see significant effort put into preserving these characteristics. Elsewhere there will be some loss to sound barrier bunds and NMU tracks. It is hoped that there will be an acceptable level of re-planting of trees and hedges in these areas. There will, however, be a significant level of visual intrusion for a wide range of properties in Winthorpe and also on the Winthorpe Parklands, a part of the conservation area. Of particular concern is the impact of the unexpectedly high A1 bridge and</p>	N/A	N	<p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Assessment of the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The assessment includes the potential impacts and likely significance of effect for properties on Barley Way, Wheatsheaf Avenue and southern properties in Winthorpe.</p> <p>The assessment considers visual impacts and effects at Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening), during both winter and summer. Viewpoint photography and digital photomontages are utilised in this assessment, to fully consider the effects of mitigation planting both in the short and longer term (once planting has established).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>its approach embankments. This will be clearly seen by properties in the [redacted] and The Spinney as it is a full 2 metres above the height of the existing bridge. The bridge could, with advantage, be constructed at a lower level as suggested on pages 7 and 8. Residents of The Spinney are particularly concerned that, whereas their present view of the A46 is mostly obscured by the zone of trees between the A1 and the Esso Service Station, a significant area of these will be removed and the bridge and approach embankment will be fully exposed to their view until the suggested area of planting alongside the embankment has matured. An augmentation of the existing tree belt along the higher boundary of the field adjacent to the A1, between the road and [redacted] is needed, especially some lower height shrubs and trees as the existing trees are quite tall with bare lower trunks. PEI Vol 1 section 8.11 20 comments that the new road will be very dominant at Crees Lane and Sandhills Park, but no mention is made of Barley Way, Wheatsheaf Avenue and southern properties in Winthorpe which are even more dominated by the high embankment and bridge. For some aspects of The Spinney and the Southfields location it is hoped that the construction of the earth bunds, together with extensive tree and vegetation planting will help to mask the road. We note that, in the Forestry Commission's response in the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion, they say 'Where woodland loss is unavoidable, it is expected that there will be significant compensation and the use of buffer zones to enhance the resilience of neighbouring woodlands.' They also comment on the Government's aspiration to plant 30,000 ha of woodland per year by 2025.</p> <p>In their response to the Planning Inspectorate, Newark and Sherwood District Council call for the planting of medium and large trees in these zones. We would like to see an extension of such proposed tree and shrub planting zones to the Winthorpe side of the new NMU. National Highways' publication 'People, places and processes: A guide to good road design' sets out an ambition to create 'good' road designs, this is referenced in the PEI vol 1 at 8.2.15. Where elements of the road environment have a particular visual effect, such as bridges, lighting, ponds, swales and road furniture we would like to see a commitment to providing aesthetically pleasing designs. Whilst it is clear that, where existing structures such as the river and rail bridges are duplicated, a sympathetic similar structure is appropriate, in the case of the A1 and Cattle Market bridge structures something more elegant is required as both mark the entrance into Newark. A particular concern for the residents of the Southfield estate and properties on the north end of Gainsborough Road is the style of lighting for the new Winthorpe roundabout. Floodlighting the junction from very tall lamp standards would be exceptionally intrusive. The same concerns will be experienced by residents local to the new Brownhills Junction roundabout.</p>			<p>Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme, including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. This includes the retention of areas of existing intervening vegetation which is located between Winthorpe and the Currys Distribution Centre. Where removal is unavoidable, mitigation planting would be provided wherever practicable to ensure landscape integration and screening of the Scheme which would also reinstate screening value of views towards the distribution centre.</p> <p>There are several lines of vegetation to be provided between Winthorpe village and the Scheme. For instance, between the southern edge of Winthorpe and the A1 a new area of woodland is would be provided to create a visual screen adjacent to Lowwood. To the south-east, a series of planted landscape bunds would also offer screening and continue the green corridor that would be provided along the route of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Mitigation would be provided within the Order Limits of the Scheme, to ensure mitigation is delivered on-site and embedded within the Scheme design.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Biodiversity; Landscape and visual effects; Road drainage and the water environment	<p><b>7.BIODIVERSITY</b></p> <p>The construction of the new road around Newark will have a significant impact on the flora and fauna in our locality. Where there are impacts we would hope that mitigation infrastructure will go beyond maintenance of the status quo and provide real term improvements in Biodiversity metrics called for by the Environment Agency and mandated in the 2021 Environment Act.</p> <p>The aspects that we would like to see addressed include tree and hedgerow planting and maintenance, preservation and further provision of wildlife corridors and protection of the aquatic environments of the Fleet and the Slough Dyke. Tree and shrub planting is important for the provision of cover, food availability and habitats as well as for visual amenity. Hedgerows are a vital feature of animal mobility and should be preserved and enhanced. Trees provide roosting sites for the wide variety of birds found locally.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned that the removal of the copse on the existing Winthorpe roundabout and adjacent tree belt will displace the colony of rooks and other birds currently using them. Sufficient trees of a suitable nature should be planted locally and in advance of</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the potential impacts of the Scheme during construction and operation on foraging, commuting and migration routes (wildlife corridors) of wildlife recorded in the area. The chapter details the appropriate and proportional mitigation measures as informed by robust survey data, desk study records, and an assessment of likely significant effects.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>The compensation planting design is comprised of habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated for, or habitats that support fauna for which the site is designated for. This compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Sites. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Site</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>the works. It is likely that the flood mitigation zone adjacent to Brownhills Junction will be a permanently wet site and might attract water fowl.</p> <p>We would welcome some investigation, alongside the RSPB from Langford Lowfields, on what provisions could usefully be made in this area. Tree and shrub planting requires a long term maintenance plan, with early term watering and longer term pruning and trimming. The selection of appropriate species of trees for sound and visual attenuation, pollution interception and animal habitation is also important. Is such a plan provided in your contracts?</p> <p>As noted in the section on Road Drainage and the Water Environment, the two water courses flowing through our village are significantly impacted by the road drainage, construction disturbance and the increasing developments around the showground. Where appropriate we would encourage National Highways to provide flood management features and pollution control structures, such as attenuation ponds and weirs, incorporating reed bed technology. Aquatic environments such as these not only provide some pollution reducing action but can also serve as habitats for animals and birds. A greater benefit to the local environment would be if the existing flows in the Fleet and the Slough Dyke were intercepted and controlled by such structures.</p> <p>In previous reports to National Highways we have commented on the way that Winthorpe is partially isolated from neighbouring areas by virtue of being cut off on three sides by the Trent, the A1 and the A46. We note National Highways' efforts to maintain and enhance our connectivity, especially with the reconnection of our footpaths 2 and 3 and the other NMU routes. However, such routes are essentially designed for human use and not very adaptable as wildlife corridors, especially where road crossings are involved. We would welcome some investigation into the significance of the A46 construction on animal movements.</p>			<p>habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. No residual significant effects are anticipated during operation. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Scheme mitigation, compensation and monitoring requirements are detailed within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Monitoring would record changes in the ecological baseline, to determine whether the mitigation and compensation measures are successful and inform whether remedial actions are required.</p> <p>Statutory requirements for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are expected for applications for development consent which are not yet in examination, in November 2025. Given the timing of the application for development consent for this Scheme, there are no statutory requirements to undertake a biodiversity net gain assessment or to achieve a specified percentage increase in habitat value for wildlife compared with the pre-development baseline. However, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project applicants are encouraged to take a proactive approach in the transition to mandatory biodiversity net gain by completing a metric and taking opportunities to improve scheme performance against this.</p> <p>A metric is also useful in demonstrating to stakeholders how a scheme is taking biodiversity into account. The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The loss of lowland meadow is unacceptable under the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> as it is considered impossible to compensate for the loss of a very high distinctiveness habitat and therefore a Scheme-wide biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved. The biodiversity net gain assessment excludes the loss and compensation for lowland meadow and a bespoke compensation strategy has been agreed with Natural England as detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The trading rules within the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> have been met by the assessment, i.e. habitat losses would be compensated with sufficient units of the required habitat type and the assessment has predicted a positive biodiversity net gain score. The habitat compensation strategy is based on the principles of no net loss and would also achieve a net gain in habitats of biodiversity value (though not a Scheme-wide biodiversity net gain according to the Metric trading rules), which are of benefit to a wide range of protected species, including enhancement of connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details such as methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss (including for important habitats such as hedgerows) with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present. The design and construction methodology has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible.</p> <p>All veteran or notable trees within or in close proximity to the Order Limits would be retained. The environmental design for the Scheme proposes a variety of planting types including tree and shrub planting, hedgerows and grasslands. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. As set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, the Scheme is anticipated to result in a not</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>significant slight adverse effect on hedgerows once established.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> This includes mitigation in the form of floodplain compensation areas to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation. This is due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained. There would be a slight adverse (but not significant) effect on the rookery due to the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season. The availability of other suitable habitats in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) would support the rookery.</p> <p>The floodplain compensation area at Brownhills is no longer required, and the land would return to its prior agricultural use following completion of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to the possibility of provisions at Langford Lowfields. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested location has not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>There are two tributaries of The Fleet stream which pass through the Scheme. Slough Dyke which is mainly culverted under Newark-on-Trent passes through the Scheme to the east of Brownhills Junction as an open channel before flowing parallel with the A1 and being culverted under the A1 to flow through Winthorpe.</p> <p>The Scheme would result in a minor realignment of the Slough Dyke watercourse to allow for the A1/A46 Crossing to be constructed. This minor realignment would result in the watercourse increasing in length and sinuosity which is considered to be minor beneficial for the watercourse conditions. Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> identifies the outfalls into this watercourse as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The second tributary of The Fleet is located east of the A46/A17 roundabout. This watercourse is culverted under both the A17 and A46 before flowing through Winthorpe to converge with the Slough Dyke to become The Fleet. Appendix 13.5 (Surface Water Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> outlines the monitoring to be undertaken as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Fish are known to use Slough Dyke and therefore measures would be needed to mitigate injury and death of fish including electro-fishing which would be undertaken as part of fish rescue prior to works to Slough Dyke. Any sheet piling or dewatering would be undertaken under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works outside the coarse fish spawning season (avoiding between 15 March to 15 June).</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes general best practice construction practices in accordance with Construction Industry Research and Information Association guidelines to ensure the protection of watercourses such as Fleet stream (and Slough Dyke).</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme including indicative species mixes, which have been chosen to provide visual screening and maximise biodiversity as far as possible.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Noise and vibration; Road layout; A1/A46 Crossing; Brownhills Junction	<p><b>8. NOISE AND VIBRATION</b></p> <p>The height of the A46 dual carriageway embankment between the A1 Winthorpe and Winthorpe Road Estate, Newark (as referenced in Section 3) is between 7.8m and 10.9m higher than the surrounding ground level as it crosses between the existing road to the [redacted] and the new A1 overbridge. This is higher than the existing A1 embankment in the vicinity of the existing Gainsborough Road underpass at its lowest (7.8m) and increasing in height over the A1 carriageway to facilitate the new overbridge. This will mean that although sight lines may be obscured to the new A46 at ground level from the end of Gainsborough Road, noise will be able to travel a considerable distance in all directions including over and combining with existing A1 noise levels.</p> <p>This change in the preliminary design is promoted as beneficial to noise levels as the alignment is marginally further away from Robert Dukeson Avenue in Newark, however this makes some elements of the embankment closer to the built-up area of Winthorpe.</p> <p>In addition, the remainder of the open break land is filled by the new Brownhills junction roundabout that is also likely to elevate noise levels further. Existing noise measurements (Table 12.9) recorded in the vicinity of [redacted] Gainsborough Road and [redacted] are above the daytime LOAEL [Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level], and close to or above the SOAEL [Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level] criteria.</p> <p>Night-time noise levels at both locations clearly exceed the SOAEL by more than 5db meaning significant effects are already likely to human health and wellbeing. Other receptors in the village experience noise at or above the LOAEL during the day and night, but do not breach the SOAEL criteria.</p> <p>The village is already overburdened with noise levels likely to cause health related issues. ANY additional noise generated by the A46 would be unacceptable, never mind the changes in noise specified in Table 12.5. This includes effects on a Noise Important Area and according to The Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006; "Where road schemes have the potential to affect the exposure of populated areas within an NIA, this should be assessed and measured to avoid adverse changes as a result of the scheme or opportunities to create beneficial impacts should be considered".</p> <p>Section 12.11 details the effects of the A46 and changes in the noise characteristics to affected receptors. It is not clear to the general public who make up these receptors where the adversely affected areas are located. The data is summarised in terms of number of receptors, not location thus downplaying the lived experience of both the construction and operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Which properties and receptors are the ones who experience a deleterious effect from noise from construction or operation of the proposed scheme? A number of Winthorpe properties</p>	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of noise on receptors in proximity to the Scheme. It concludes that, with the mitigation set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, the Scheme would not have a significant adverse noise effect at Brownhills or Winthorpe. For a significant number of receptors in these locations, including Bridge House Boarding Kennels, the existing noise climate is dominated by noise from the A1 and that would remain the case with or without the Scheme.</p> <p><i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> has formed the basis of the assessment for noise and vibration. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> remains the benchmark standard for assessing major highways schemes in the UK. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> promotes the assessment of significant effects considering existing noise levels as well as noise impact. Therefore, exceeding significant observed adverse effect level in isolation is not considered a significant adverse effect of the Scheme, unless there is also an adverse impact.</p> <p>Operational vibration has been scoped out of the assessment for the reasons provided in paragraph 3.6.1 of the Scoping Opinion in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> which states that '<i>Based on the low likelihood of significant effects resulting from a new smoother road surface, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of operational phase vibration may be scoped out</i>'. The Applicant understands the concerns regarding low noise road surfacing which would be provided throughout the Scheme. The life of low noise road surfacing is typically between 8-12 years depending upon many factors, suggesting continual repairs would not be required.</p> <p>No significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted during operation or construction of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Receptors which have been identified as having potentially significant effects have been identified within the chapter and rationale has been provided for each whether the significant effect is likely.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>are likely to be within the distance limits described in paragraph 12.11.6 for construction noise, for example.</p> <p>The UK Health Security Agency in their response to the Environment Scoping report state that the LOAEL and SOAEL levels and noise analysis described and undertaken in accordance LA111 of the DMRB is not sufficient to characterise the effect of noise on human health and wellbeing.</p> <p>In addition, the statistical data and numbers presented do not enable the general public to understand and experience the changes in noise they would experience as a result of the proposed scheme. We would support and advocate immersive experiences for people to hear first-hand the noise effect experienced in the Winthorpe Conservation Area.</p> <p>Vibration in operation is 'scoped out' of the environmental analysis as 'a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance'. This is an idealised picture and, in practice, as the experience of anyone using the A46 between Newark and Lincoln can testify, the road surface is rarely free of irregularities, and is consistently undergoing maintenance. The nature of the low-noise surfacing proposed is that it has a shorter service life and is likely to need maintenance more often than other options. This will bring periods of vibration associated with surface defects e.g. fretting and potholing, and maintenance generating often night time noise on a semi-regular basis (every 5 to 8 years).</p>			
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Population and human health; Air quality; Consultation – general; Winthorpe village; Construction	<p>9. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</p> <p>This section is thin on detail. A more detailed assessment is promised as part of the DCO submission, but this is out of the scope of the statutory public consultation. A key question therefore is what mechanisms will be made available for members of the general public to comment on areas where information is currently missing, at the point in time when new information becomes available? How can members of the public meaningfully comment on new information emerging, and what status will be given to any feedback received? Winthorpe is explicitly mentioned as an impacted community. The Report recognises that the health implications of the scheme are most pressing for the most vulnerable groups, including young people and older people. This is significant as Winthorpe has a primary school. A higher number of Winthorpe residents are also older (35% are over 60 years, compared with an England and Wales and East Midlands average of 23%). Given Winthorpe's close proximity to the scheme, an important question is what are the health implications for younger and older groups, over and above non-vulnerable groups? The report is non-committal regarding whether the scheme changes will result in a positive or a negative outcome on health grounds. It is mentioned that there could be "a potential reduction in pollutants" but it is not clear how this is achieved, nor which geographical areas this might relate to. Please can National Highways offer more precision here – how will Winthorpe village be specifically impacted regarding air pollutants and noise? Will the scheme generate positive or negative impacts for Winthorpe village?</p> <p>Safety is mentioned numerous times in the report, but it is not defined. It can be gleaned that safety is referring to road users (and traffic accident avoidance) rather than either those living in close proximity to the scheme nor pedestrians/cyclists/horse-riders. Think Again has fielded numerous concerns regarding the new road crossing point for people walking or cycling between Winthorpe Road Estate and Winthorpe. Given this is a core route for users of the primary school, there is concern that vulnerable users will regularly be using this crossing point. What analysis has been undertaken to determine the safety of this route, compared with the existing provision where people do not have to cross a busy road? Furthermore, a key question is whether this scheme is safe on health grounds for those living close to it. The example of a child living close to the North Circular in London who died because of air pollution is a sobering case in point. The A46 scheme creates far greater road infrastructure in close proximity to houses. The concept of safety must be more broadly applied to also incorporate the health of householders. Can National Highways comment on the remit of their concept of safety and whether the health of householders is factored in?</p> <p>The report mentions an increase in HGV and construction traffic on local roads during construction. Can National Highways please model how much such traffic would be entering Winthorpe village? The report acknowledges that access to businesses in Winthorpe may be</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Consultee's comments relate to the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> which was produced for statutory consultation. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. This document provides information requested by the Consultee around safety for nearby residents.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a second statutory consultation at this stage.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation and physical activity. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>), considers the impact of the Scheme on different groups with protected characteristics, as defined under the Equality Act 2010. As identified in the response, older people and young people are more affected by noise effects. However, as there are no significant residual noise effects identified in Winthorpe by Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the Equality Impact Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) found that there would be no equality impacts as a result of noise.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>impacted. Please can National Highways offer greater precision here, regarding likely impact, and for how long. Two businesses of key concern relate to the Lord Nelson pub and the [redacted]. Is it likely that access will be cut off for periods of time? What measures will be taken to protect these businesses? The same applies to Winthorpe Primary School. The financial viability of the school rests on an extended catchment to capture children living on the Winthorpe Road Estate. Making pedestrian access more challenging between the school and Winthorpe Road Estate could have a negative impact on parental choice in school and could jeopardise the continuation of a school in Winthorpe.</p>			<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment undertaken demonstrates that road traffic noise would reduce for most properties within Winthorpe and does not increase noise at any receptor in Winthorpe by more than 1dB 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic in 2043. No significant noise and vibration related effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) also assesses access to residential properties, businesses, community assets and walkers, cyclists and horse-rider's routes. No significant impacts on access to residential properties, businesses, or community assets were identified in the assessment, including to Bridge House Boarding Kennels, Lord Nelson Pub, or Winthorpe Primary School. Some significant impacts were found for users of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 during construction due to diversions; and a significant impact was found for users of National Cycle Route 64 during operation due to a permanent 105m diversion. The new crossing of the slip road at Brownhills Junction would be signalised to provide all users with a safe crossing point. At detailed design stage a further assessment would be undertaken to determine whether or not a pedestrian guardrail is to be provided around the route to prevent users taking routes that avoid the crossing. Since statutory consultation the route has been straightened up to the crossing to follow the desire line.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect on air quality. This is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Dispersion modelling was undertaken for Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) using ADMS-Roads, which is a computer based model of dispersion in the atmosphere of pollutants released from road traffic sources. The dispersion modelling accounts for all roads within the operational study area that meet the criteria for assessment. Dispersion modelling to determine the air quality effects includes all roads within 200m of affected roads where they add to total pollution concentrations. Roads modelled within the air quality assessment are presented in Figure 5.4 (Air Quality Affected Road Network) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidelines. Winthorpe village and the primary school are located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore have not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>road network, have been included in the assessment. The predicted concentrations at these receptors, which are below the air quality objectives, are likely to have the highest pollutant concentrations or anticipated to experience highest level of change within the vicinity of Winthorpe village. The highest annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the vicinity of Winthorpe along the A46 and A1 is predicted to be 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Do Something scenario (with the Scheme). The greatest changes in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub>, at modelled receptors along the A46 and A1 outside of Winthorpe, are predicted to be a decrease of 2.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and increase of 0.5µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>), a Traffic Management plan will be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network. A set of local road restrictions are set out within the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>). This includes restrictions on Drove Lane, A1133 and Gainsborough Road near/in Winthorpe village.</p> <p>A Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) submitted with the application. Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) and details of the traffic impacts of construction can be found in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and Public Rights of Way are assessed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWXU-1	Road drainage and the water environment; Biodiversity	<p><b>10. ROAD DRAINAGE AND THE WATER ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>In Winthorpe the main hydrological features are the River Trent, the Slough Dyke and the Fleet. Whilst we recognise that the Trent, being a national asset, is under scrutiny of various statutory agencies, we are more concerned over the state of our smaller watercourses, the Slough Dyke and the Fleet. The diagram on page 16 shows the catchment area of these streams.</p> <p>As can be seen, it extends south and east into Newark and Coddington. In your PEI Vol 1 you reference these watercourses in a rather confusing way as The Slough Dyke (Fleet) and suggesting that it is crossed by the new road only once. This is incorrect; it crosses twice. The problem may arise from the confusing way that these streams are named. Firstly, the Slough Dyke, which is under the control of the Environment Agency, is shown on the EA database as rising in Newark and outfalling to the Trent at Cromwell Weir.</p> <p>The Fleet is considered to be a tributary of the Slough Dyke, rising in Coddington and outfalling to the Slough Dyke near to the Community Centre in Winthorpe; it is under the control of the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board.</p> <p>However, Ordnance Survey maps name the Fleet as rising in Coddington and flowing through to the Langford rail crossing where it then becomes the Slough Dyke. It is not named at all where it flows within Newark. Consequently, it can be seen that the Slough Dyke is crossed by the new road adjacent to Brownhills roundabout and the Fleet is crossed at the Friendly Farmer junction so twice, not once. From these it can be seen that the runoff from the new road will have a considerable impact on Winthorpe's watercourses. Reference to the Environment Agency's Catchment Data Explorer reveals that the Slough Dyke is in a poor condition for invertebrate life, with low dissolved oxygen levels and high levels of copper, zinc and Priority Hazardous Substances. The reasons for this poor state are named as Transport Drainage for several of these failed conditions. We also note that in the Environment Agency's response to the Planning Inspectorate attached to their Scoping Opinion:- 'There should be no additional deterioration as a result of this project therefore appropriate mitigation measures are required to be incorporated into the design. Wherever possible improvement should also be made to existing infrastructure to retrofit drainage features to reduce the current impact on water quality.' The PEI Vol 1 proposes various techniques of Sustainable</p>	N/A	N	<p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority, including the Slough Dyke and The Fleet. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Storage volumes have been calculated using the MicroDrainage Quick Storage Estimate, which utilises rainfall and catchment permeability characteristics to estimate an upper and lower bound storage requirement. The upper bound storage requirements have been used for the design of the basins at preliminary design stage (a conservative approach). Additional calculations, and a detailed drainage model will be undertaken at the detailed design stage, to ensure that attenuation volumes are adequate and that the Scheme does not increase flood risk to the surrounding watercourses (including The Slough Dyke and The Fleet).</p> <p>There are two tributaries of The Fleet stream which pass through the Scheme. Slough Dyke which is mainly culverted under Newark-on-Trent passes through the Scheme to the east of Brownhills Junction as an open channel before flowing parallel with the A1 and being culverted under the A1 to flow through Winthorpe. The Scheme would result in a minor realignment of the Slough Dyke watercourse to allow for the A1/A46 Crossing to be constructed. This minor realignment would result in the watercourse increasing in length and sinuosity which is considered to be minor beneficial for the watercourse conditions. Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) identifies the outfalls into this watercourse as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The second tributary of The Fleet is located east of the Friendly Farmer Roundabout. This watercourse is culverted under both the A17 and A46 before flowing through Winthorpe to converge with the Slough Dyke to become The Fleet. Appendix 13.5 (Surface Water Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) outlines the monitoring to be undertaken as part of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Drainage System (SuDS) designs for controlling runoff and the General Arrangement drawings show a variety of locations for Attenuation Ponds or Swales, but there is no indication of how the linear elements of the highway drainage system will be arranged. Nor is there any indication as to how water finding its way to these Attenuation Ponds will be dealt with. Is infiltration to be promoted? Will excess water outfall to the Slough Dyke and the Fleet? Will such outfalls be controlled to provide attenuation, and what measures will be put in place to reduce the polluting effect of hydrocarbon and particulate runoff? The Fleet, which flows through the centre of Winthorpe, is channelled and constrained by culverts in the locality of the Lord Nelson, the village green and Holme Lane. This gives rise to flooding risks which are increasing as the area of impermeable developed land around Godfrey Drive and Long Hollow Way increases. It would be advantageous if, in accordance with the above statement from the Environment Agency, flood attenuation measures could be applied to the Fleet in the vicinity of the road, rather than applying such measures solely to the road drainage infrastructure. A significant omission in the consideration of road drainage effects is that of the problems that can arise after traffic accidents, either the spillage of polluting materials from tanker HGVs or the runoff from firefighting materials after an incident. In order to make a judgement on the possible impact of flood volumes and pollutant flows we would need to see much more detail in the design proposals. We need significant and effectual infrastructure to be provided to mitigate the impact of the road on our environment.</p>			<p>The '<i>Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool</i>' has been utilised to assess the water quality impact at each of the drainage outfalls throughout the Scheme. This assessment 'passes' for all outfalls, including those to The Fleet and Slough Dyke, indicating that the proposed drainage strategy treats surface water run-off sufficiently to not impact the wider water environment. Details of the Drainage strategy can be seen in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Details of the water quality assessments (using <i>Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool</i>) is detailed in Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation to prevent potential pollution spill events, including the installation of penstocks that can be closed to prevent pollutants entering the ponds, have been incorporated in the design at the base of each swale. These penstocks would be closed by the emergency services in case of a pollution event and would not be opened until the polluted water and sludge have been removed from the swales. A Spillage Risk Assessment has been undertaken for all outfalls throughout the Scheme (including those to the Slough Dyke and The Fleet) and all outfalls pass the assessment. The risk of spillage would be mitigated for within the drainage system.</p> <p>Conversations are ongoing with the Environment Agency regarding the number and volume of oil spills to be contained within the swales. These volumes will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects on biodiversity receptors is set out within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Appendix 8.8 (Invertebrate (Aquatic) Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> presents the results of the riverine and ditch macroinvertebrate surveys undertaken for the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNF-8	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; A17/A46/A1	<p>We are concerned that the needs of non motorised users have been given little attention especially with respect to the A1/A46/A17 junction. The existing NCN64, footpath and Trent Vale Trail all use a route requiring an underpass under the existing A46 and a narrow passage under the A1. This is the only existing route to link Newark with villages to northeast of the town. The proposed scheme would add an additional underpass, a diversion 18nexperie busy slip roads and the need to cross one of them. Rather than encouraging active travel this will have the opposite effect especially for people with young families and 18nexperie cyclists.</p> <p>The proposed route will be more noisy, more polluted, less safe and longer than the existing route, all of which goes against various government policies which state the objective of encouraging active travel.</p>	2B	N	<p>At the location outlined, the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts, and the existing adjoining A46 trunk road, are currently serviced by a walking route which links Winthorpe Roundabout in the north onwards towards Newark-on-Trent in the south. There is currently one crossing over the existing A46 carriageway, adjacent to Friendly Farmer roundabout.</p> <p>At Brownhills Junction the diverted route 64 utilises the same bridge as the highway and crosses the northbound exit slip road via a signalised crossing. It is the Applicant's view that this route is safer and less likely to attract anti-social behaviour when compared to a long subway that could have been provided along the existing route. The at grade route is segregated away from the carriageway and is 105m longer than the existing route. This small increase in length outweighs the disbenefits associated with a subway.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, the Applicant has also added a walking and cycling route from Hargon Lane that heads towards the A1133, passes around the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout and joins the walking cycling route on Drove Lane therefore providing a direct access to the Showground entrance and a circular walking route. Further detail on walking and cycling routes can be found in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNF-8	Landscape and visual effects	Re our concerns about the current proposals there is no mention of measures to mitigate the negative impact of the new road eg lighting, sight lines, improving the existing tunnel under the A1, installing barriers to separate the path from the slip roads.	2D	N	The diverted route follows the desire lines beneath the new Brownhills Underbridge as closely as possible to make it as direct as possible. The route would be lit to improve safety and the crossing of the northbound exit slip road at Brownhills Junction would be signalised. During the detailed design stage the route would be assessed further and if required, pedestrian guard rails would be installed to prevent users from leaving the prescribed route. The existing underpass beneath the A1 would remain as it is at present.
ANON-559H-RWNF-8	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	There is an alternative possibility of improving the existing bridleway alongside the River Trent and emerging to NW of Winthorpe. We understand that this lies outside the scope of the current plan but developing this route would provide mitigation of the deleterious effect of the proposals and should have been taken into account.	2D	N	The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the opportunity to improve the existing bridleway alongside the River Trent. This route is not impacted by the Scheme and has therefore not been included within the Order Limits. As a result, this change will not be included as part of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWNF-8	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Climate	The whole process is focussed on improving motorised traffic flows . It largely ignores government policies to encourage active travel and long term to reduce our carbon emissions from motorised transport.	2I	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> sets out the Scheme objectives and how these will be met. The objectives of the Scheme are designed to improve safety, congestion, connectivity to accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent whilst delivering better environmental outcomes and inclusivity to improve facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected.</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>This engagement led to the introduction of the walking and cycling route that runs from Hargon Lane to the A1133, around Winthorpe Roundabout and to the first Showground entrance on Drove Lane. Further details about this engagement and resulting changes to the design of the Scheme can be found in the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>. The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (National Policy Statement for National Network) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the assessment undertaken, setting out any likely significant effects.</p> <p>The assessment relies upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Scheme. Further information on the</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which will reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). The assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes no likely significant effects are anticipated.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	The route doesn't take enough consideration of the safe routes for cyclists and walkers either during construction or when its finished. Currently the route from Winthorpe to Newark is relatively safe but this proposal puts large construction over the cycling and walking routes making the route less visible when using it with the potential to make it less safe and a far less attractive route to use. It will be a concrete junction on the cycling route rather than a pleasant and attractive route through the countryside	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Consultee is referring to the Trent Valley Way. On completion, the Scheme would provide a 3m wide walking and cycling route with a signalised crossing of the northbound exit slip road at Brownhills Junction.</p> <p>During some aspects of construction, such as the installation of new overbridges, the walking and cycling route would need to be temporarily diverted due to safety concerns as a result of live construction work. The route would be segregated and fenced off to prevent interaction with the construction sites.</p> <p>Closures/diversions would be minimised where practicable with the use of marshals where possible to maintain access. Further information is detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's concern that the Scheme would make the cycling route less attractive to use. As part of the Scheme, the Applicant has aimed to mitigate the visual impact of structures and the road layout where possible. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, which include roadside planting wherever practicable and appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme, by aiding its settlement within the receiving landscape and helping to screen the Scheme from nearby visual receptors.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Environment – general; Road drainage and the water environment	The environmental impact seems to have been partially sacrificed to ensure this development goes ahead. This development will impact on the water sources in the area with little regard for the impact of run off from the roads into these rivers and drains	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing. Measures include the use of basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Overall scheme	The current A1133 is the main route into Newark for the villages north of the A46 and it is a very unsafe route for anyone walking, cycling or travelling except in a motor vehicle. A main priority of this development should be to enhance and improve green ways of using alternative transports and yet these proposals seem to ignore these needs both during and after construction, choosing to major on improving the routes for motor vehicles only.	2D	N	<p>One of the key objectives for the Scheme is to build inclusivity which improves facilities for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users where existing routes are affected.</p> <p>At the north-east side of Winthorpe, Gainsborough Road, and its associated walking route, would join the A1133 which has an existing walking route at this location. This allows for connectivity of pedestrian traffic from northern areas to Winthorpe village, and then onwards towards Newark-on-Trent via the new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Provisions have been included in the design to replace and, where feasible and appropriate, improve existing routes and facilities within the Order Limits that are used by pedestrians and cyclists. The objective is to ensure continued connectivity is provided between communities and routes within the wider Public Rights of Way network.</p> <p>As far as reasonably practicable, the walking, cycling and horse-riding routes that currently exist have been retained or diverted and additional walking and cycling routes would be provided.</p> <p>The following improvements would be provided, which aim to improve overall connectivity in the area of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout from Hargon Lane, providing access between Winthorpe village and the Newark Showground</li> <li>• A new walking and cycling route that passes beneath the new A1/A46 Crossing and passes over the existing A46 via a new signalised crossing between Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts, that connects Winthorpe village to the walking and cycling networks south of the existing A46</li> <li>• At Cattle Market, the existing signalised crossings over the A46 would be retained and improved. The crossing over the A616 would be improved by widening it to 3m and providing traffic signals. The 3m wide walking and cycling route would continue south of Cattle Market along Great North Road</li> <li>• The existing lorry park entrance crossing would be relocated and improved by providing traffic signals to make it safer for walkers and cyclists to cross</li> </ul> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>) submitted with the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Overall scheme	Throughout the Trent valley there are many environmental schemes already in existence and working with these organisations to enhance those environments must be considered - Notts Wildlife Trust and the RSPB both have large nature reserves with limited funding to enhance these environments	2E/2F	N	<p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regards to potentially available local locations or sites that could be used for environmental enhancements. All requirements imposed on a Development Consent Order must satisfy six tests to be lawful. They must be precise, enforceable, necessary, relevant to the development, relevant to planning and reasonable in all other respects. In this case, the suggested nature reserves not been taken forward as part of the Scheme design. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. The Scheme would also achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> .
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Road drainage and the water environment	This area is a flood plain - compensating here will impact further afield, unfortunately. Perhaps providing funds to help with flooding alleviation along the River Fleet and Trent for the villages north of this development would be beneficial.	2G	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns and the suggestion raised by the Consultee with regards to flood plain compensation and flooding alleviation in the area.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme of floodplain compensation areas has been developed that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environment Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors, including those further afield, to flooding.</p> <p>The mitigation includes the raising of the new roundabout at Brownhills Junction. The mitigation has been prepared based upon a fluvial hydraulic model of the floodplain developed in partnership with the Environment Agency.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNG-9	Consultation - general	This scheme should give great weight to the views of the local communities as they know this area better than anyone who is an outsider particularly to the views of the Think Again campaign group	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has welcomed feedback from the local community as part of the statutory consultation. Ongoing engagement has taken place with a range of local stakeholders (including the Think Again: A46 Winthorpe Residents' Group) as outlined in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown that it has had regard to Consultee comments within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> in compliance with the requirements of Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Where appropriate, changes have been made to the Scheme as detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Road layout; Route corridor	<p>The 2020 Route Options 'Consultation' only offered routes within the current A46 route which it had already recognised would potentially impact badly on the local area. The 2020 Options Summary stated, " (within Corridor C) all options result in potential for significant adverse effects on noise receptors, heritage assets, landscape and visual, biodiversity, material assets and waste." [page 63 para 5.7.9]</p> <p>National Highways has focused on 'road users' – prioritising a shorter route for a faster journey time, and they have assumed that this route would be cheaper as it is shorter (see Options Report 2020 page56). The current proposed route shows that this idea of 'cheaper' isn't necessarily the case; not only does it require massive embankments to cross the floodplain, but also 6 new rail and river bridges, but 2 flyovers and several new roundabouts – and will 'cost' the local environment heavily – all for 6.5km of road!</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives for the Scheme alignment which informed the current design. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides a description of the alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Route Corridor C, as the most direct route (due to it being the shortest route corridor that followed the existing A46 the closest), scored better than the other four corridors for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups and environment. The Applicant has provided robust justification for the corridor selection within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Environment - general	<p>Question 1</p> <p>How can National Highways justify all the expected damage to the local environment , especially in light of the NPPF, principles of sustainable and spacial planning and the Environment Act 2021</p>	2B	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b> set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The key objectives of the Scheme are to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would contribute to the national, regional and local government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Overall scheme	<p>Question 2</p> <p>We need see a full cost benefit study of this proposed scheme. This is vital to evaluating the scheme and commenting on it. Factors such as noise pollution, health, wellbeing and environment must be part of the cost-benefit analysis, and not just focus on journey times and business-focused need.</p>	2B	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, as submitted, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The factors that are included in the benefit to cost ratio are journey time and vehicle operating cost savings during operation, construction and maintenance, safety benefits, reliability benefits, wider economic impacts, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas impacts.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The findings of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, would feed into the overall decision of whether the Scheme should be granted development consent.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>Question 3</p> <p>A key scheme objective is to reduce journey times yet specific information about this is not available within the scheme information; how can we comment with no information? (also see below - we note no evidence that the scheme will reduce journey times .... Especially as new roundabout are being introduced in different parts of the scheme!)</p>	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the assessments that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has now been undertaken and is described in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					opening). The Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ) further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Stakeholder engagement	Question 4 Why does there seem to be no road planning cooperation and collaboration with other road /network providers when Newark seems to be surrounded by such a complex road network - there has to be 'network resilience' but the scheme seems to take little account of that?	2B	N	The Applicant has consulted with Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council as host local authorities, on the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ). Engagement with these host authorities will continue throughout the ongoing development of the Scheme. Neighbouring authorities have also been consulted including Lincolnshire County Council, Leicestershire County Council, Derbyshire County Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, City of Doncaster Council and North Lincolnshire Council.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Southern Link Road	Question 5 Years ago (1990?) we were told that 'The Southern Link Road' was going ahead and would link the A46 and the A1, also relieving congestion on the A46 bypass. Funding was in place for this; why has this not happened and why is it not mentioned or built into this scheme?	2B	N	The Southern Link Road, which is being delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council, will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. Phase 1 of the Scheme has already been delivered with work set to commence on the remaining two phases in Spring 2023 with expected completion by Spring 2025. Further information about this can be found on the Newark Town Board website.  Traffic modelling that has been carried out for the Scheme has accounted for the development of the Southern Link Road. It demonstrates that without the Scheme, even with the development of the Southern Link Road, there would still be significant delays on the A46, especially at the Cattle Market Junction.  The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ) further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Overall scheme	Question 6 The road scheme is very expensive for such a short distance, we are tax- payers paying for it. Who is monitoring this budget as the scheme seems to grow? ... checking that this is going to be value for money, and will they share this information with us?	2B	N	The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ). The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b> ).  The cost and the value for money that the Scheme represents is monitored at every stage of the Scheme development by the Applicant.  The Applicant would provide regular updates on the Scheme webpage and through social media, as well as via mail drops and public information events. This community engagement will aim to address any community concerns and also identify ways to generate benefits and mitigate impacts related to the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Traffic forecasts; Newark Castle level crossing	Question 7 We see that there is an expectation of increased flow into Newark Town from the 'Cattle Market' roundabout, we know that the commonest cause of hold-up to flow is the rail crossing. Have the frequency of rail crossing gate closures been factored into the calculation of traffic flow rates anticipated?	2B	N	The traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme includes the Newark Castle level crossing. The traffic modelling indicates an improvement in conditions on Great North Road and the A46 as a result of the update to the Cattle Market Junction. Further information on forecast modelling is detailed in the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ).  An additional lane would be provided southbound to provide stacking space and prevent the queue that currently extends into the existing Cattle Market Roundabout.  Improving the level crossing itself is not required by the Scheme, as the Scheme does not worsen or change the existing situation in relation to crossing operation and safety. Therefore, the Scheme is not required to mitigate the current delays caused by the level crossing. Newark and Sherwood District Council have advised the Applicant that they are discussing improvements to the crossing with Network Rail.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Noise and vibration; Speed limit	Question 8 We are concerned about National Highways adding to current noise levels; if National Highways were planning a brand new highway would they use a route that ran 50m from residents' bedroom windows?	2B	N	Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) provides justification for the route corridor that was chosen. Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Siting Tool</i> was used to sift the four options identified within the preferred route corridor which considered how the options fit against specific strategic, economic, managerial, financial and commercial criteria. The <i>Early Assessment and Siting Tool</i> applies

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Question 9</p> <p>What is the justification for considering a 40 or 50 speed limit for only part of the scheme as part of noise reduction mitigation - other areas are just as close to the road?</p>			<p>a 5-point scale on carbon emissions, economic growth, wellbeing, local environment and socio-distributional impacts to appraise the Scheme.</p> <p>The effect of noise from a road does not only consider the proximity of residences from that road but also the traffic flow, composition of traffic, speed, road surface type, road gradient, local topography, and any additional screening such as buildings, fences, or noise barriers. Therefore, it may be possible and therefore appropriate to position a road 50m from local residences without adverse noise effects provided the acoustic context was also appropriate. In the context of this Scheme, no residual operational adverse effects would arise due to changes in road alignment. Further information on operational noise can be found in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Specification of speed limits as currently designed are not driven by the noise assessment. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit. Speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and included on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (TR010065/APP/2.8).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Stakeholder engagement	<p>Question 11</p> <p>Some homes close to the scheme are going to be significantly impacted, both during and after construction - at what point are National Highways going to approach householders individually and directly and COMMUNICATE .?</p>	2B	N	<p>Early stakeholder engagement with residents was conducted prior to statutory consultation. Ongoing, two-way communication will continue throughout the process, to keep stakeholders informed and respond to individual enquiries.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>Question 11</p> <p>The Environmental Impact work is being carried out by the contractor, why are they not sharing the results clearly with us - information in the Consultation Documents tells us little and is very unclear and confusing. Why is this work not done by an independent group, not paid by the contractor as that would be more trustworthy?</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken by a design consultant who is independent from the Principal Contractor and is made up of a team of competent experts in relevant fields. The Environmental Impact Assessment will be examined by the Examining Authority as part of the public examination stage. Results of the Environmental Impact Assessment can be found within the respective chapters of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Air quality; Population and human health	<p>Question 12</p> <p>Why do National Highways not consider fine particulate Air pollution to matter when evidence of the damage it causes to human health are growing every day? This should be built into the cost benefit analysis.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant is committed to ensuring that air quality is within prescribed legal limits. Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides detail on why PM<sub>2.5</sub> has not been considered further within the local air quality assessment, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidelines. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> contains information about current design standards relating to the design, assessment and operation of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads in the UK.</p> <p>In summary, <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the United Kingdom currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds and modelling of PM<sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold. For this assessment, when the maximum modelled contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> of 4.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> from existing traffic in the base year at modelled receptors is combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded.</p> <p>Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicle emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>. Further to this, the greatest change in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at modelled receptors in the year the Scheme is open to traffic is predicted to be 3.9 µg/m<sup>3</sup> between the Do Something</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>and Do Minimum scenarios. Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> would therefore be even lower in the year the Scheme is open to traffic, as PM<sub>2.5</sub> is a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are an order of magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that the current and future PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are lower than the current target value of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and the Scheme would not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold at any of the human health receptors considered and no further assessment is required.</p> <p>Nonetheless, impacts from PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations associated with the operation of the Scheme have been quantified as part of the cost benefit analysis. The approach to monetise the impacts has followed the 'Damage Cost' approach in accordance with the <i>Transport Planning and Appraisal Guidance (2018)</i> and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, May 2022</i>. Further detail on the damage cost assessment is provided in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and vibration	<p>Question 13</p> <p>National Highways state an objective to improve 'road safety'; please explain and justify the concern for 'safety' in relation to road traffic accidents but not to safety in relation to human health in relation to fine particulate air pollution or noise?</p>	2C	N	<p>Safety is one of the three imperatives of the Applicant and is at the forefront of what the Applicant does. This also encompasses human health and well-being. All of the Applicants schemes are delivered within the requirements of national policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) and legislation.</p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme. Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides detail on why PM<sub>2.5</sub> has not been considered further within the local air quality assessment. The air quality assessment confirms that the Scheme will not have a significant effect on air quality and there will not be any exceedances of the air quality objectives for NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to noise and vibration changes around the Scheme. No significant effects are predicted from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality or on noise and vibration at any of the human health receptors.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Landscape and visual effects; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Question 14</p> <p>Visual impact of the proposed development is clearly immense – the PEI does admit that but hidden in a blur of 'gobbledygook'. Why are/were no photomontages of the scheme available within the consultation, for example on the large banners and posters?</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p><i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> along the Scheme were produced following requests from stakeholders and made available online and at consultation events from 16 November 2022.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. These are shown in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the Scheme within its setting.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed with consideration of the surrounding landscape and local visual receptors and sought to reduce effects wherever possible either through embedded mitigation such as retention of existing vegetation or essential mitigation measures such as planting of trees and shrubs to aid screening of the Scheme. The potential effects upon landscape and visual amenity have been assessed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Information regarding the landscape proposals for the Scheme is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Noise and vibration; Population and human health	<p>No to Noise!</p> <p>We are concerned about potentially increasing noise, we don't believe that National Highways are taking seriously the impact this is on peoples lives and health – they just see noise as a 'thing' – maybe a 'bit of an annoyance'.</p> <p>Excess noise is known to be damaging to peoples health and well-being. National Highways cannot ignore this fact. The UK Health Services Agency says, "UKHSA 'expects decisions regarding noise mitigation measures to be underpinned by good quality evidence, in particular whether mitigation measures are proven to reduce adverse impacts on health and quality of life.' (Scoping Opinion: A46 Newark). They go on to indicate that noise should be reduced at source, with noise insulation as a last resort.</p>	2C	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.</p> <p>The assessment is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of noise on receptors in proximity to the Scheme. Any potential for significant effects has been avoided with the introduction of mitigation at source (low noise running surface and noise barriers). The assessment concludes that with mitigation in place, the Scheme would not have a significant adverse noise effect.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment will be managed and monitored. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>Question 15.</p> <p>We residents are prevented from commenting in an informed way on the consultation because we are not presented with information in a clear and accessible way. Why is the information about noise (and other environmental aspects) not presented in clear accessible form?</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The results of the Environmental Impact Assessment are summarised in the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary <b>(TR010065/APP/6.4)</b>, which presents the results of each environmental chapter, including noise, in a clear and accessible form.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements</i> and the Infrastructure (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					A full thorough statutory consultation was delivered, encouraging stakeholders from across the Scheme to engage with the content of the brochure face to face or online. Staff at events did advise visitors that further information would be available on a number of aspects of the Scheme as part of the development consent application.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Noise and vibration; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Question 16  Please will you provide information about noise impact work in an understandable form and consult with us properly before the DCO submission?	2C	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment are summarised in the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (<b>TR010065/APP/6.4</b>), which presents the results of each environmental chapter (including noise) in a clear and accessible form.</p> <p>Further information on noise impacts is available within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022. The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The Applicant will produce a Construction Communications Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will provide further information on further methods of engagement. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Winthorpe village; Landscape and visual effects	<p>Since the 2020 design we notice that a lot of attention has been paid to the scheme design in the north that will reduce the impact on Winthorpe village. We see a large earth bund is planned to help protect the east of Winthorpe.</p> <p>Question 17  Why has the same attention not been paid to other areas of the scheme? - not everyone has the same capacity to 'fight'. This is not fair.</p>	2C	N	<p>Engagement with a variety of stakeholders has taken place throughout the Scheme's development. Information relating to ongoing engagement is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing Engagement) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>Across the Scheme, mitigation has been designed to reduce impacts to people, wildlife, and the environment. Prior to and during the statutory consultation, additional measures have been considered and several put in place to support mitigation within the design.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order. (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>A full assessment of landscape and visual effects has been undertaken as part of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The outcomes of this assessment have informed the mitigation measures developed and presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). With regards to the use of landscape bunds; this has only been possible outside of the floodplain, and as such would be suitable for inclusion at Winthorpe only. Mitigation planting including trees, shrubs and grassland would be used wherever possible to aid screening and settlement of the Scheme within the surrounding landscape. This would include planting on embankments to provide at height screening where feasible.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Noise and vibration	<p>Question 18</p> <p>Please will National Highways show clearly how they will prevent increase in noise and protect other residential zones of the scheme from noise - BEFORE application for the DCO? Defra should have reviewed and remapped 'Noise Important Areas' in 2022, they have failed. National Highways sampled noise around the scheme area in Spring 2022 it is clear from this that much of the scheme 'zone' could/should be designated as a 'noise important area'.</p> <p>Question 19</p> <p>Will information on what National Highways considers to be 'Noise Important Areas' be made available to for members of the public and 'interested parties' to comment on before the application for the DCO?</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The acoustic mitigation has been considered for locations where required to remove significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs extant designation of noise important areas to be the most robust and appropriate, therefore any speculation that additional areas should be considered as noise important areas for the purposes of this assessment would require significant evidence to support this claim.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Noise and vibration; Population and human health	<p>Question 20</p> <p>Why is damaging 'Noise and Vibration' not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the impact of the Scheme on local amenity, this includes the impact of the Scheme on air quality, noise and vibration and landscape amenity. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified. The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects on amenity as a result of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Floodplain 'dig out' and 'borrowpits'</p> <p>Currently available plans show three different versions of the proposed flood compensation areas and 'borrow pits' , with no detail at all about what we might expect to see/experience. - this is potentially a vast area that could go all the way over to Averham (2 miles away?) This appears to be a major engineering project in itself yet we have no detail to comment on.- just lines on a plan and a diagram of a 'dust corridor'. It will be taking place close (opposite) to our homes and we will live with the impact both during and after the scheme works</p>	2C/2G	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. Areas for floodplain compensation have been reduced in plan area post statutory consultation.</p> <p>The widened embankment for the A46 carriageway passes through land that acts as the floodplain for the River Trent. By using this land, the Scheme has the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere unless mitigation is provided. This mitigation would include three floodplain compensation areas which would seek to provide an equivalent volume of floodplain storage in the local catchment by excavating land at similar elevations to that which would be displaced by the Scheme.</p> <p>To demonstrate that the floodplain compensation areas are effective, analytical flood modelling has been carried out. A mitigation scheme has been produced which has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas being provided at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>). Further information on the floodplain compensation areas is detailed within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) and Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels as detailed</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). The design philosophy of this floodplain compensation area is to ensure the land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Two floodplain compensation areas would be provided adjacent to the A46 and the River Trent immediately north of Windmill Viaduct, referred to as Farndon West and Farndon East floodplain compensation areas. These are to provide a combination of direct and indirect compensation to floodplain lost.</p> <p>Farndon West floodplain compensation area would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake at the Farndon East floodplain compensation area would also be provided.</p> <p>At Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas, two areas of land north of the A617 would be utilised, connected by a ditch. A culvert would be constructed under the A617 highway to connect the floodplain compensation area to an existing ditch that runs down the field boundary adjacent to Kelham Hall and connects with the River Trent.</p> <p>Three borrow pits are required to support the creation of embankments required for the Scheme at Farndon West, Farndon East and Brownhills. Further details on these are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The Farndon West and East borrow pits would be used as floodplain compensation to compensate for loss of floodplain storage as a result of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>Question 20</p> <p>Before plans go forward for the DCO , local residents need proper informed consultation about the process (which could take several years) and extent of these works. Can National Highways assure us that this will happen?</p>	2C/2G	N	<p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022 allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the statutory minimum requirement of 28 days as set out in the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Road drainage and the water environment	At least one of the 'borrowpit' areas already floods quickly, it would seem unrealistic to envisage that this might be 'returned to grassland'. Better that these areas between the road and river/ river and railway were to be full of well planned mixed riparian woodland which would help to mitigate noise, provide wildlife habitats and compensate for carbon loss	2C/2G	N	Three borrow pits are required to support the creation of embankments required for the Scheme at Farndon West, Farndon East and Brownhills. Further details on these are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ). The Farndon West and East borrow pits would be used as floodplain compensation to compensate for loss of floodplain storage as a result of the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint from that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement.</p> <p>The locations of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels as detailed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The design philosophy of this floodplain compensation area is to ensure the land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West would provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.</p> <p>Meetings have been held with Newark and Sherwood District Council to ensure that their works to reduce flood risk to the local community are not impacted by the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Road drainage and the water environment; Overall scheme	<p>Question 21 a)</p> <p>What is the budget for the floodplain engineering work?</p> <p>B) Which organisations will be involved to plan reparation? And will there be a protected budget for this?</p> <p>Question 22 a)</p> <p>If material has to be removed from the floodplain extension area to enlarge the capacity of the floodplain in recompense for the floodplain land taken by the road development, where will it go?</p> <p>b) Where will material to build the embankments be sourced?</p> <p>c) What will the cost if this be in time? In disturbance and damage to soil? In £ ? And in extra carbon cost?</p> <p>Question 23</p> <p>b) Has the floodplain engineering project been fully built into the project cost currently predicted?</p>	2C/2G	N	<p>With regard to question 21 a, the Applicant is unable to provide details of the exact budget for the floodplain engineering work. The cost of the work required to the floodplain is included within the overall budget for the Scheme. More information relating to the Scheme's budget is included within the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to question 21 b, the Applicant has, and will continue to work closely alongside the Principal Contractor in relation to the associated floodplain works. In addition, the Applicant has engaged relevant statutory environmental bodies (for example, the Environment Agency) with regards to the design of the floodplain compensation areas.</p> <p>With regard to question 22 a, material removed from the floodplain would be used within the construction of the widened A46. Further detail on materials and waste can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to question 22 b, materials for embankments would be sourced from the floodplain compensation area and borrow pit areas where possible. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to question 22 c, site won materials are to be used on the Scheme to minimise costs and reduce carbon emissions on the Scheme. All surplus materials would either be reinstated or used on local infrastructure and community schemes where possible. Soil management methodologies will be in accordance with the <i>Department for Rural Affairs, Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils in Construction</i> to prevent any damage occurring during construction and reinstatement. This code of construction practice</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					sets out various best practice methods to be followed for all in the construction sector to ensure the protection of soils.  In relation to question 23 b, the overall cost estimate for the Scheme accounts for the engineering work required on the floodplain.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Overall scheme	The scheme needs to be reviewed sites for 'environmental enhancement, habitat creation, tree/woodland planting? Tree planting - all existing vegetation along the sides of the A46, and new tree planting, needs to be considerably 'beefed up' and made to include a significant proportion of trees that retain leaves longer and evergreens. The current screens fail in winter in terms of both light and noise pollution BECAUSE THE LEAVES FALL OFF! The tree 'screens' are currently very narrow .. National Highways need to develop a more sophisticated approach to block noise and to help capture fine pollution particles - including on bridges and flyovers. Planting needs to be extensive and informed, and needs to start well before 'first dig' – other noise barriers, including over the bridge, need to be employed too. Planting should be managed so that trees do not fail. This should be happening anyway as part of National Highways declared intention to reduce road noise.  Question 24  What budget allowance is there in this scheme for building 'environmental enhancement' into mitigation measures? This cannot be 'left to chance' - it is the law!	2D/2E	N	Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> has been developed since statutory consultation in light of the broader Scheme development and outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment which has informed the mitigation required both during construction and operation of the Scheme. Further details are described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> .  Mitigation measures to reduce landscape and visual effects are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> . The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, which is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> , which also requires the Scheme to be constructed in accordance with this document.  A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.  A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> .  Plant species are chosen with the surrounding landscape character in mind to aid landscape integration and avoid the use of inappropriate species not found in the local area. In addition, growing conditions and biodiversity value have also been considered. Whilst occasional evergreen species may be used, large scale use of evergreen species would not be considered in keeping with the area and nor would it provide the biodiversity and habitat value required by the Scheme. There is a misconception that planting (referred to as tree screens in the response) reduces noise levels, instead the actual noise levels remain unchanged during winter months, albeit the perception of noise increases as the source becomes visible.  The noise assessment in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has identified the locations at which mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers, bunding or a combination of the two, is required and this has been captured within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> . Where possible, early planting works would be undertaken, however this would only be possible in areas unaffected by construction works, which are few in number. Planting would however be implemented at the soonest opportunity, within the next available planting season (November to March) following completion of construction works.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Overall scheme	We are interested in the 'headline' scheme budget - said to be about £490,000,000 and monitoring this in relation to what we see evolving.  Question 24  Taking the 'headline budget - what date and stage of the plan does this refer to, is it fixed? Is inflation built in? Is the developing scale of the project built in e.g. the floodplain and reparation work?	2H	N	In response to Consultee question 24, the figure referred to relates to the estimated cost of the Scheme during the preliminary design stage. It includes all works associated with the Scheme, including the floodplain and reparation work. Allowances for inflation are also included within the cost estimate. As this figure is an estimate, it is not fixed. The most up to date cost estimate is included in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b> .  In relation to Consultee question 25, in order for the Applicant to comply with the Development Consent Order, if granted, the Applicant is required to ensure that all essential

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Question 25</p> <p>What safeguards are built into the budgeting/contracting process to ensure that proper, thorough environmental damage prevention, mitigation and reparation will take place and not be "short-changed" because its "difficult" / "expensive" etc. ??</p>			environmental mitigation is provided as set out in the application documents. This is covered in the Scheme budget contained in the Funding Statement (TR010065/APP/4.2). Any environmental damage caused by the Applicant would be covered by the usual regulatory controls which will require the Applicant to comply with and rectify where necessary.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation - general	<p>In some households an individual received a personal letter about the scheme consultation, implying that they might have a particular interest. In other households two named people received the letter (the home owners ??). When a representative asked the Liaison team what the criteria was for receiving the letter as they had not had one whilst their partner had, they were told that the Liaison Team 'were not sure'!!! "but if you think someone who should have got one hasn't then let us know?" - they then sent one to the person who asked!</p> <p>Question 26</p> <p>What were the criteria for sending individually addressed letters to individuals at the start of the Consultation period?</p>	21	N	During the statutory consultation, the Applicant made contact with all prescribed consultees (as defined by the Planning Act 2008), landowners and other stakeholders in the area of the Scheme. In relation to Consultee question 26, letters were sent to all landowners within the Scheme boundary who were directly affected by the Scheme. The recipients of these letters were based upon a search of His Majesty's Land Registry records. Additional consultation materials were able to be provided upon request.
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>The 'Glossy brochure' posted to some households - and available to collect - contains very little real clear information about the likely environmental impacts and their proposed mitigation. Additionally, in too many areas it admits that the work has not yet been done. For example, regarding noise it says that at the operational stage of the scheme, "There is potential for changes to traffic flows to result in both increased and decreased noise levels at sensitive receptors. Assessment work is on-going to understand the likely adverse and beneficial effects of the scheme for noise sensitive receptors. Any identified adverse effects will be reduced through mitigation measures such as through the use of low noise road surfacing and noise fencing where appropriate."</p> <p>In the 'Non-technical Summary' (available on-line if you notice it) re: "Noise" it says: "Without mitigation, changes in traffic flows and road alignment can potentially result in changes at noise sensitive receptors, particularly from road noise traffic. These impacts can be beneficial or adverse. Measures to mitigate the impacts of noise and vibration during the operation phase include the use of noise barriers and earth bunds. Sound insulation packages for residences will be offered where significant impacts remain after incorporation of reasonably practicable mitigation measures. The preliminary operational assessment indicates that the scheme has potential to result in significant residual adverse effects at noise sensitive receptors, thus suitable mitigation will be considered. Operational vibration is not considered to lead to significant adverse effects and has already been scoped out of requiring further assessment. "suitable mitigation will be considered" gives us no reassurance at all.</p> <p>Question 27</p> <p>How can we comment on environmental impacts - especially noise that may/will affect us - and proposed mitigation when we are not given information?</p> <p>Pages 30/31 of the document claims to show changes in traffic flows with/without the scheme and also journey times. National Highways have stated that improved journey time is a key objective of the scheme</p> <p>Question 28</p> <p>Despite the title on the page, there appears to be no information given on journey times. Please explain this gap - or tell us where on the diagram it is? Consultees cannot comment in relation to this key objective without data.</p>	21	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The Applicant considers that the information presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements</i> and the Infrastructure Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to noise and vibration changes around the Scheme, during construction and operation. This includes potentially sensitive receptors in proximity to the A1 grade separation location.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that there would be no permanent or temporary significant effects for noise and/or vibration during the operation or construction of the Scheme. Mitigation measures necessary to avoid significant effects are secured via the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (TR010065/APP/3.1). This will ensure that any adverse effects are no worse than set out in the assessment as per Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) and are compliant with any subsequent agreements with the local authority associated with temporary noise and/or vibration effects.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that during operation of the Scheme there is potential for changes to traffic flows and road alignment which may result in noise changes at noise sensitive receptors, many of which would be beneficial due to the addition of acoustic screening, permanent landscaping bunds and changes in the carriageway surface material to reduce operational noise. Any likely significant adverse effects shall be monitored, ensuring the mitigation measures as set out in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (TR010065/APP/6.5) are adhered to and the resulting effects are no worse than set out in the assessment as per Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Both construction and operation mitigation measures are also included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme, identifies actions and commitments, demonstrating compliance with environmental legislation.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>Page 29 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> states that journey times are expected to reduce by an average of 30% as a result of the Scheme. The traffic modelling undertaken forecasts that the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). More information on journey times is detailed within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that an oversight was made with regards to the fact that the Forecast Traffic Flow diagram on pages 30 and 31 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> did not indicate that the figures related to daily traffic counts. Following the statutory consultation, an updated version of this document was published on the Scheme's webpage. More information relating to traffic forecasts is detailed in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWNM-F	Consultation - negative feedback/ experience	<p>Consultation Events</p> <p>The first weekend of Consultation involved paying £9 per person to enter a 'Food' event at the Showground. This is not open access fair consultation. The events were not helpful at all in terms of showing the local impact/environmental impact of the scheme - just lots of drawings of roads and idealised pictures, many focusing on groups of eager-looking Highways England employees.</p> <p>Question 29</p> <p>Why was there no focus on 'How we are going to prevent damage to peoples lives and the environment "? - with real clear information - there were no display banners .... Not important?</p> <p>Question 30</p> <p>Why was there no consultation event near to the 'Windmill Viaduct' where the scheme will have great impact - and the 'drop off/collection point at the pub there (the Lord Ted) was closed for refurbishment for most of the consultation time?</p>	21	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments on how the consultation process has been carried out. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Information relating to the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>). A copy of the Statement of Community Consultation can be found within Annex E (Published SoCC) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>In response to the Consultee's comments in relation to consultation events, a total of fourteen consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. Twelve were held in person and two online. The first two in person consultation events took place at Newark Showground during the Gift and Food Show. These events were chosen due to the large number of visitors that attend the show, providing a prime opportunity to engage with regional and local stakeholders to promote understanding of the Scheme and the consultation period. All consultation events were advertised to the public through newspaper notices, letters sent out with the <i>Consultation Brochures</i> and <i>Consultation Response Forms</i>, on the Scheme webpage, posters, social media, press notices and brochures.</p> <p>In relation to question 29, consultation materials including the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The development consent application will be accompanied by a suite of documents, reflecting the greater level of detail associated with the Scheme design. This is an iterative approach that complies with the requirements for schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The comprehensive submission will be available for review on a dedicated Scheme webpage on the National Infrastructure Planning website if accepted for examination and there will be an opportunity to provide further comments on the Scheme prior to and during the examination.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In relation to question 30, the consultation event locations were chosen so that they were spread out across the length of the Scheme. Suitably sized venues with available car parking were selected and it was ensured that each location was easily accessible for the public both via walking and public transport. Event locations were also selected based on their proximity to affected residents. Further details regarding the consultation events can be found in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The consultation event held nearest to the Windmill Viaduct (approximately one mile away) was at Farndon Memorial Hall on 8 November 2022.</p> <p>For 28 days during the consultation period, the Lord Ted was inaccessible as a deposit location, due to refurbishment works. This closure was not communicated to the Applicant when the deposit location was organised and only took place for part of the advertised 47-day consultation period. Signage was erected at the deposit location site informing visitors of the reason for the closure, where alternative deposit locations were available and how consultation materials could be viewed online.</p> <p>Due to this deposit location being unavailable for only part of the consultation period, six other locations being available (two of them being within two miles of the Lord Ted) and no other suitable deposit locations being available in this area, it was decided that a new location was not required to replace the Lord Ted as a deposit location.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW7E-G	Single carriageway link between Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>The new single-carriageway road between the Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe roundabouts [RAs] (item Q) is to ""include provisions for pedestrians and cyclists"". Such path along the south-east side of the new road should be specified and constructed to LTN 1/20 standard. It is inconceivable that a scheme promoted by National Highways should not comply with the prevailing Department for Transport specification.</p> <p>The new northbound A46 exit slip road via a new RA to the existing Brownhills RA (item N). This necessitates diversion of the existing non-mechanised [NM] user routes (including NCN Route 64) between Winthorpe Road and [redacted]. Any new section of these routes adjacent to new carriageways should be specified and constructed to LTN 1/20 standard; elsewhere to an equivalent standard. The crossing of the new slip road should be traffic light controlled.</p> <p>These NM routes continue northeastwards through an underpass beneath the A1, shown as being within the 'scheme boundary'. This section of the routes should also be improved to an equivalent standard, particularly eliminating the discriminatory barriers.</p>	2B	N	<p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing of the new A46 northbound exit slip road would be a signal-controlled crossing.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's suggestion to improve the existing route beneath the A1 at the end of Winthorpe Road. The section is not affected by the Scheme and there is no proposal to change this. Discussions with local residents and Nottinghamshire County Council regarding this area did identify the need for it to stay as it is due to concerns that the route could be used by criminals to leave or enter Winthorpe village using motorised vehicles and that they would strongly object to this being opened up.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7E-G	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Provision of safe and convenient active travel route(s) between Newark town centre and the industrial, showground and former airfield sites to the north-east.	2D	N	<p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). This includes retaining and improving walking and cycling routes throughout the Scheme, as well as reducing severance between Winthorpe and Newark Showground, and south of the A46.</p> <p>New crossings would be provided beneath the A46 alongside the A1 and new crossings provided around Winthorpe roundabout. A new walking and cycling route would connect the entrances to Newark Showground, forming a continuous new route from Drove Lane, alongside the A46 and connecting into the existing walking and cycling crossing at Godfrey Drive adjacent to the A17.</p>
ANON-559H-RW7E-G	Consultation – positive feedback	Excellent consultation brochure.	2I	N	Comment acknowledged by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWVE-F	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Sustrans are concerned that users of the National Cycle Network Route 64 (Trent Vale Trail route) and changes to its route presented in the current design offer a substandard experience for non motorised users.</p> <p>The existing NCN64, footpath and Trent Vale Trail all use a route alignment with an underpass under the existing A46 and a narrow passage under the A1. At present this is the only existing route to link the villages to the east of Newark with villages to the town centre. The proposed scheme would add an additional underpass, a diversionary route alongside slip roads and an additional crossing point across the proposed Brownhills Junction slip road.</p> <p>The proposed design and diversionary route's impact on the NCN has the potential to negatively impact the propensity of journeys made actively, especially for those travelling with children or who have additional mobility needs.</p> <p>The proposed route downgrades key indicators in making a quality cycle and walking route (directness and safety). The proposed route of the NCN with the additional stopping time to use the crossing journeys are significantly longer in terms of distance and time (estimated 250% increased distance at this section). This is a significant increase on journeys made actively.</p> <p>The proposed route will run adjacent to the busy slip road for motorised vehicles leaving the A46. Separation and width of proposed cycle route has not been provided for this section. It is recommended, in accordance to LTN 1/20 table 6-1, a horizontal separation of a minimum 2m is given from the carriageway (assuming speed limit of slip road will be 60 mph) in addition to the width of the cycle route, assumed at least 3m wide in accordance with LTN 1/20 table 5-2. This would require a total width of 5m. Due to the speed of adjacent motorised traffic physical separation from the cycle route is recommended, such as a barrier, the buffer helps protect cyclists from the air turbulence created by passing motor traffic and from debris thrown up from the carriageway, especially important during bad weather.</p> <p>The above also applies to the proposed diversionary route proposed during the bypass construction.</p> <p>The proposed new layout of NCN64 requires directional signage and lighting to increase usability.</p> <p>Sustrans support the submission from the Friends of the Trent Vale Trail and the Newark Active Travel Group.</p>	2B	N	<p>Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), to include consideration of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on access to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders routes and identified that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of the National Cycle Network Route 64 as a result of the 105m diversion.</p> <p>The new Brownhills Junction would result in the permanent realignment of National Cycle Route 64 and the Trent Valley Way along Winthorpe Road.</p> <p>While the realignment would increase walking distance along the route by 105m it would be on a 3m wide walking and cycling route with a separation from the road. The new alignment would require users to cross the A46 exit slip road at a signalised crossing. As vehicles would already be slowing down for the Brownhills Junction Roundabout, the inclusion of a signalised crossing point at the site would improve safety for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Lighting and signing would be provided in the area where the upgraded National Cycle Network Route 64 intersect with the realigned A46, such as the Brownhills Junction Roundabout and adjacent the Brownhills Junction Link Road and within the Scheme Order Limits only.</p> <p>In the location where the National Cycle Network Route 64 intersects the A46, the route would utilise a shared use walking and cycling route, therefore allowing physical separation from the existing and proposed road networks. Where the proposed infrastructure joins the existing infrastructure, the physical separation of the National Cycle Network Route 64 would return to existing conditions.</p> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). All new walking and cycling routes would be separated by a 1.0m hard strip, a kerb upstand and a 0.5m separation next to the 3m walking and cycling route. This detail provides safe facilities for users. The speed limit of this route would be 50mph, so this is considered appropriate.</p> <p>A barrier is not considered appropriate due to the low speeds of the link road and as it creates a safety risk in itself due to it being an obstacle that can be hit by vehicles or cyclists. It should be noted that the lane of traffic adjacent to the walking and cycling route would have very low usage as it is mainly providing local access to a small number of residents and a boarding kennel business. The majority of traffic would therefore be an additional 3.65m from the walking and cycling path.</p> <p>The route would remain open throughout construction. The associated Outline Traffic Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b>) provides details on how the environment effects and traffic movements would be managed during construction. During construction the walking and cycling route would be segregated from live traffic.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Route corridor; Overall scheme	<p>We suggest a fundamental flaw in scheme design, probably because the decision was made very early on regarding the route corridor (2015-2018). This was based on too simplistic and assumptive criteria and this was not reviewed/evaluated once the scheme got purchase under RIS2 in 2020 - or since.</p> <p>A workshop in 2018 evaluated 5 route corridors "against selected criteria". "Corridor C, which uses the existing A46 corridor, was the best performing corridor in terms of user benefits, providing the best reductions in journey times, delays and incidents, and improvement in reliability" [2020 Options report page 56 para 5.2.7 ]. The other corridors were deemed longer, giving less journey time saving. It was also stated that because the other considered 'corridors' were longer distance they "are expected to be higher (cost) for a longer corridor" [para 5.2.10]. We suggest that this was a naive assumption. Corridor C selected, involves not only building continuous high embankment over a floodplain but - over only 6.5km - 3 bridges to cross the river, 3 bridges to cross 2 railways, 2 flyovers, 4 roundabout developments and one new roundabout.</p> <p>Question 2b 1a) - At the 2018 sifting stage - were any indicative costings considered that factored in the high density of complex, expensive engineering structures that this 'shorter' route corridor would require?</p> <p>Question 2b 1b) - At this 2018 sifting stage, did the 'carbon' cost figures factor in the structures referred to in question1a above? It is clearly reported in the PEI 2020 that route choices within corridor 'c' were, at that point, 'evaluated' considering:</p> <p>*"The least number of structures and volumes of earthworks, hence the lowest scheme costs. Less land take, including agricultural and 'Best and Most Versatile' land (defined as excellent to good quality land which is able to best deliver food and non-food crops), resulting in a smaller volume of additional floodplain compensation storage required outside of the flood risk areas (flood zones 2 and 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less likely significant adverse environmental effects with mitigation as there would be less habitat fragmentation, have fewer heritage assets and a smaller impact on affected listed structures along the A616, and have the least likely significant adverse effects predicted for noise.</li> <li>• Less likely significant adverse effects on landscape, townscape and visual receptors, water, mineral resources, waste generation, and materials asset use. This is due to the extent of land take, new sections of road and additional grade separated junctions, area of permeability and increased construction within the floodplain (which would require compensation). "Para 3.2.11 2022 PEI</li> </ul> <p>The scheme did not get further traction until 2020 when 'RIS2' was launched. It would seem, from the evidence available, that this 2018 corridor selection work was picked up without question and progressed, although it was already recognised how damaging that corridor choice would be to people and to the environment i.e. it did not embody the principle of sustainable planning.</p> <p>The 2020 Options Summary stated, " (within Corridor C) all options result in potential for significant adverse effects on noise receptors, heritage assets, landscape and visual, biodiversity, material assets and waste." [page 63 para 5.7.9]. Having identified so many 'significant adverse effects', lots of carbon cost, the need for many structures and volumes of earthworks National Highways seemingly failed to re-evaluate the 2018 corridor selection. Pages 6 and 7 of the consultation brochure seem to support this assertion.</p> <p>Question 2b 2) : How does this action (picking up the 2018 route corridor selection without question) reflect the requirement in the License under which National Highways operates?</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives for the Scheme alignment which informed the current design. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides a description of the alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>The route corridor and option selection process that were followed align with the steps and requirements set out in the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>. As part of this, an initial sift was undertaken which followed all the steps required of the Scheme as set out in Step 6: Initial Sifting of the <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i> transport appraisal process and it was determined that Corridor C scored better than the other corridors.</p> <p>With regard to questions 2b, 1a and 1b asked by the Consultee, each corridor was assessed against the Scheme objectives, the National Policy Statement for National Networks, and Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment</i> and <i>Sifting Tool</i> qualitatively. At this early design stage, given consideration was being applied to route corridors as a whole, rather than individual routes, it was considered appropriate to sift the corridors without consideration of indicative costings. This approach aligns with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i> when sifting schemes at an early stage. The 2018 sifting did consider differences in the five route corridors from a carbon perspective, qualitatively. It is noted that all of the route corridors pass through floodplains and would therefore have required engineering structures.</p> <p>Route Corridor C, as the most direct route (due to it being the shortest route corridor that followed the existing A46 the closest), scored better than the other four corridors for economic growth, movement, accessibility, journey time, resilience, customer groups and environment. The Applicant has provided robust justification for the corridor selection within Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to question 2b 2 asked by the Consultee, the corridor selection reflects the Applicant's licence requirements, as set out below. It ensures value for money and efficiency whilst minimising environmental impacts of operating, maintaining and improving its network. The Applicant considers that the Scheme conforms to the principles of sustainable development and seeks to promote the well-being of road users and communities affected by the work.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed and informed iteratively by the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment process, which has enabled the inclusion of embedded mitigation to ensure a sustainable design that aligns with the Applicant's design principles in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 103 - Introduction and general requirements for sustainable development and design</i>, which outlines general requirements for sustainable development and design for highway and all-purpose trunk road projects.</p> <p>This has included designing the Scheme to minimise habitat loss and reduce impacts on key environmental constraints, to include provision of planting and careful siting of earthworks to integrate the Scheme into the landscape, to use thin surface courses and barriers to reduce noise and to provide sustainable drainage systems which have been designed to be integrated with the landscape.</p> <p>The design has also sought to minimise land take as far as possible to reduce direct impacts upon communities, ensuring that access would be maintained for properties and areas of</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>"- 4.2d - ensure efficiency and value for money, 4.2g minimise the environmental impacts of operating, maintaining and improving its network ... , and 4.2h - "conform to the principles of sustainable development .... And to comply with 4.2 .. d) seek to promote the well-being of road users and communities affected by the network?" and the statement in chapter 2 para 2.1.3 of the 'PEI' referring to RIS2, "In exercising its functions and complying with its legal duties National Highways must act in a manner which it considers best calculated to, among others:</p> <p>1. Minimise the environmental impacts of operating, maintaining and improving its network and seek to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment 2. Conform to the principles of sustainable development."?"</p> <p>Question 2b 3) How were the following principles pronounced in 'Road Investment Strategy 2' (RIS2) incorporated into the A46 scheme launched late 2020?</p> <p>- e.g. "this Road Investment Strategy is not a blueprint for pouring concrete, laying tarmac or welding steel ... this is first and foremost a document with people at its heart" [page 1 paras 1,2]...then regarding delivery it states, "where the SRN passes through existing residential areas it is important that its impact on the people that live there is carefully managed, with steps taken to reduce air, light and noise pollution ..." [page 23 para5].</p>			<p>designated open space. In addition, diversions would be provided for road users as well as walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) further details all of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>Some habitat loss as a result of the Scheme is unavoidable, however, the Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Additional essential mitigation has also been developed to mitigate or minimise any likely significant effects as a result of the Scheme. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) shows the environmental mitigation to be provided.</p> <p>With regards to question 2b 3, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> identified a need for the Scheme. Since announcing the preferred route in February 2022, the Applicant has refined the design of the Scheme, including the development of environmental design. The Applicant has worked with statutory environmental bodies and the local authorities to ensure that community impacts are carefully managed and mitigated as best as possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has made every effort to reduce impact on local communities. The Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i>, which has sought to reduce any effects in relation to air, light and noise pollution as far as possible. Measures to mitigate any effects in relation to these factors are included in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisances (<b>TR010065/APP/6.7</b>) prepared for the Scheme has identified that the Scheme is not anticipated to result in statutory nuisance in relation to air quality, light and noise pollution.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Traffic forecasts	<p>We asked at the Town Hall consultation (Nov 30th) regarding journey times information as it is not shown in the scheme information yet was stated to be a key objective. We were told that they had that information (but implied it was very complicated) and we could write and ask for specific information.</p> <p>The representative seemed puzzled that we wanted to know. He was insistent that he knew that journeys would be quicker and that was all that people cared about - "getting home quickly at 5pm" . He dismissed our concerns about the magnitude of work needed and impact on the floodplain, of noise and disruption to homes. He said that journey time was most important variable - but could not tell us how much the scheme would supposedly improve the journey time - or what the cost/benefits would be to achieve this.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regard to their experience at the consultation event.</p> <p>A total of fourteen consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. Twelve were held in person and two online. The first two in person consultation events took place at Newark Showground during the Gift and Food Show, which was a ticketed event. The objective of these events was to provide the local community and other stakeholders with multiple opportunities to view and discuss the Scheme with various members of the team, including technical experts.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Consultation materials, including traffic forecasts and related information, were provided at the events and were also available for viewing online. Expected journey time savings can be found on Page 29 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> that was shared during consultation events and was also made available for viewing online on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>The information provided was based on assessments available at the time and has been updated following further development of traffic models. When the Scheme is introduced, the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent. The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> further outlines the benefits of the Scheme. Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would also result in environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats and increased accessibility via the new walking and cycling routes. Further information is detailed in the Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary <b>(TR010065/APP/6.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regard to the impact on the floodplain. The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which is presented in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. This appendix also details the mitigation scheme that has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding the noise impacts of the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> presents the Applicant's assessment of any potential effects associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment concerning the disruption to homes and the magnitude of work for the Scheme. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings, the environment, residents, businesses and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>, a Traffic Management Plan will be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the local road network. The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined and produce an overall Value for Money assessment. This is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme; Environment - general; Population	<p>Question 2b 4 a) Please can we see a full cost benefit study of this proposed scheme - if journey time is the key objective then what are the costs and what are the benefits? This is vital to evaluating the scheme and commenting on it.</p> <p>Question 2b 4 b) Please can you ensure that factors such as health, wellbeing and</p>	2B	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Case for the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	and human health	environment are part of the cost-benefit analysis, and not just focus on journey times and business-focused need. It is important to recognise the lived environment, people's health, biodiversity and associated issues that are harder to quantify but where due credit must be given within the cost-benefit calculation.			<p>The approach to monetise the impacts has followed the 'Damage Cost' approach in accordance with the <i>Transport Planning and Appraisal Guidance (2018)</i> and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, May 2022</i>. Further detail on the damage cost assessment is presented in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to health, <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i> requires consideration of air quality and noise as part of the cost benefit calculation. Consideration of biodiversity is not required as part of the monetised benefits aspect within the Case for the Scheme, however qualitative consideration has been given as part of the non-monetised benefits, in line with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Landscape and visual effects	The Environmental Report highlights that this design is expected to have a substantial negative visual impact on the surrounding landscape.	2B	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Applicant refers the Consultee to Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> for further information on the extent of visual impact.</p> <p>The potential impact upon seven Landscape Character Areas was assessed as part of this Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Of the seven identified, two Landscape Character Areas (Landscape Character Area 1 Trent Washlands and Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe Village and Farmlands) would experience temporary significant adverse effects during the construction of the Scheme. Two Landscape Character Areas (Landscape Character Area 1 Trent Washlands and Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe village and Farmlands) are likely to experience significant adverse effects in Year 1 (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic). When considering the establishment of mitigation planting by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), only one Landscape Character Area (Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe Village and Farmlands Landscape Character Area) is considered to have a residual significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to impacts and effects upon visual amenity, of those 63 visual receptors assessed, 15 receptors would experience significant adverse effects during construction of the Scheme, reducing to six receptors in Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) of operation. When considering the establishment of mitigation planting by Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening), two visual receptors (No.24, being residential properties at Sandhills Park, and No.40, users of the Trent Valley Way and National Cycle Network Route 64 on Winthorpe Road), were considered to have a residual significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>It should be noted that landscape and visual effects alongside broader environmental effects have been avoided, wherever possible, in the first instance. Where unavoidable, the design has been developed to limit impacts and offset impacts. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme including the Applicant's actions, commitments, and compliance with environmental legislation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Question 2b 5 - What advice has National Highways as License holder sought/been given from the 'Design Panel' with regard to this scheme ? [ref License para 5.27].</p> <p>Cooperation in scheme design - National Highways is required to : "consider effective integration... (with) .... The rest of the transport system, including carrying out joint studies with other organisations where appropriate.... and " consider opportunities for collaborative</p>	2B	N	The Applicant has engaged with the Design Review Panel during the evolution of the preliminary design. The Design Review Panel are a group of built environment experts who impartially evaluate the Applicant's proposals and constructively challenge the design approach for individual road schemes.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>solutions .... That can improve performance of the network .....where this delivers value for money."(para 5.14) (National Highways Licence March 2015).</p> <p>The main aim of the scheme is to get A46 traffic past Newark quickly. The scheme plans only consider the surrounding road network at a very superficial level.</p>			<p>The Scheme Design Report (<b>TR010065/APP/7.5</b>) details the engagement that has taken place with the Design Review Panel following comments received from the Panel in January 2023, as well as how these actions and issues have been addressed.</p> <p>The Design Review Panel provided comments structured around general themes for the overall Scheme, relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design principles</li> <li>• Active travel</li> <li>• Landscape framework</li> <li>• Flood risk and water management</li> <li>• Budget and costs</li> </ul> <p>They also provided comments on specific areas, relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newark-on-Trent</li> <li>• Farndon Road/B6166</li> <li>• Cattle Market Junction/Roundabout</li> <li>• Nether Lock</li> <li>• Winthorpe</li> <li>• Newark Showground</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant responded to these comments and made subsequent amendments to the design at Cattle Market to reduce the visual impact; amended the landscape design at Nether Lock Viaduct; realigned walking and cycling routes at Brownhills Junction; amended the route from Hargon Lane to the Showground entrance and retained more vegetation and existing gardens at Crees Lane.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the aim of the Scheme. In addition to journey time savings, the objectives for the Scheme cover a range of topics. The Scheme objectives are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Safety</b> - Improve safety through scheme design to reduce collisions for all users of the Scheme</li> <li>• <b>Congestion</b> - Improve journey time and journey time reliability along the A46 and its junctions between Farndon and Winthorpe, including all approaches and A1 slip roads</li> <li>• <b>Connectivity</b> - Accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent and the wider area by improving its strategic and local connectivity</li> <li>• <b>Environment</b> - Deliver better environmental outcomes by achieving a net gain in biodiversity and improve noise levels at noise important areas along the A46 between Farndon and Winthorpe roundabouts</li> <li>• <b>Customer</b> - Build an inclusive Scheme which improves facilities for walkers, cyclists, and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected</li> </ul> <p>Traffic modelling has been carried out to support the Scheme. The modelling has provided further understanding of patterns of travel for different users allowing the Applicant to assess how the Scheme provides benefits to businesses and individuals.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and modelling process is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant's statutory remit is to manage and maintain the strategic road network. The delivery of the Scheme seeks to enable traffic to stay on strategic routes, thereby reducing delays and congestion. The problems along the existing A46 need road improvement solutions consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, as pursued via the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> for upgrading the A46 to a high-quality dual carriageway between Lincoln and Gloucestershire. Much of this road is already high-quality dual carriageway, and by filling in key sections, a coast-to-coast</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					highway can be created without need for major new road building across open countryside. The single greatest gap in this route is the A46 at Newark-on-Trent.
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Southern Link Road; Stakeholder engagement; Route corridor	<p>Question 2b 6) Because Newark is located at the hub of a complex transport network then collaboration to promote 'network resilience' would seem to be particularly important in seeking value for money, yet this scheme does not seem to demonstrate collaborative working, even internally to National Highways. For example, considerable development of warehousing is occurring to the west around Mansfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield - what about the endless stream of massive freight lorries trying to approach (at a right-angle) and to get over historic and very narrow Kelham Bridge? (A616)</p> <p>6a) Please explain why the current A46 design team we spoke to seem unaware of the 'Newark Southern link road' which National Highways are clearly involved in as they are named on a current planning submission - yet this (approximate) route corridor was dismissed by NH in 2018? This current application will actually put yet another roundabout on the A46 south of Newark - quietly not acknowledged by the current design team as they say "it is outside our scheme". This roundabout does not appear on the 'consultation drawings (page 16 or 18) yet this roundabout will have an impact on flows of traffic, and seems to run counter to the logic of the 'proposed A46 scheme' of removing roundabouts elsewhere to improve journey time.</p> <p>6 b) In 1990 this 'Southern Link Road' was part of D2N2 and was part of £49 million of 'Local Growth Funding', it was said to be "designed to ease traffic congestion and improve journey times along the Newark bypass by providing an alternative A46 to A1 route and a new River Devon crossing point" - please explain why this route corridor is not linked into a current scheme?</p>	2B	N	<p>In relation to question 2b 6, the Applicant has engaged a range of stakeholders throughout all stages of the Scheme. This has included working closely with both Nottinghamshire County Council (as the local highway authority) and Newark and Sherwood District Council (as local planning authority) to ensure resilience and connectivity between the strategic and local road networks. Information relating to ongoing engagement is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ratio, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The factors that are included in the benefit to cost ratio are all impacted by improved network resilience and therefore influencing the overall Value for Money. These factors include journey time and vehicle operating cost savings during operation, construction and maintenance, safety benefits, reliability benefits, wider economic impacts, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas impacts.</p> <p>A Development Uncertainty Log has been produced by the Applicant. This document contains information on future 'certain' or 'more than likely' planned developments in close proximity to the Scheme and how these have been accounted for in the traffic forecasts. This can be viewed in Appendix A (Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The growth forecast and the additional volumes accounted for within the Development Uncertainty Log, therefore would provide capacity for future economic growth and opportunity for employment development, in line with the Scheme objective to accommodate economic growth in Newark-on-Trent and the wider area. This includes developments around Mansfield, however, Sutton-in-Ashfield falls outside of the modelled area, which was drawn up based on a combination of development density, local authority districts and geographical proximity to the A46. Further information regarding the traffic modelling can be found within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to HGVs using Kelham bridge on the A617. As the A617 is a local authority road, any interventions relating to HGVs using the Kelham bridge would be managed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority for the area.</p> <p>Regarding questions 6a and 6b, the Applicant is aware of the Southern Link Road project, and it is included in the current traffic modelling. The Southern Link Road being is delivered by the Newark Town Board with funding from Newark and Sherwood District Council. It will link the A46 and A1 at Balderton Interchange to the south of Newark-on-Trent. The Southern Link Road has been granted planning permission and early works have commenced with completion expected by spring 2025, ahead of the Scheme. Further information about this project can be found on the Newark Town Board website.</p> <p>While the Southern Link Road is not a National Highways project, the Applicant has taken the implications and potential impacts of the Southern Link Road in traffic modelling, where the project is included in the 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (fifteen years after opening) modelling scenarios. The Do Minimum modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road, but not the Scheme) forecasts that there would be delays along the Scheme section of the A46. The Do Something modelling scenario (which includes the Southern Link Road and the Scheme) forecasts a reduction of delays along the A46 significantly, particularly at Cattle Market Roundabout. This information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>As the Southern Link Road project falls within 2km of the Scheme, it is also considered by the Applicant within the list of developments as part of Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					The Southern Link Road alignment was shown within the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> produced for statutory consultation to provide context only. The Southern Link Road Roundabout junction was not included as it was not yet constructed at the time of consultation.
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Traffic forecasts; Congestion; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Newark Castle level crossing	<p>6 c) Please explain what collaborative planning work National Highways have engaged in within the planning of this scheme since 2015 , particularly with regard to trying to achieve improved network resilience with the A1, A616, A617 and A17. What analysis has been undertaken to assess whether the new scheme will make conditions better or worse on these routes?</p> <p>6 d) Given that the scheme is built on increased capacity, what will the impact of this increase in traffic be on tributary roads? Will congestion simply be moved around or even intensified in years to come?</p> <p>Question 2b 7) The key scheme objective seems to be 'to reduce journey time', page 29 tells us that they project a 30% average saving yet no specific understandable metrics – or how they were sourced – are shared with consultees; the diagram on pages 30/31 fails to indicate journey times now/projected. Please explain how consultees can comment on the scheme without any meaningful metrics?</p> <p>Question 2b. 8 a)- We note an expectation of increased flow into Newark Town from the 'Cattle Market' roundabout. As regular users of this route we know that the commonest cause of hold-up to flow is the rail crossing. Have the frequency of rail crossing gate closures been factored into the calculation of traffic flow rates anticipated ? There seems to be a suggestion in the consultation document that widening/increasing capacity of 'The Great North Road' near Cattle Market junction will help to ease congestion at the roundabout and the road onward into town via the rail crossing.</p> <p>Question 2b. 8 b) Please clarify – is this suggesting that 'The Great North Road' approach would be seen as some sort of 'holding area' (particularly in view of point raised in a) above? If so, then we don't deem this to be any sort of worthwhile congestion alleviation measure – a queue is a queue.</p>	2B	N	<p>Regarding question 6c, the Applicant has engaged with relevant statutory consultees and local communities to inform and refine the design of the Scheme during its development. This includes working closely with both Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council to ensure resilience and connectivity between the strategic and local road networks. Information relating to ongoing engagement is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using the A46 Newark Bypass Model which comprises three primary modelling components, a Highway Assignment Model, Variable Demand Model and microsimulation (operational) model. The microsimulation (operational) model has been developed to assess the impact of the Scheme at a local level and as such focusses on the impact on the A46 and A617.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> summarises the forecast journey times that have been extracted from the strategic highway assignment model for the M1, A1, A17, A516, A1133 and A1173. This analysis indicates that there are forecast to be reductions in journey times on the A617 and A17 corridors as a result of the Scheme. Journey times savings are broadly comparable between 2028 and 2043, with the journey times on the A617 forecast to reduce in the AM peak by around 6% in the eastbound direction. Journey times on the A17 are forecast to reduce in the PM peak by around 7% in the westbound direction. Journey times on all other routes are forecast to remain largely unchanged as a result of the Scheme. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding point 6d, the traffic modelling forecasts that there would be no significant delays on the surrounding local road network in 2043 (15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic) as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>In relation to point 2b 7, improving journey times is one of several objectives set for the Scheme. The Scheme improvements would provide more capacity on the A46 route, resulting in shorter and more reliable journey times. When the Scheme is introduced the main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043. This would make the A46 a more attractive route for road users and encourage a higher proportion of road users to remain on the strategic road network, as opposed to using local roads to rat-run through Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>The Applicant used traffic modelling data and projections available at the time of statutory consultation to forecast what traffic flows and journey times would be in the planned year of Scheme opening (2028) without the Scheme, and then forecast what traffic flows and journey times would be with the Scheme in place. The traffic modelling used traffic surveys and traffic data taken from a large area covering the roads along the A46 and beyond, to understand how drivers may respond to changes in road layouts. This information was presented in the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> as a comparison of the traffic flows on pages 30 and 31.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that an oversight was made with regards to the fact that the diagram on pages 30 and 31 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> did not indicate that the figures related to daily traffic counts. Following the statutory consultation, an updated version of this document was published on the Scheme's webpage.</p> <p>Further information regarding the methodology used for the traffic modelling undertaken and detailed journey time savings is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to point 2b 8a, the rail crossing gates closures have been factored into the traffic modelling undertaken. More information is available within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Local traffic accessing Newark-on-Trent town centre is forecast to increase on Great North Road. The annual average daily traffic flow on the section of the B6326 Great North Road immediately south of the Cattle Market Roundabout is forecast to increase from 13,400 in the Do Minimum scenario, to 17,800 in the Do Something scenario in 2028 (the year the Scheme is open to traffic), an increase of 4,400 vehicles per day (+33%). However, traffic modelling predicts a reduction in delays and congestion along Great North Road towards the Cattle Market Junction as a result of the new grade separated Cattle Market Junction with the A46.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a new grade separated junction at Cattle Market Junction, with the widened A46 elevated to pass over the existing Cattle Market Roundabout. The existing roundabout would be enlarged beneath to provide increased capacity.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken for the Scheme includes the Newark Castle level crossing. The traffic modelling indicates an improvement in conditions on Great North Road as a result of the upgrade to the Cattle Market Junction.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic forecasts and modelling is available within the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Improving Newark Castle level crossing itself is not required by the Scheme, as the Scheme does not worsen or change the existing situation in relation to crossing operation and safety. Therefore, the Scheme is not required to mitigate the current delays caused by Newark Castle level crossing. Newark and Sherwood District Council have advised the Applicant that they are discussing improvements to the crossing with Network Rail.</p> <p>Regarding point 2b 8b, the widening of the Great North Road south approach to Cattle Market Roundabout is necessary to address queueing issues at this location.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Population and human health; Route corridor	<p>This scheme appears to be overly complex for a town to deal with, not just on its doorstep but actually in its bedrooms and gardens.</p> <p>Question 2b 9 – Please explain how this is acceptable within the principles of sustainable planning and spatial planning, notwithstanding the right of individuals not to have their health and well-being damaged by others.</p> <p>Question 2 b 10 – In 2022/23, if National Highways were planning a brand new highway would they use a route corridor that ran 50m from residents' bedroom windows?</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding the complexity of the Scheme. The Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project as defined by the Planning Act 2008. This means that an application will need to be made to the Secretary of State for Transport for a Development Consent Order, to obtain permission to build and operate the Scheme. Applications are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The Scheme is also an Environmental Impact Assessment development, as defined by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's question 2b 9, the Applicant considers that the Scheme accords with the principles of sustainable planning and spatial planning. Consideration has also been given to national policy including the National Planning Policy Framework within the Legislation and Policy section for each of the environmental topics presented in Chapters 5 to 15 of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) where relevant.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the most sustainable corridor was selected that performed the best in terms of user benefits, providing the greatest reductions in journey times, delays and incidents, and improvement in reliability whilst also having the least impact on the environment.</p> <p>Since then, the design has been developed to meet the Scheme objectives whilst also minimising environmental effects and also effects on the local community wherever practicable. Consequently, the Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 – Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle being to avoid potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) assesses the impact of the Scheme on the local community, taking into consideration effects regarding land requirements, accessibility and amenity. It concludes that no significant effects would be experienced in relation to human health as a result of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Applicant has produced a First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>, which sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts associated with the Scheme. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Relating to point 2b 10, any Scheme promoted by the Applicant seeks to minimise impacts upon the local community wherever possible. A variety of factors (including the impact on residential properties) are accounted for when selecting any preferred corridor and route. As part of this, consideration is given to the impacts of each option on local communities.</p> <p>The approach toward option selection for the Scheme aligns with the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>. This is a requirement for all schemes deemed to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p> <p>Where applicable mitigation and/or compensation is provided in accordance with relevant legislation.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Consultation – negative feedback/ experience	<p>Talking to members of the current scheme team at various Consultation meetings they are completely 'task focused' in a 'tick-box' way. They generally seem to consider that because they have distributed a brochure (to some), and set up some events, then they have 'consulted'. But they have not considered the 'audience' they need to reach to truly 'consult'.</p> <p>The team use jargon when they talk to you - referring to us as an 'IP' and/or a 'sensitive receptor' for example. One representative completely dismissed any suggestion that anything held value except a driver being able to get around Newark at "5 in the afternoon to go home as quickly as possible by the shortest route". He completely dismissed concerns about road noise for residents and people's health, the floodplain (which he seemed not to understand the scope of at all), damage to the visual environment and heritage nature of the town.</p> <p>Another representative seemed almost anxious at the suggestion that the guidelines in the DRMB LA111 might be out of date/not in line with recent regulations/ and contradictory regarding other cited 'Legal framework sources'. As Consultees we feel that DMRB LA111 is simply seen as 'The Holy Grail' - full stop. It is as if they put on the 'High Viz/ National Highways Badge and blindly pledge allegiance to one document, meaning common sense disappears.</p> <p>Many staff were pleasant - but we do not consider that some of their responses reflect the gravity of people's concerns. For example: we showed a representative a double page spread in the consultation document about 'The Environment' - she agreed that it actually had no useful, understandable content in the 200 words it contained; she laughed and told us to "mention that in your response". This was the same for the following 8/10 pages of the document.</p>	2B	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding their experience at the consultation event. A total of fourteen consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. During all consultation events, the Applicant aimed to ensure that visitors to events received answers to any questions they may have or were directed towards alternative methods whereby they could receive the necessary information.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Careful consideration was given to the promotion of the consultation. The two target areas, referred to as the inner and outer distribution areas, were based on who the Applicant considered would be most affected by the Scheme. This took into account visibility, noise levels and the proximity of the Scheme to existing properties.</p> <p>Addresses within the inner distribution area were sent all the consultation information, along with copies of the statutory consultation brochures and response forms, as well as a follow-up information postcard. Addresses within the outer distribution area were sent an information postcard promoting the statutory consultation and setting out details of where information was available to view. In addition, information posters with details about the consultation were displayed at public locations in close proximity to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that people who live and work beyond the identified distribution areas may also have an interest in the Scheme. To give these individuals and organisations an opportunity to participate, the Applicant used a variety of publicity methods to share information with a range of audiences including the use of social media, website updates, press releases and newspaper notices. Evidence of this is shown within Annex J (Section 47 Consultation Material) of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regard to the use of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> guidelines. This document sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration from construction, operation and maintenance projects, applying a proportionate and consistent approach using best practice and ensuring compliance with relevant legislation. It provides requirements and advice resulting from research, practical experience of constructing and operating motorway and all-purpose trunk roads, and for delivering compliance to legislative requirements.</p> <p>A range of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b> ) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Speed limit; Air quality; Noise and vibration	<p>Speed Limits</p> <p>Question 2 b 11. What is the justification for considering a 40 or 50 speed limit for only part of the scheme as part of noise reduction mitigation?</p> <p>The consultation document mentions consideration of speed limit between Winthorpe and Cattle Market roundabouts. The south-west segment of the scheme passes closer to people's homes, the distance is not great and much noise is already made by vehicles accelerating and then braking quickly - especially in the area around the 'Windmill viaduct' which is 50m from houses.</p> <p>We also note that because the road creates an arc to the north / north-west of the houses here then the noise actually has a 'surround sound' effect, not just a 'passing' effect.</p> <p>Additionally, this route needs to be monitored by average speed cameras as the area already suffers late night/early morning and weekend noisy motorbike and car 'racing' - especially in summer - that is very disturbing to sleep - the flyover will only encourage this more.</p> <p>No doubt increased braking also creates more harmful fine particulate pollution (PM 2.5), and over the length of road greater speed gives minimal benefit to journey time. This disparity is also a social justice issue.</p> <p>In short, a lower speed limit must be formally committed to for the entire length, and not be merely considered for part of it.</p>	2B	N	<p>In response to question 2b 11, specification of speed limits as currently designed are not driven by the noise assessment. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement in the form of average speed cameras would be provided to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>With regards the 'surround sound effect', it should be noted that receptors closest to the road would not experience this effect due to the curvature of the road being negligible in relation to the distance from the receptor. Receptors further from the road would benefit from lower noise levels in general. The new alignment of the A46 is also not substantially different from the existing alignment and therefore any 'surround sound effect' would not be the result of this Scheme. Further information on operational noise can be found in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme would not have a significant effect on particulate matter (PM) during the operation of the Scheme. The main pollutant emitted from road traffic is nitrogen oxide (NOx). NOx is primarily made up of nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) the latter being of most concern due to its impact on human health and as such monitored by local authorities across the UK. NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the study area are well below the annual mean objective and, as PM concentrations from road traffic are an order of magnitude lower than NOx, the assessment has demonstrated based on background PM data available from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, that concentrations are low and the impact from the Scheme would not have a significant effect on PM.</p> <p>The Applicant has also undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment, described in the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>), which assesses the equality impact of the Scheme on protected characteristic groups, including the health impact caused by air quality. No equality impacts were found based on the air quality assessment findings.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regard to a reduced speed limit for the entire length of the Scheme. A speed limit would be allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and included on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Consultation – general	<p>'General Comments'</p> <p>Question 2C. a)- Local residents and other parties are asked to comment on the proposal. It is clear to those who have the time and ability to read, and unpick, the full Environmental Report that the proposed scheme carries a high risk of 'bad impact' on the environment in general and specifically the health of hundreds/thousands of local residents – but these residents are not presented with this information in a clear and accessible form.</p> <p>How can ordinary people comment on what they don't know? (The Gov UK Guidance cited above explains exactly why the large proportion of the local population will not be informed by the methodology and materials of this consultation)</p> <p>We contend that this is not "open and accessible information to affected stakeholders" (as is required) – for whom these impacts could be life-changing in a negative way.</p>	2C	N	<p>In response to question 2c a, the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided information on the environmental assessment undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. The Applicant considers that the information presented in <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures align with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements</i> and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has identified both adverse and beneficial effects resulting from the Scheme. The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on population human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality; access to services, health and social care; social capital; employment and income; and access to green space, recreation. No significant amenity or human health impacts have been identified during operation or construction.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. This included a customer friendly style <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>Fly through video</i>, <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i>, as well as more detailed, technical reports and drawings. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Noise and vibration; Population and human health; Construction	<p>We list below some of the hidden facts - these are a sample from just one of the 10 areas (noise) - people are entitled to have this information in clear accessible form as they can then be in a position to feel engaged and to comment :-</p> <p>- Some measurements of noise levels near homes that are close to the A46 were made last Spring. These show that areas are already exposed to noise levels that damage well-being and are linked to higher health risks like high blood pressure, heart disease, stroke, Alzheimers.</p> <p>'Noise Important Areas', last mapped in 2017 are clearly not accurate now. We already know that too much noise is bad for our health and well-being, so without serious attempts to reduce noise then there will be higher risk for hundreds/thousands of local residents.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. No noise related significant effects are predicted from the construction and operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Operational noise impacts would result in either a negligible change or be slightly beneficial in all noise important areas within the study area.</p> <p>The noise assessment, found in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) has retained the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs designations of noise important areas, however, it must be stated that these are not the only areas that have been targeted to avoid adverse noise effects as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment relating to the number of homes identified as being at high risk from increased noise. All noise sensitive receptors which have the potential</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Approx 50-60 homes have been identified as being at particularly high risk from increased road noise but National Highways haven't told these residents as they do not identify these houses.. This is not informed consultation.</p> <p>- Construction is likely to take three years and construction dust, noise and vibration is likely to have a negative impact on people locally; National Highways say that they will try to do what they can to keep dust down and not to make more noise at night. (which sounds like a flimsy and inadequate response.)</p> <p>- When the new road is operational then more traffic flow will make more noise. The scheme is rationalized on increased capacity; without more traffic, it is not economically feasible.</p>			<p>to experience significant effects have been assessed and are detailed in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. This includes all receptors that are at risk due to noise. For each receptor, rationale is provided which expresses the final assessment of significance.</p> <p>Noise levels with and without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes short term (the year the Scheme is open to traffic in 2028) and long term (15 years after Scheme opening in 2043) are presented within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. This includes dust and noise management, air pollution control measures and general construction best practice.</p> <p>The use of best practicable means would be applied for noise and vibration control at all times during construction. These should include the selection of the most appropriate method and plant for the job, adequate maintenance of plant, optimum siting of stationary plant, local screening and the education of the workforce. Restrictions may also be placed on early/late delivery times. Dust control measures would include locating stockpiles out of the wind, damping down surfaces in dry conditions and switching off vehicle engines when not in use as well as daily inspections to ensure dust management is effective.</p> <p>Temporary acoustic barriers would also be constructed for mitigation of noise at a number of locations throughout the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on local amenity, this includes the impact of the Scheme on air quality, noise and vibration and landscape amenity. It concludes that, through the implementation of mitigation measures, no significant adverse effects on amenity or human health would occur as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to increased traffic flow and the associated noise impacts. Traffic modelling undertaken shows that even if the Scheme is not built, traffic forecasts would increase along the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. More information is detailed in the Transport Assessment Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening.</p> <p>Further information relating to noise mitigation can be found within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Environment – general; Landscape and visual effects; Noise and vibration; Biodiversity; Road drainage and the water environment; Geology and soils	<p>Question 2C b: The Environmental Impact work is being carried out by the contractor; how is scientific impartiality/validity ensured ? Good science requires validation.</p> <p>The Environmental work presented does not indicate attention to the inter-relationship between the different aspects of the scheme – both in terms of impacts and potential mitigation. For example, if the area of the 'borrowpits/floodplain was filled with mixed (carefully planned) riparian woodland then it might provide some real noise mitigation, contribute to flood protection, hold the soils, and contribute to repairing some of the carbon cost – and provide wildlife habitats.</p>	2C	N	<p>All subject matter experts who have carried out the Environmental Impact Assessment and who have authored their respective chapters of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) are members of professional bodies who are required to comply with legislation including the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and <i>Design Manual for Road and Bridges</i> guidance which is the relevant standard for highway schemes.</p> <p>All documentation submitted by the Applicant as part of the development consent application is subject to review by the Planning Inspectorate during the examination period. Inspectors work within the principles of openness, fairness and impartiality as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's code of conduct which can be viewed on their website at:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct</a></p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regard to the relationship of the environmental work to other relevant disciplines.</p> <p>The development of the Scheme design has been an iterative process, undertaken by the Applicant's integrated design team, bringing together civil infrastructure disciplines alongside broader design disciplines including landscape architects and environmental specialists. The design has been developed to meet the Scheme objectives whilst also minimising environmental impacts wherever practicable. As part of this, the principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas are designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon East and Farndon West would be provided as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple ecological benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures, can be seen on Figure 2.3 Environmental Masterplan of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. For these areas in particular, public access would not be provided in order to maximise the biodiversity value of the areas (reducing stresses presented by public use, such as dog walking) and also to reduce health and safety risks posed by ponds (former borrow pits which would hold standing water).</p> <p>Planting is typically not considered a suitable alternative to noise barriers and is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy. Noise barriers or bunds are used instead to avoid significant effects where necessary.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme	Question 2C c - What processes/mechanisms/personnel do the Scheme Team have to ensure 'cross-working' between different professionals/disciplines within the Team? How can we see the evidence of this?	2C	N	<p>Weekly integration calls by the Applicant have been held during Scheme development to share information across disciplines (including engineering and environmental specialists), and to coordinate changes and develop solutions with a multi-disciplinary approach. These meetings also included the construction teams to ensure safe and buildable solutions have been developed. During construction, weekly planning meetings would be held, these would include all disciplines from the construction teams and the designers' representatives.</p> <p>The Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b> details the design philosophy that has been followed for the Scheme including the processes, mechanisms and ways of cross working that have been followed by different disciplines and professions to deliver an integrated design that meets the key Scheme objectives whilst also minimising environmental impacts wherever practicable.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme; Climate; Population and human health; Landscape and visual effects	Question 2C d Before the submission for the DCO will the following be available to interested parties? A) An updated project budget ? B) Updated project timeline ? C) Updated carbon cost calculations ? D) Full cost benefit that includes factors relating to the natural environment, people's health, visual and landscape loss, and so forth ?	2C	N	<p>The information identified by the Consultee forms part of the development consent application submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>In relation to point A, the latest cost estimate is detailed in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to point B, if the development consent application is granted, the main construction works are due to commence in 2025 and expected to be completed in 2028. Further details of the construction timeline are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to point C, the Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of likely significant effects which is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). A carbon budget places a restriction on the total amount of greenhouse gases the UK can emit over a five-year period. This assessment is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Operational emissions are provided in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, for both the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years from the Scheme's opening (2043). As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes no likely significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>With regards to point D, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. This includes consideration of monetised costs and benefits for noise, air quality and greenhouse gases as required by Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, May 2022</i>.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects (including biodiversity, population &amp; human health, and landscape &amp; visual impacts) of the Scheme.</p> <p>Consideration of other environmental factors such as landscape is not required as part of the monetised benefits aspect within the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, however qualitative consideration has been given as part of the non-monetised benefits and forms part of the overall planning balance (i.e. weighing up the benefits of the Scheme against any predicted harm) presented in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>, which will be submitted as part of the development consent application, in line with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Air quality; Population and human health	<p>2C 1. Air Quality</p> <p>The PEI demonstrates a failure to consider fine particulate air pollution - PM 2.5 - in respect of the many residents living very close to the intended development; yet it is becoming increasingly understood that these are the most dangerous particles to human health. Many of these fine particles come from 'non-exhaust emissions' (-NEE ) - tyre and brake wear, road surface breakdown etc. - and are only projected to increase with increased traffic volume. National Highways mention these 'road contaminants' in relation to potential for drainage run-off but fail to recognise their role as air pollutants that make people ill and potentially kill them.</p> <p>HE have identified a 'dust corridor' for the construction period. Dust is air pollution. This is not a minor impact as this represents 3 years of people's lives. The British Lung Foundation research reports that in 2017 background PM 2.5 levels in the Newark area were 8.95. This does not allow for raised levels due to proximity to busy roads. No level is 'safe' but WHO have recently reduced their recommended 'threshold' target to 5 µg/m3 (from 10 µg/m3).- research shows that every rise of 5% can be linked to a 7% rise in mortality. In May 2022 the "Committee on Medical Effects of Air Pollutants" agreed, and supported the new threshold in advising Defra re current target setting.</p> <p>"... (more and more) evidence (is) developing, for example for a growing number of mortality endpoints" (COMEAP minutes 11.5.22 para 10 Gov UK).</p> <p>The most current research (Crick Institute in London; conference of the European Society for Medical Oncology) emphasizes emerging new facts about air pollution:</p> <p>"Cancer rules rewritten by air-pollution discovery" Published 10 September 2022 By James Gallagher Health and science correspondent - "Researchers say they have cracked how air pollution leads to cancer, in a discovery that completely transforms our understanding of how tumours arise. The team at the Francis Crick Institute in London</p>	2C	N	<p>With regards to the points raised by the Consultee in 2C 1 and question 2c1 a, the Applicant is committed to ensuring that air quality is within prescribed legal limits. Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides detail on why PM<sub>2.5</sub> has not been considered further within the air quality assessment. In summary, <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> states that there should be no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality thresholds. Modelling of PM<sub>10</sub> can be used to demonstrate that the Scheme does not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that the current and future PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are lower than the current target threshold of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and the Scheme would not impact on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality threshold at any of the human health receptors considered.</p> <p>Impacts from PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> (nitrogen oxide) concentrations associated with the operation of the Scheme have been quantified as part of the cost benefit analysis. The approach to monetise the impacts has followed the 'Damage Cost' approach in accordance with the <i>Transport Planning and Appraisal Guidance (2018)</i> and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, May 2022</i>. Further detail on the damage cost assessment is provided in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding dust during construction. It should be noted the term 'dust' covers a wide range of particle sizes and generally dust generated from construction activities results in larger fractions which do not penetrate into the respiratory system. A qualitative assessment of potential dust effects has been undertaken, based on a review of likely dust raising activities, and identification of nearby sensitive receptors. The methodology undertaken and the outcomes of the assessment can be seen in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>showed that rather than causing damage, (fine particulate) .. air pollution was waking up old damaged cells. One of the world's leading experts, Prof Charles Swanton, said the breakthrough marked a "new era"..... "</p> <p>When current and extremely valid science shows that we are increasingly understanding the danger of fine particulates to health, and we are now starting to quantify the cost of illness and mortality in relation to exposure to these particles. Based on COMEAP's consideration of new scientific evidence (early 2022), the recommended coefficient (concentration-response function, CRF) of relative risk (RR) = 1.08 per 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub> is higher than the previous (2018) recommendation of RR = 1.06. per 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The updated recommendation has been used in cost-benefit analyses of interventions to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations, undertaken to inform the development of PM<sub>2.5</sub> targets.</p> <p>The Environment Act 2021 established a legally binding duty on government to bring forward at least two new air quality targets in secondary legislation by 31 October 2022. - Defra have failed yet to set these targets, but are advised by COMEAP and should have reported in November. 'COMEAP' is a Committee of the most eminent scientists in the UK, formed to advise on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants. The committee minutes and publications webpage make salutary reading (available on GOV. UK website)</p> <p>Air pollution costs health and costs lives - this is a real cost of putting heavy traffic close to where people live, play and work. This road scheme should be anticipating future standards as much as possible - not clinging to outdated understandings because it makes the project easier to justify. Sustainable spatial planning is a must.</p> <p>Question 2c1 a ) Why do National Highways not consider fine particulate Air pollution to matter when evidence of the damage it causes to human health are growing every day? This should be built into the cost benefit analysis.</p> <p>Question 2c1 b ) Can, and will, National Highways please identify the scientific evidence - and name the scientists who have produced it - that justifies them ignoring PM<sub>2.5</sub> and even finer particles in air pollution?</p> <p>Question 2 c1 c) Please justify the design team attempting to create new 'green' spaces for people to use that are adjacent to heavy road infrastructure, and how they can deem this to be a positive benefit even though respected scientists - and the Planning Inspectorate (ref Appeal A Ref: APP/B3030/C/18/3196972 2022 described in section 2 of this response below) - consider that such proximity of green spaces to the road is not good for people's health and well-being.</p> <p>Question 2c 1 d) The Environment Act 2021 establishes a legally binding duty to set new air quality targets. Please explain why National Highways are seemingly able to make long term plans with no reference to projections and targets relating to what we already know about dangers of air pollution now in 2022.</p> <p>Question 2c 1 e . National Highways state an objective to improve 'road safety'; please explain and justify the concern for 'safety' in relation to road traffic accidents but not to safety in relation to human health in relation to fine particulate air pollution?</p>			<p>Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practical means and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee in relation to research detailing the health-related impacts associated with air quality. During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 1b, competent experts have carried out the assessments in relation to the air quality impacts associated with the Scheme. As noted, assessments have been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> guidelines which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highway projects on air quality.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's question 2c 1c, no new or additional green spaces with public access are being provided beyond areas already accessible by Public Rights of Way. The green spaces that would be provided are for environmental mitigation purposes, particularly in relation to landscape integration and visual screening, biodiversity, drainage and water quality. Following engagement with the landowner, the area of floodplain compensation at Brownhills, that was outlined as a possible public amenity space during the public consultation, has been removed from the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments (throughout the response including question 2c 1d) with regards to the new air quality targets contained within the Environment Act 2021. It is noted that the World Health Organization threshold targets have not been adopted as legally binding thresholds which must be complied with and therefore have not informed the air quality assessment.</p> <p>The new annual mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to be met by 2040, as identified within the Environment Act 2021 is required to be met at air quality monitoring stations. As there are no air quality monitoring stations within the vicinity of the Scheme, this target does not apply. Therefore, this target has not been considered further in this assessment.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration across the modelled human health receptors for 2022 is 9.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> which is below the new PM<sub>2.5</sub> target. PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future.</p> <p>Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> contributions due to changes in road traffic as a result of the Scheme would also be very small. PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are mainly influenced by existing background concentrations, which are currently below the future target. The Applicant therefore considers that the Scheme would not have a significant effect on the ability to meet the future PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's question 2C 1e, the Applicant's remit is to manage and improve the strategic road network to make journeys safer, smoother and more reliable.</p> <p>From January 2015 to December 2019, incidents on the section of the A46 around Newark-on-Trent resulted in 208 casualties. As a result, improving road safety is a key objective of the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are also concluded to be not</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					significant. In addition, as indicated by the modelled results for NO <sub>2</sub> , the Scheme would have a beneficial effect within Newark-on-Trent by reducing traffic where pollutant concentrations and population density are highest.
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Cultural heritage; Landscape and visual effects	<p>2c 2 Cultural Heritage</p> <p>This area overlaps considerably with section 3 below re "Landscape and Visual". - please cross-refer The PEI quotes a number of pieces of Regulation and Legislation that have within them clear 'protective' principles (eg NPPF and the 25 yr Environment Plan), but then 'selects' criteria to justify a very much more narrow 'view' regarding how this scheme might impact the cultural heritage of Newark and its closely surrounding villages and countryside. All principles of sustainability, "environmental wholeness" and spatial planning seem to be lost. For example Regarding 'heritage assets' - the PEI report separates assets into individual little pieces, and apparently values these little pieces according to whether they are 'designated' or 'not' - it does not attribute value to the whole picture; yet the principle that "the whole is more than the sum of the parts" is widely accepted in life. The 'whole' also includes the setting in which these assets sit - NPPF paragraph 80, for example, makes it clear that historic towns are regarded as having a setting.</p> <p>Question 2c 2 a) How are National Highways mapping Newark as an historic town within its wider setting , and paying reference to this with regard to the environmental impact work for this road development?</p> <p>Question 2c 2 b) - Newark and the surrounding areas and villages impacted by this scheme have deep and rich histories and cultural heritage to be valued, 'designated' individual bits and much more. Please explain why the Environmental work fails to follow the guidance within " The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)" (Historic England 2017" ? This is referenced from the NPPF as setting out guidance, and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guide (PPG), on managing change within the settings of heritage assets, including archaeological; it is referenced in para 7.3.11 (page 112) , yet National Highways has clearly failed to take guidance from it.</p> <p>Question 2c 2 c) - Please explain and justify why 'non designated heritage assets' are assumed to only consist of "archeological remains"? (ref. para 7.4.2). The PEI refers to 'Heritage Assets' as being 'sensitive receptors' and seems only to evaluate the impact of the road in direct relation to them ie. the 'thing' (eg. piece of archaeology) - there seems to be no other dimension of impact considered; for example the fact that we, as interested parties/people, might also be 'sensitive receptors' of the impact on the assets of our cultural heritage...within our multi-dimensional environment.</p> <p>Again, we consider that this approach by National Highways takes away the 'wholeness' of the planning and impact of the scheme. - and denies its full impact on the community/environment through which they intend to push it.</p> <p>Question 2 c 2 d) Please can National Highways assure residents of Newark and surrounding villages/communities that in the 'further environmental impact work' a more informed understanding and wider view of what constitute 'Heritage assets' - and the range of receptors that are impacted by their damage/change—('designated'/'non designated/ setting/ wholeness) will be brought to the analysis?</p> <p>Example b) - cultural heritage and visual impact: in paras 7.4.2 /3/4 All the preliminary work has been carried out on the naive assumptions stated in paras 7.4.2 regarding the potential visual impact distances and relative 'values' of 'designated' and 'non-'designated' assets. Paras 7.4.3/4 then go on the say that the real visual field / 'zone of theoretical visibility' ( also understood as 'zones of influence' ) will be produced at a later stage. As this scheme crosses a floodplain and Newark clearly has a hunk of land by the river with a medieval castle on it, then it does not take complex modelling to work out that the scheme will be intrusive (beyond 500m). Some early fieldwork in the landscape studies would quickly have guided this work more cost effectively and the Consultation could have included this modelling - which is not difficult, yet vital when working in this type of landscape.</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee under point 2c 2. The assessment of Scheme effects on cultural heritage has been undertaken in line with relevant legislation, policy and guidance which is detailed in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Setting, however, is not a protected asset in its own right. The Applicant notes the reference to paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework, however paragraph 80 relates to the development of isolated homes and therefore, this is not part of the above consideration.</p> <p>As per the policy guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, paragraph 200 states that when determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. The Applicant's assessment of heritage assets and their settings has been undertaken in accordance with this guidance and in consultation with historic environment stakeholders from Nottinghamshire County Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and Historic England.</p> <p>Heritage assets are defined by Historic England as buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance or heritage value, meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of their heritage interest. These assets can be designated or non-designated. Designated assets are afforded statutory protection and can include scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered park and gardens, registered battlefields and conservation areas. Non-designated assets are identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.</p> <p>For the purpose of the assessment, a study area was defined to enable an understanding of all designated and non-designated archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes and to assess the potential for physical impacts as well as changes to the setting of these heritage assets. The study area used for the assessment was based on professional judgement and accepted as sufficient by relevant cultural heritage consultees including Historic England, and archaeological advisors and conservation offers from Nottinghamshire County Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee comment 2c 2a, the historic town of Newark-on-Trent is identified broadly by the designated conservation area boundary. Its connection with the wider landscape is most easily articulated through its connection with Civil War sites and monuments, and historic and modern transport networks including road, river and rail. Each individual asset has been mapped and their relationships understood. Thereafter, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks, identified impacts have been assessed to determine levels of harm, and weighed against public benefit.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee comment 2c 2b, the Applicant notes that <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) (Historic England 2017)</i> has been taken into consideration and informs the assessment for the contribution of setting to the significance of heritage assets, whilst noting that setting is not a designated asset in and of itself. An assessment has been undertaken in accordance with this guidance, whilst taking a proportionate approach when considering levels of impact and harm. Further information can be found in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>As noted above, non-designated assets are identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Considerable funds (£25 million) are currently being invested in Newark in terms of town regeneration. Newark Castle is at the centre of this, "it is home to treasured memories and a vital town centre green space, the Castle is important not only to local residents but also nationally. Historic England has designated it an Ancient Monument due to its significance as the death place of King John in 1216, its architectural and archaeological worth, having the most complete example of a Romanesque gatehouse in England and, as the home of Bishop Alexander the Magnificent, being one of the few remaining episcopal residences in England." A million pounds is being spent to repair the castle and to develop and promote the tourism offering. (Newark and Sherwood District Council website 23.2.2022)</p> <p>Many visitors - local, national and international - come to Newark to enjoy the townscape, the landscapes and the heritage experiences it offers. There is a wide range of historic buildings and streets that form the whole 'historic town'. To the west - beyond the 'Cattle market roundabout' we find fishing lakes and two camping sites (Smeatons Lakes and Kelham); visitors often wish to cycle - or walk - but busy highways and flyovers are very off-putting. Many holidaying visitors to Centre Parcs, the adjoining camp site and other accommodations within Sherwood Forest also visit the town and this needs to be encouraged. People wish to relax, wander, sit and enjoy, take a boat ride, to look out from the castle and 'see for miles' ... not to view a heap of fly-overs and listen to the noise. Visitors have choice, they need to be encouraged by knowing they will have a 'feel good' experience - a "whole" experience.</p> <p>Question 2c 2 e) Why does the impact consideration of the road scheme in relation to 'Cultural Heritage' not take account of Newark - the whole place and setting - as a visitor/tourism offering, and as a lovely place to live? When we talk of needing to build nice places to live we should not destroy/degrade places we have already - and are seeking to improve - see q2.2v below.</p> <p>Question 2c 2 f) - The PEI already recognises significant negative ("adverse") impact on Newark and its setting that would present a risk to this visitor offering that can only be detrimental; people want to access the town, relax by the river, enjoy the green spaces, visit the 'old town', enjoy refreshments, explore the castle etc. etc. The 'cost benefit' analysis of the scheme needs to include the (already predicted by National Highways) detrimental impact on heritage assets and landscapes on the tourism/visitor offering; will National Highways please ensure that this is included?</p> <p>Trees are also integral to the cultural heritage of historic Newark - King John, 'Robin Hood' and Sherwood Forest (hence the name of the District Council). For some years, there has been a programme to 'reforest' the area; this is an environmental issue and a heritage issue. This scheme needs to take account of trees - 'significant' and otherwise - in the wider place of Newark and Sherwood.</p> <p>Question 2c 2 g) - Why are trees not considered within the impact work for the proposed scheme, for their wider contribution to the cultural heritage - our 'historic story' - of the area? (Again this highlights the need to inter-relate different aspects of the environment).</p>			<p>In relation to the point raised by the Consultee under question 2c 2c, the Applicant does not consider only archaeological remains as non-designated heritage assets. Buildings and structures identified in the Historic Environment Record, as referenced in the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>), have also been considered and assessed as part of the Scheme. The collective value of heritage assets has also been considered within the assessment.</p> <p>In accordance with policies and guidance, 'sensitive receptors' is a term which relates to physical assets which can be impacted by a scheme. However, <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)</i> highlights that intangible aspects contribute to the experience of an asset within its setting, including the character of surrounding areas, views, noise, movement, peace, smells, cultural association, whilst acknowledging that <i>'the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on public rights or ability to access it'</i>. To this end, an inter-disciplinary approach has been undertaken to ensure that noise, vibration and other Scheme related activities have been considered in relation to their impact within the setting, and consequently on the significance of both designated and non-designated heritage assets. The Applicant therefore considers that the experience of the significance of an asset, by those within its setting, has been considered in assessments.</p> <p>A heritage asset is that which is defined by the National Planning Policy Framework as a <i>'building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)'</i> and the historic environment as <i>'all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora'</i>. With reference to the Consultee's question 2c 2d, this understanding has been taken forward into the Applicant's assessment of the Scheme on the cultural heritage aspects.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to visual impact distances. The study area for cultural heritage has been defined according to the sensitivity of the environment and the potential impacts of the Scheme. This was based on professional judgement and consultation with historic environment stakeholders from Nottinghamshire County Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and Historic England. For this assessment, the study area includes the Order Limits of the Scheme plus any land outside of that which includes any heritage assets which could be physically affected and/or experience changes to their setting which would alter their heritage value.</p> <p>Due to the range of potential impacts, as well as the variety of heritage assets anticipated to be affected, a 500m buffer from the Scheme has been defined to enable an understanding of all known non-designated heritage assets including archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes. A 1km buffer from the Scheme has been defined to assess potential changes to the setting of designated heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and conservation areas.</p> <p>Professional judgement is used when considering the data provided by Zones of Theoretical Visibility, supported by site visits and walk overs. Understanding the experience of an asset within its setting has informed the assessment of impact on heritage assets. While the Zone of Theoretical Visibility produced to support Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) notes extensive views across the floodplain to and from the Scheme, it has been considered unlikely that heritage assets beyond 1km would have prominent or dominating views of the Scheme due to distance and nature of these assets. As a result, the Applicant made the decision to use a 1km study area.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's question 2c 2e, the Applicant notes the Consultee's comments on balancing improvement schemes with preserving existing setting and tourism appeal. The statutory designations of Newark Conservation Area, the castle and grounds,</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>and their setting, have been considered in the Applicant's assessments of impacts arising from the Scheme. The assessment presented in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concluded that due to existing modern development within the setting, no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated to either Newark Conservation Area or Newark Castle.</p> <p>With regards to question 2c 2f raised by the Consultee, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). Consideration of other environmental factors such as landscape, townscape and the historic environment is not required as part of the monetised benefits aspect within the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>), however qualitative consideration has been given as part of the non-monetised benefits, in line with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding trees. In relation to question 2c 2g, the Applicant has sought to reduce impacts on trees as far as possible. Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has developed further meaning that no veteran or notable trees are expected to be lost. There would be some impact on certain identified veteran trees and ongoing monitoring would be undertaken to inform any remedial action. Measures such as arboricultural supervision and use of ground and barrier protection would be implemented to reduce impacts where construction activities conflict with the root protection area of a veteran tree. Further details on this can be found in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Landscape and visual effects; Cultural heritage; Population and human health; Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested; A1/A46 Crossing; Winthorpe Roundabout	<p>2c 3 Landscape and Visual Vistas/landscapes</p> <p>The new bypass will damage the landscape setting of an historic market town. National Highways' own documentation makes this clear when they say that:</p> <p>"significant adverse effects upon landscape character are likely during both construction and operation, with the project having the potential to directly affect local character, including alterations to existing local pattern and land cover, as well as changes to the setting of an open, rural landscape... construction works have the potential to reduce the visual tranquillity in the area, particularly in close proximity to the scheme, which may in turn have an adverse effect on wellbeing".</p> <p>Furthermore, National Highways admits that this will be severe for those living close to the A46, where visibility of the road will be impactful: "There's the potential for significant adverse effects for visual receptors such as residential properties in close proximity to the scheme, where there would be short distance, direct views to the widened A46 and associated structures... It may not be possible to fully mitigate all significant visual effects during operation, particularly for visual receptors with direct views to the scheme, or where at height structures such as bridges are notable within a view."</p> <p>Para 13.7.11 of the PEI under 'Public Health admits that "There is evidence to suggest links between the quality of places and health and wellbeing, as health and wellbeing may be positively influenced by the perceived attractiveness of the environment.</p> <p>Question 2c 3 a) – Regarding the impact of " significant ...adverse effects for ... visual receptors... residential properties in close proximity to the scheme " i.e. people who live in places near the scheme are really going to suffer, lose 'visual tranquillity' and suffer damage to their well-being. How is this going to be built into the cost benefit overall ?</p> <p>Question 2c 3 b) How will the real mental and physical damage to people and their lives be managed to prevent them having to endure years of building work and 'highway open' time</p>	2C	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant refers the Consultee to Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) for further information on the extent of visual impact. The potential impact upon seven Landscape Character Areas was assessed as part of this Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Of the seven identified, two Landscape Character Areas (Landscape Character Area 1 Trent Washlands and Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe village and Farmlands) would experience temporary significant adverse effects during the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Two Landscape Character Areas (Landscape Character Area 1 Trent Washlands and Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe village and Farmlands) are likely to experience significant adverse effects in Year 1 (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic).</p> <p>When considering the establishment of mitigation planting by Year 15 (2043, 15 years after the Scheme is open to traffic), only one Landscape Character Area (Landscape Character Area 2 Winthorpe Village and Farmlands Landscape Character Area) is considered to have a residual significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to impacts and effects upon visual amenity, of those 63 visual receptors assessed, 15 receptors would experience significant adverse effects during construction of the Scheme, reducing to six receptors in Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) of operation. When considering the establishment of mitigation planting by Year 15 (2043, 15</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>before they have the right to apply for compensation ? It is illegal to assault someone and to damage them, to injure them, or to kill them; how can you justify progressing with a plan than will assault and damages people in a real way in ethical and legal terms?</p> <p>Heights/setting</p> <p>The new bypass is a very significant infrastructure project. It's scale is immense. Much of the highway is built on a high embankment across the floodplain. The proposed development will make the A46 an even more commanding presence in the landscape around Newark and the new complex 3D structures will be very dominant in this 'small scale' town on flat floodplain land. Yet the heights and dominance are not made clear in the consultation documents and it is left to residents to calculate them; which is unlikely as specialist skills are required to do this. This is another major fault line of the consultation, and we doubt that Newark residents really understand how high and intrusive this scheme will be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At some points, the road surface height of the new A46 will be between 7.8 metres and 10.9 meters high.</li> <li>• The height of the proposed Cattle Market flyover carriageway is 8 metres. – lorry wheels flying by at house roof level?</li> <li>• The road surface height of the new A1 over-bridge is 10.9 metres. – hard to hide behind a tree or two!</li> <li>• The proposed embankment widths are considerable – at some points the embankment will be 100 metres wide</li> </ul> <p>Question 2c 3 c) Newark is home to many people, it is also attractive to visitors from near and far. Money is currently being spent, e.g. to revive Newark Castle and town heritage features to enhance this offering. At a time when the NPPF is promoting sustainable and spatial planning, and recognising the importance of quality in the living environment to promote quality of life, how can National Highways plan to "pour concrete across our countryside" (our home) in pursuit of narrow 'better' outcomes for others?? (predominantly freight by-passing the town).</p> <p>Question 2c 3 d) – Visual impact of the development is clearly immense – the PEI acknowledges this but that information is hidden in a blur of 'gobbledygook. Why are/were no photomontages of the scheme available within the consultation, for example on the large banners and posters? Why were scheme images in an idealized format, depicting the scheme in full greenery? Why was other uninformative material included in the material – like pictures of smiling people in high viz which adds no consultative merit ?</p> <p>Question 2c 3 e) – National Highways state an objective to improve 'safety' ; please explain and justify the concern for 'safety' in relation to road traffic accidents but not to safety in relation to human health and well-being in relation to landscape and visual amenity?</p> <p>Open Break</p> <p>The following quote from a Planning Inspectorate report (Appeal A Ref: PP/B3030/C/18/3196972 2022) refers to the open break between Newark and Winthorpe. The 'development referred to was residential caravans and associated hardstanding etc.</p> <p>The Open Break policy: August 2019 review:</p> <p>21. In the Allocations and Development Management DPD, 2013 (DPD) there is an "Open Breaks" Policy NUA/OB/1 that aims to keep certain areas under development pressure free from built development. As the previous Inspector had found, the development in relation to both appeals has had a harmful effect on the open break between Newark and Winthorpe, contrary to the aims of this policy. The harm is substantial in terms of the development in Appeal A, and as it relates to Appeal H, contributes to the overall negative impact of the development. It is contrary to relevant development plan policy in that regard."</p> <p>Within the scheme the existing open break of fields between the town of Newark and</p>			<p>years from Scheme opening) two visual receptors (No.24 being residential properties at Sandhills Park and No.40 being users of the Trent Valley Way and National Cycle Network Route 64 on Winthorpe Road) were considered to have a residual significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on the local community. It concludes that no significant human health effects would be experienced during the construction or operation of the Scheme, including amenity. Further information on the impact of the Scheme on the community and on protected characteristic groups can be found in the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b>. This assessment draws upon the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment when assessing the impacts of noise and air pollution on physical health and identified that there was likely to be no adverse equality impacts on groups with protected characteristics as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before, during and after construction are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. Where necessary monitoring requirements have also been specified. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are shown on Figure 2.3 (Environment Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Planting would be provided alongside the Scheme including along earthworks where slope profiles allow. Planting would also be provided beyond the earthworks slopes to aid landscape integration and visual screening.</p> <p>In relation to question 2c 3a, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and the National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>, which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. Consideration of other environmental factors such as landscape, townscape and the historic environment is not required as part of the monetised benefits aspect within the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. However, qualitative consideration has been given as part of the non-monetised benefits, in line with Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 3b, in order to manage the impact of the Scheme upon local people, the principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process as detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. In developing the Scheme, the Applicant has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with property and landowners directly impacted by the Scheme to ensure that an open line of communication is available for any landowner queries or concerns to be dealt with. Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Winthorpe village will be eradicated. Instead, there will be an agglomeration of highways and associated structures. In total, this amounts to ten lanes of road, including a flyover, with the associated health damaging noise and particulate pollution that this will generate.</p> <p>The new roundabout near Winthorpe is misleadingly labelled as a small roundabout. This roundabout will be taking all traffic exiting the northbound A46 to get onto other roads such as the A17, A1 and routes into Newark. Currently, those existing the A46 to get on the A17 navigate two roundabouts in this vicinity – this will be increased to three.</p> <p>Question 2c 3 f) – Please explain how this plan to place 10 lanes of traffic including a flyover and a roundabout in the open break between Newark and Winthorpe contributes to the aims of Open Break Policy , particularly in light of the fact that a small residential caravan site was considered to have a 'harmful effect' ?</p>			<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the heights of specific aspects of the Scheme. Information relating to this was included within the <i>Plan and Profile Drawings</i> produced for the statutory consultation. All technical drawings produced for the statutory consultation included scale measurements on them.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 3c, the Scheme would help to alleviate congestion in and around Newark-on-Trent which is anticipated to encourage more visitors to the town. The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) further outlines the benefits of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme accords with the principles of sustainable planning and consideration has also been given for the national policy including the National Planning Policy Framework within the Legislation and Policy section for each of the environmental topics (Chapters 5 to 15) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) where relevant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments and questions under 2c 3d regarding the materials produced for statutory consultation. The Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project as defined by the Planning Act 2008 and as part of the development consent application, the Applicant is required to formally consult local planning and highways authorities, statutory stakeholders, persons with land interests and local communities about the Scheme proposals including identified environmental effects based on the information available at the time.</p> <p>Consultation materials were available on request and on the Scheme webpage as well as at in-person events to ensure a clear understanding of the scheme, its potential effects and the ways feedback could be provided. The materials available included the <i>Consultation Brochure, Consultation Response Form, General Arrangement Drawings, Plan and Profile Drawings, Scheme fly-through video, Scheme route overview maps, Artist impressions from selected locations, Section 48 and Section 47 Notices, property information brochures and a Statement of Community Consultation</i>. There was also a <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report and Non-Technical Summary of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> available for consultees to view.</p> <p>Some of the visualisation materials (<i>artist impressions from selected locations</i>) were produced during the statutory consultation as a direct response to stakeholder requests. These were displayed at public consultation events alongside other visualisation and mapping documents from 12 November to 30 November and published on the Scheme webpage from 16 November, which is the main source of information for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant ensured that all consultation materials were displayed at consultation events in a consistent manner, were easily accessible and visible to event visitors. Event staff explained to event visitors what materials were being presented at the public consultation events and where they could be found.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown in Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>). The photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the proposed Scheme within its setting. The photomontages present both the Scheme in Year 1 (2028, year the Scheme is open to traffic) and Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening) during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Public Right of Way Farndon Footpath FP5</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> <li>View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>View south from Public Right of Way Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul> <p>In relation to the Consultee's question 2C 3e, the Applicant's remit is to manage and improve the strategic road network to make journeys safer, smoother and more reliable.</p> <p>From January 2015 to December 2019, incidents on the section of the A46 around Newark-on-Trent resulted in 208 casualties. As a result, improving road safety is a key objective of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on the local community (including landscape amenity). It concludes that, through the implementation of mitigation measures, no significant adverse effects on amenity will occur as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the Newark and Winthorpe open break in addition to the size of the new Brownhills Junction. The assessment in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes consideration of the Newark and Winthorpe Open Break. The A1/A46 Crossing in this location is assessed as reducing the sense of openness between settlements.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that Landscape Character Area 2 (Winthorpe village and Farmlands) which includes the Newark and Winthorpe Open Break would experience significant adverse effects as a result of the Scheme. Mitigation in the form of planting would be provided to reduce the effect as far as possible.</p> <p>With regard to question 2c 3f, the Applicant is aware of the Open Break policy referenced within the Newark and Sherwood District Council's <i>Allocations and Development Management Development Plan</i>. The Applicant has consulted with Newark and Sherwood District Council about the design of the Scheme. Feedback received from Newark and Sherwood District Council has confirmed that the Scheme would impact significantly upon the Open Break and it should continue to be regarded as a highly relevant matter by the Applicant. Newark and Sherwood District Council has also emphasised that there are no statutory landscape designations in this area, and the Winthorpe Open Break is not protected for landscape value reasons.</p> <p>Details of engagement with environmental stakeholders is included within Appendix 4.3 (Record of Environmental Engagement) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010066/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Biodiversity; Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>2c 4 Biodiversity</p> <p>In 2022 there is wide recognition and Regulation with regard to the need to ensure 'biodiversity net gain' – "BNG". At all stages (since 2015) the scheme plans have predicted net environmental loss, yet National Highways have not stopped to review and reflect on this. This is not acceptable in 2022 and clearly tells us that NH pay lip service to their own License Conditions and the many Regulations including the NPPF and the Environment Act 2021 that should frame their work.</p> <p>We are told in the PEI that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many trees will be removed, Deciduous woodland, wood pasture marsh, meadow and fen will be lost.</li> <li>Various protected species could be adversely affected including otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers and bats.</li> <li>Bat migratory paths are likely be disturbed, in particular the new road height and lighting could result in species being killed/injured due to traffic collisions.</li> </ul>	2C	N	<p>There is no statutory requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects to achieve biodiversity net gain at present and the requirement is not expected to come into force for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects until November 2025. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regard to the information contained within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008. A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much Environmental Impact work is as yet not done – the public surely have the right to consider the full EIA as part of open consultation, yet this is seemed to be denied.</li> </ul> <p>Question 2c. 4 a) – Will National Highways demonstrate to us that they are working within the conditions of their Licence with regard to protecting the environment?</p> <p>Question 2 c 4 b) – Does this scheme have a special exemption from the Environment Act 2021?</p> <p>The 'Preliminary Environmental Information' report has many, many gaps in the section on 'biodiversity'. This is a great disappointment as much work in this area needs to be carried out across the seasons in order to give an accurate account.</p> <p>We are also disappointed that the people we have witnessed on the ground in the summer carrying out habitat surveys were wearing full 'high viz', hard hats etc – and refused invitations to step off the footpath to talk about / see habitats/ wildlife we regularly witness (e.g. by the river). Authentic observers of wildlife genuinely seeking to search out habitats and clues about wildlife don't usually wear high vis nor stick to footpaths. They "follow leads", they search, they carry/use binoculars, they survey at different times of day, and night. Generally an invitation to "talk to the 'serious twitcher' who lives just down there" (100m down the river) – or "the fisherman next door who spends hours and days sitting here and spies things out", might be expected to elicit interest, even activity. The validity of such habitat surveys can therefore be brought into question.</p> <p>Question 2 c 4 c) Does seeking out and finding too much wildlife to disturb or destroy just cause problems for National Highways such that they only 'do' superficial 'tickorbox' surveys ??</p> <p>Question 2 c 4 d) – Please will National Highways ensure that the people of Newark and all other interested parties have full sight of all the impact work on biodiversity that we are told has yet to be done BEFORE it is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and that this research process will be treated seriously, not just as a 'tick box' exercise? Will Newark residents be given a meaningful right to reply to data that has not yet been made available?</p> <p>Question 2 c 4 e) Will we see the full detailed plans and budget for protection, mitigation and reparation re 'biodiversity' ?</p>			<p>Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards. The materials available included the <i>Consultation Brochure, Consultation Response Form, General Arrangement Drawings, Plan and Profile Drawings, Scheme fly-through video, Scheme route overview maps, Artist impressions from selected locations, Preliminary Environmental Information Report and Non-Technical Summary, Section 48 and Section 47 Notices, Property information brochures and Statement of Community Consultation.</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's question 2c 4a, the Applicant operates within the confines of national policy and legislation. Details of survey methodologies and assessments can be found within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). This application is accompanied by the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Scheme complies with its general duty under section 5(2) of the Infrastructure Act 2015 to have regard to the environment.</p> <p>In relation to question 2c 4b, the Applicant does not have any special exemption from the Environment Act 2021 and has complied with the requirements of this legislation. For example, the Applicant has assessed biodiversity net gain in line with the <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i>. It should however be noted that there is no statutory requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects applying for development consent to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain until November 2025.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the level of information contained within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> included details relating to the assessment work undertaken, baseline conditions, study and indicative design, mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the survey work undertaken as well as question 2c 4c. Detailed ecological surveys have been undertaken across the 2022 and 2023 survey seasons, considering the optimal survey periods for the relevant species group. This detailed survey information can be found within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>All schemes delivered by the Applicant are subject to rigorous ecology surveys conducted by professional ecologists using current surveying guidelines. Further information on survey methodologies and assessment assumptions and limitations can be found within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>With regards to question 2c 4d, the Applicant notes that the Environmental Impact Assessment work for biodiversity within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) would be made available to the public on a dedicated Scheme webpage on the Planning Inspectorate's website following the submission and acceptance period.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. This allows the opportunity for the public to comment further on the application.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 4e, Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) submitted as part of the application shows the plans for biodiversity mitigation and biodiversity net gain compensation habitats. The breakdown of the budget is not shown in this level of detail.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Geology and soils	<p>2c. 5 Geology and Soils</p> <p>Higher-grade agricultural soils are the focus of the report; such soils seem to be the only concern for National Highways but this is an oversight in true 'Environmental' terms. Soil is the basis of life, it evolves – sometimes quickly such as if waterlogged or contaminated, sometimes very slowly e.g. under a woodland or hedgerow or undisturbed land. Different soils provide different habitats for the variety of flora and fauna we need to protect, they are not just considered to be a medium for agricultural crops.</p> <p>Question 2c 5 a) Will National Highways please consider any soil loss or degradation in full and not just focus on valuing 'higher grade' agricultural soils ? This proposal has the potential for much soil loss and soil degradation through compaction and water-logging , particularly as it involves an extensive area of floodplain and potentially wet ground.</p> <p>Question 2c 5 b) – Will National Highways please provide a soil map/register of the 'zone ' of the scheme ,and in the scheme planning provide a comparative 'soil impact map' and more detailed data ? This would help interested parties to better assess the impact on soils within the wider natural environment, such that we can properly comment on the proposed scheme.</p>	2C	N	<p>With regards to the Consultee's questions surrounding 2c 5 and 2c 5a, further information on the survey and assessment methodology for soils can be found within Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Whilst the determination of agricultural land grade is a requirement for a scheme such as this (all grades identified have been reported, not just the higher grades), in line with National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Applicant also commissioned a field-by-field nutrient survey to support plant life/biodiversity in areas of potential landscaping in addition to the area of permanent and temporary acquisition of land. The results are reported within Appendix 9.4 (Soil Nutrient Survey Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>In the Nutrient Survey Report, the suitability of each area/ field in relation to the types of flora it can sustain are reported in accordance with standards and guidance relating to the management of soils. The guidance is provided from the <i>British Standards 3882 Specification for Topsoil (BS3882)</i> and <i>Natural England Technical Information Note TIN036, Soil and agri-environment schemes: interpretation of soil analysis (NE TIN036)</i>.</p> <p>Appendix B.3 (The Outline Soils Management Plan) of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), provides information relating to the soil resources that are present. It follows industry guidelines and codes of practice to mitigate against the loss of soil quality and functionality during the construction process.</p> <p>The Outline Soil Management Plan will be developed into a working Soil Management Plan as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan by the Applicant once construction details are finalised. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's comments surrounding 2c 5b, a number of figures are presented in Appendix 9.4 (Soil Nutrient Survey Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) which show the concentration of different nutrients across the Scheme. Appendix 9.3 (Agricultural Land Classification Grade) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) details the grade of agricultural land across the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Material assets and waste; Climate	<p>2c. 6 Material Assets and waste</p> <p>Consultation documents suggest that material to build the embankments might be taken from the floodplain 'borrowpit' areas. Informal conversation with a design engineer at one consultation event indicated that this material may prove to be unsuitable. As indeed we might suspect as this has been a massive fluvial floodplain of various rivers for millennia.</p> <p>Question 2c 6 a) If material has to be removed from the floodplain extension area to enlarge</p>	2C	N	<p>Three borrow pits are required to support the creation of embankments required for the Scheme at Farndon West, Farndon East and Brownhills Junction. Further details on these are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The Farndon West and East borrow pits would be used as floodplain compensation to compensate for loss of floodplain storage as a result of the Scheme. If the material removed to create the borrow pits was deemed not to be suitable to create the embankments, it would not be removed from the ground and alternative material would be imported from existing quarry sites to create the embankments.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>the capacity of the floodplain in recompense for the floodplain land taken by the road development, where will it go?</p> <p>b) Where will material to build the embankments be sourced ?</p> <p>c) What will the cost if this be in time? In disturbance and damage to soil? In £ ? And in extra carbon cost?</p>			<p>In response to question 2c 6a, material removed from the floodplain would be used within the construction of the widened A46. Further detail on materials and waste can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>In response to question b, as set out above, materials for embankments would be sourced from the floodplain compensation area and borrow pit areas where possible. Further details can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>In response to question c, site won materials are to be used on the Scheme to minimise costs and reduce carbon emissions on the Scheme. All surplus materials would either be reinstated or used on local infrastructure and community schemes if possible. Soil management methodologies will be in accordance with the <i>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils in Construction</i> to prevent any damage occurring during construction and reinstatement. This code of construction practice sets out various best practice methods to be followed for all in the construction sector to ensure the protection of soils.</p> <p>If the development consent application is granted, the main construction works are due to commence in 2025 and expected to be completed in 2028. Further details of the construction timeline are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The cost of the embankment work is included within the latest overall cost estimate for the Scheme which is included within the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>. The carbon emissions associated with the embankment work is factored into the overall emissions relating to the construction of the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Noise and vibration; Consultation – more information/ publicity/time requested; Construction; Population and human health	<p>2c 7 Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Residents ('noise sensitive receptors) are excluded from commenting in an informed way on the consultation because they are not presented with information in a clear and accessible way. This goes against the guidelines of the UK Health Security Agency when they say: 'UKHSA encourages the Applicant to use effective ways of communicating any changes in the acoustic environment generated by the scheme to local communities. For example, immersive and suitably calibrated audio-visual demonstrations can help make noise and visual changes more intuitive to understand and accessible to a wider demographic.' (Scoping Opinion: A46 Newark).</p> <p>These are examples of some of the information that should be clearly communicated to residents:</p> <p>measurement of noise levels near homes that are close to the A46 (conducted spring 2022) show that houses are already exposed to noise levels already so high that they are linked to higher risk of health problems such as high blood pressure, heart disease, stroke, Alzheimers. 'Noise Important Areas' last mapped in 2017 are clearly not accurate now. We know that too much noise is bad for our health and well-being. Without serious attention, the noise situation will present high risk for thousands of local residents. (ref table 5.16 page 347 of the PEI).Approx 50-60 homes have been identified (2020 report) as being at particularly high risk from increased road noise but exactly which houses are impacted is not disclosed. Neither have the 420 residential properties in the LIA (which is smaller than the 'noise impact area) or the 4 to 5 THOUSAND properties that are predicted to suffer levels of noise above the threshold currently considered to trigger a range of serious health conditions. Construction is likely to take three years and construction dust, noise and vibration is likely to have a negative impact on people locally; National Highways say they will try to do what they can to keep dust down and not to make more noise at night. This sounds like a sticking plaster approach; the measures proposed seem basic at best.</p> <p>- When the new road is operational then more traffic flow will make more noise.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes the assessment of construction and operational noise and vibration.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008. A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme, and accompanies the development consent application.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>- Vibration has been scoped out from analysis on scheme completion. This is short-sighted given low noise tarmacked roads fail more quickly; the resulting potholes and maintenance required WILL then cause a vibration effect that needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Question 2c 7 a) Why is information about noise not presented to stakeholders in accessible form? (ref. Gov UK guidance 2016, updated 2022, "Content Design:, planning, writing and managing content." ?);</p> <p>This is a 'social justice' issue too – 61% of the residential areas in the impact area (LIA) represent the two most deprived social cohorts. It is well understood that typically negative environmental impacts relating to health and well-being impact more greatly on lower socio-economic groups who are less equipped to 'protect themselves'.</p> <p>Question 2c 7 b) Since the 2020 design, much greater mitigation measures have been put in place for the east of Winthorpe, such as an earth bund (though not for the south of Winthorpe), no doubt a result of Winthorpe's campaigning on this issue. Why has the same attention not been paid to other areas of the scheme, particularly for areas comprised of lower socio-economic groups? Mitigation should be equally applied to all areas impacted by the scheme and not concentrated on locations where residents have the means and capital to 'fight their corner'. Please can National Highways indicate how they will mitigate other zones of the scheme, as this crucial detail is currently lacking, and ensure social justice?</p> <p>Question 2c 7 c) Why are people less able to protect themselves not better protected by those identified with that responsibility for this scheme within society? [eg Defra, National Highways, Office for Environmental Protection, the Planning Inspectorate].</p> <p>Study Area – The scheme has designated 300m as the 'study –rea' for construction time noise and 600m at operational phase. In practice, residents note that the river can act as a noise funnel and that noise is also affected by wind direction, time of year (leaves on or fallen from the trees) and weather conditions. (this was witnessed and acknowledged by a designer and a scientist on-site). On a clear summer night, speeding cars can be tracked zooming around from the cattle market roundabout right to the approach to Farndon roundabout – and back again sometimes, repeatedly! Local observation recognises a concentration of noise in places where the road 'arcs' around compared to points where the road passes as a 'point of tangency'.</p> <p>Question 2c 7 d) Will a future 'full' noise survey (promised verbally) still assume a simple and continuous pattern of noise dispersal from a single fixed point, or will a more sophisticated survey approach be taken?</p> <p>Question 2c 7 e) Please can you explain the methodology of the noise surveys and predictions, important given the complexity of noise already apparent in the vicinity of Newark, a result of an already existing high load of road infrastructure ?</p> <p>"Noise Important Areas" The PEI is not consistent - and not accurate – in the way it focuses on 'Noise Important Areas' defined in 2017. Defra are outstanding in reviewing these 'designated' areas (this was due in 2022) but National Highways know that such areas are not fixed. Having sampled noise around the scheme area in Spring 2022 it is clear that much of the scheme 'zone' could/should be designated as a 'noise important area'.</p> <p>The 'Scheme team' try to assure us that there is much Environmental Impact work and design work yet to do relating to noise and its management, but surely this information should be available for members of the public to comment on at the statutory consultation stage?</p> <p>Question 2 c 7 f) – Will National Highways continue to wait for Defra to remap or will they act on the sample data they have already collected in taking a wider view of 'Noise important Areas' within the scheme zone – and reducing noise?</p>			<p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5 metres would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide noise screening.</p> <p>No significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted during operation or construction of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required before and during construction, and during operation of the Schemes are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan for implementation during construction of the Scheme. These include temporary acoustic barriers where necessary during construction and general best practice. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7a, the Equality Impact Assessment presented in Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) assesses the impact of the Scheme on groups with protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010. As such, deprivation is included as an assessed characteristic. As there are no identified significant noise impacts on human health receptors, the Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring (<b>TR010065/APP/7.6</b>) concludes that deprived groups would not be differentially or disproportionately impacted by the Scheme. As such the Applicant does not consider the noise impacts associated with the Scheme to be a social justice issue.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7b, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at all locations. Suitable mitigation measures would be provided to avoid noise and vibration related significant effects during either construction or operation of the Scheme at any location with mitigation (see introductory paragraphs) in place.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7c, study areas have been defined in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> and are shown within Figure 11.1 (Operational Noise Study Area) and Figure 11.2 (Construction Noise Study Area) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7d, a complete noise assessment has been undertaken as described within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), considering potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme at all locations. For the purposes of this assessment, noise monitoring was also undertaken at representative locations throughout the Scheme to facilitate a more complete understanding of the local noise environment (it is noted the noise assessment is predominantly based on forecast traffic flows and predicted for all noise sensitive receptors in the study area, therefore no additional noise monitoring is required).</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7e, the noise and vibration assessment is undertaken in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>. The assessment methodology is described within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment in relation to noise important areas. This assessment has retained the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs designations of noise important areas however, it must be stated that these are not the only areas that have been targeted to avoid adverse noise effects. The Scheme would introduce a low noise running surface for the length of the A46 as well as noise barriers at Windmill Viaduct, Cattle Market Junction, Brownhills Junction and along the south side of Winthorpe village. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Question 2 c 7 g) Will information on what National Highways considers to be 'Noise Important Areas' be made available to for members of the public and 'interested parties' to comment on before the application for the DCO?</p> <p>Noise measurement, and 'benchmark standards'</p> <p>Attempted questioning/consultation with the Scheme Team – (many emails and face to face at consultations) , has drawn little information or explanation – just 'assurances' that most of the work in this area is yet to be done. Although the PEI (section 12.2 'Legislation and Policy Context (re noise)) cites 18 different sources of 'Policy', and 'Standards and Guidance' (interestingly not including the Environment Act 2021), the 'Scheme team' seem to solely rely on 'DMRB LA111' as their 'Bible'.</p> <p>The PEI reports noise assessments based on benchmarks (the 'LOAEL' and 'SOAEL' ) set at levels which are way above the levels that the World Health Organisation (2018) and numerous medics and scientists in the UK and internationally currently report to be 'safe'/'less safe'/'certainly high risk to human health. (table 12.7). Paragraph 12.13.2 of the PEI report does actually admit this.</p> <p>Para 12.11.16 claims that increases in daytime noise of between 3 and 9.9dB are only 'minor' (up to 4.9) or 'moderate'. This is unsubstantiated – indeed refuted – in current scientific studies.</p> <p>Question 2c 7 h) – What grounds do the National Highways funded scientists have to ignore the validated work of the many nationally and internationally respected scientists and medical scientists by setting as a 'low' benchmark a figure that all others now recognise to indicate a risk trigger threshold (eg for a number of serious health conditions ) ?</p> <p>Question 2c 7 i) Can, and will, National Highways please identify the scientific evidence – and name the scientists who have produced it – that justifies them using benchmarks higher than science-led studies we can find, and suggesting that increases of up to 9.9dB should be considered as minor or moderate in terms of impact on humans?</p> <p>Question 2 c 7 j) In planning a highway for the future, the construction alone costing at least £490,000,000, what rationale is there to go ahead knowing that this will right from the start risk the health and well-being of thousands of local residents?</p> <p>Question 2 c 7 k) Will National Highways and Skanska contribute funds to local health and social care services ?</p> <p>Noise mitigation</p> <p>Discussions with the Engineers / Designers / Environmental Scientists on the scheme team simply elicit naïve understandings of the impact of noise and vibration on people and vague 'promises' of mitigation. ["just another 'thing' to tick a box against" ??] This reflects vague 'promises' of considering possible mitigation in the 'PEI'.</p> <p>For example, on-site engineers tried to assure us that the vegetation to the south of the current road around the Windmill Viaduct would not be disturbed – implying that this was mitigation. We pointed out that there was no mitigation over the bridge – and resonating noise caused by lack of damping of bridge joints .... They agreed.</p> <p>We also pointed out that in the winter the small belt of trees on the bank lose their leaves and the 'barrier' became transparent – they looked over and witnessed leaves gently falling ...and the lights of vehicles appearing between the vegetation , "Oh yes" declared the (very pleasant and polite) surprised Design professional.</p> <p>Discussions/questions at the consultation elicited comments like , "we will look at possible mitigation", and they talk about road surfacing, yet on the current drawn plans we note that the only proposed earth bund is to the east of Winthorpe There is nothing else, except small</p>			<p>(Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider there to be any issues with consistency or accuracy with regards to how the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> defined noise important areas.</p> <p>A full assessment has now been carried out in relation to potential noise and vibration impacts from the Scheme, as presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7f, the Applicant has adopted the current Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs designated noise important areas. It is however noted potential mitigation measures do not aim solely at noise important areas but rather consider the Scheme study areas, presented within Figure 11.1 (Operational Noise Study Area) and Figure 11.2 (Construction Noise Study Area) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. No significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted during operation or construction of the Scheme at any location with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7g, the Environmental Impact Assessment work for noise and vibration within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> would be made available to the public on a dedicated Scheme webpage on the Planning Inspectorate's website following the submission and acceptance period.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the points raised by the Consultee in relation to the guidelines that have been followed for the assessment work on the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments with regards to World Health Organization measures when considering noise impacts. The World Health Organization's Environmental <i>Noise Guidelines</i> have been considered within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. It is noted however that these guidelines do not account for sustainability which is a key element of the Noise Policy Statement for England (and UK Government policy).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the figures quoted in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> in relation to increases in daytime noise. In line with guidance outlined in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i>, the threshold for a long-term minor impact would be an increase of 3-4.9 dB. The threshold for a long-term moderate impact would be an increase of 5-9.9 dB. These <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i> classifications enable quantifying impacts but do not necessarily provide in isolation definitive answers in relation to the presence or not of a significant effect i.e. minor impacts are still considered when assessing potentially significant effects.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7h and 2c 7i, competent experts have carried out the assessments in relation to noise and vibration impacts associated with the Scheme. As noted, assessments have been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 – Noise and</i></p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>blobs of 'green vegetation' indicated. There is no detail regarding the style of planting or type of planting, nor why earth bunds have not been considered in other areas.</p> <p>UKHSA 'expects decisions regarding noise mitigation measures to be underpinned by good quality evidence, in particular whether mitigation measures are proven to reduce adverse impacts on health and quality of life.' (Scoping Opinion: A46 Newark). They go on to indicate that noise should be reduced at source, with noise insulation as a last resort.</p> <p>Question 2C 7 l) – It is already acknowledged in current Noise Regulations that the UK should be reducing road traffic noise – mitigation is a complex 'science' that includes on-site and strategic measures. At what point will National Highways demonstrate that they heed guidelines and share planned measures for this scheme with stakeholders such that we can be properly consulted ?</p> <p>Question 2 C 7 m) – Please tell us what organisations/professions/teams will be involved in designing noise mitigation, as it is clear that road Engineers and designers do not hold the full range of required expertise ?</p> <p>Noise and health and well-being</p> <p>In an appeal earlier in 2022, - "Appeal A Ref: APP/B3030/C/18/3196972. Land to the north-west side of Winthorpe Road, Newark, Nottinghamshire", - the Planning Inspector clearly cited the links between noise and health and well-being. The inspector clearly said that a site close to the current A46/A1 was unsuitable for residence:</p> <p>"Paras 31/32 " The noise from nearby sources is indeed noticeable and likely to be disruptive, with potential for sleep disturbance. In policy terms the development is not in a place that would promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and is contrary to key development plan policies. There are adverse effects that cannot be adequately mitigated. National policy is to the effect that such living conditions should be avoided. .... (other residential sites near roads) ....they do not provide a compelling reason to override the harmful effects of the road noise and noise from other sources that are and would be experienced by present and future occupants of the appeal site.</p> <p>Further, the Inspector argued that people should not live in an environment where they could not open windows due to noise: "The Inspector was quite clear (paragraph 58 of his letter) that it might be possible to design a mobile home with noise attenuation in mind, but occupants would have windows and doors open in warmer weather and it was unrealistic to expect windows to be closed for most of that time." National Highways is proposing to build significantly more road infrastructure in this very vicinity, despite the Planning Inspectorate deeming the area already too noisy."</p> <p>Question 2c 7 n) – Sampled noise measurements (cited within the PEI) indicate that Defra and National Highways have failed to reduce road noise levels around Newark where people live over the last 'Planning period 2017- 2022'. Current plans involve doubling, or more than doubling road capacity very close to these homes – as close as 50m away. Please justify the plans for this scheme in the light of the comments in the Appeal cited above. [this scheme was, in 2020, cited to effect 10,863 'residential receptors' in terms of noise – Options Summary Report 2020 para 4.7.62 ].</p> <p>Question 2c 7 o) National Highways state an objective to improve 'road safety'; please explain and justify the concern for 'safety' in relation to road traffic accidents but not to safety in relation to human health in relation to noise and vibration.</p>			<p><i>vibration</i> which establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7j, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>). It sets out that there is a need to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the A46 around Newark-on-Trent. This would directly contribute to the UK, regional and local Government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway network, and improving route standard consistency for the A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in the Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p> <p>As noted previously, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. The human health assessment considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. Significant adverse amenity or human health effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7k, the Applicant does not contribute directly to local health and social care services. However, the Applicant does work to a social value framework through which it commits to being a good neighbour in a number of ways. The Applicant is working closely with the local authorities and relevant stakeholders to ensure Scheme impacts are minimised or mitigated as best possible.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments in relation to discussions with members of the Scheme team. The Scheme design has evolved throughout its development and a noise assessment has now been completed and presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Noise mitigation would be provided as described in earlier sections. No significant effects with respect to noise and vibration are predicted during operation or construction of the Scheme with mitigation in place. Further information relating to noise mitigation can be found within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7l, noise assessments are undertaken in accordance with industry standards and best practice guidance including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Design Manual for Road and Bridge LA 111 – Noise and vibration</i></li> <li>• <i>Calculation of Road Traffic Noise</i></li> <li>• <i>Transport Research Laboratory 2014, British Standard 5228:2009+A1:2014</i></li> <li>• World Health Organization <i>Night Noise Guidelines for Europe 2009, and</i></li> <li>• World Health Organization <i>Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region 2018</i></li> </ul> <p>This ensures compliance with national policy and legislation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Land Compensation Act 1973</li> <li>• The Noise Insulation Regulations 1975</li> <li>• The Control of Pollution Act 1974</li> <li>• The Environmental Noise Regulations 2006 (amended 2018)</li> <li>• The Environmental Protection Act 1990</li> <li>• The Highways Noise Payments and Movable Homes Regulations 2000</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for National Networks 2014</li> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework 2023</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise Policy Statement for England 2010</li> </ul> <p>As noted above, there is a process for individuals and community groups to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit representations (known as "relevant representations") to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7m, competent experts in the relevant fields have carried out different assessments in accordance with relevant guidance and legislation which have determined the types of mitigation required. Competent expert evidence can be found within the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7n, the assessment considers a number of factors such as the number and type of vehicles, vehicular speed, road surface type, road gradient, local topography, proximity to noise sensitive receptors, and any specific noise mitigation to establish potentially significant effects. While the Scheme can affect a large number of receptors, resulting in a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts, no significant effects are predicted at any location with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Regarding 2c 7o, the Applicant's remit is to manage and improve the strategic road network to make journeys safer, smoother and more reliable. From January 2015 to December 2019, incidents on the section of the A46 around Newark-on-Trent resulted in 208 casualties. As such, improving road safety is a key objective of the Scheme. As previously stated, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that no significant adverse amenity or human health have been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Population and human health; Air quality; Noise and vibration; Landscape and visual effects	<p>2c. 8 Population and Human health</p> <p>Road traffic noise was recognised as second only to particulate pollution as the most serious environmental hazard to health and well being in Europe in 2018 [WHO 'Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region] . Since then, scientific evidence has grown. In September 2021 The British Medical Journal reported on noise and health, more specifically 'Noise and Dementia/Alzheimers'. They reported emerging studies finding that in adults over 60, long term exposure to residential noise from roads was associated with a 27% higher risk of Alzheimers for exposure over 55dB. They, and others (references available) identify the growing understanding of how noise actually leads to our bodies 'going wrong' and these diseases emerging.</p> <p>In 2018 WHO attempted to quantify the cost of traffic related noise to human health/life. They reported that in Western Europe more than 1 million healthy years of life were lost each year. With further evidence of the impact of noise emerging this figure is likely to be an underestimate e.g.. regarding links to dementia.</p> <p>Question 2c 8 a) Why is damaging 'Noise and Vibration' not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p> <p>Question 2c 8 b) Why is 'fine particulate air pollution' not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p> <p>Question 2c 8 c) Why is loss of visual tranquility and positive well-being not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p> <p>Question 2c 8 d) Please explain why the study fails to consider the impact on healthy recreation and access to peoples own gardens for those households where high road noise levels mean that gardens and open spaces become unpleasant, unhealthy and stressful places to be and adults of all ages, and children, are forced to spend more time inside their homes with the windows shut (report section 13.11) ? [People do not just go to parks, the cricket pitch, Rugby club etc for recreation; they more frequently want to enjoy their own immediately accessible garden— many rely entirely on their open windows and/or gardens for fresh air and pleasure of the outdoors.]</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments referencing research in relation to the human health related effects of road traffic.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the methodology and scope defined in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 112 - Population and human health</i> and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidance on delivering human health in environmental impact assessment.</p> <p>The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> is the accepted guidance for population and human health assessments of highways schemes in the United Kingdom and is the primary guidance for the assessment.</p> <p>The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment provides further guidance on assessing health effects across all infrastructure schemes.</p> <p>In relation to all questions asked by the Consultee, the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers impacts on human health as a result of changes in air quality, noise and vibration and landscape and visual amenity. An amenity effect is identified where</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Question 2c 8 e) Why is the loss of the pleasurable access to the amenity of their own gardens and area around their homes not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p> <p>Question 2c 8 f) Why is loss of the facility to be able to open windows to enjoy fresh air within their homes (as also recommended by the Chief Medical Officer to prevent spread of infectious diseases) not mentioned in the Environmental Report under the section on Public Health?</p>			<p>two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor.</p> <p>Through the implementation of mitigation measures, as set out in the First Iteration Environment Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> and secured in the Draft Development Consent Order, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) concludes that there would be no significant effects on amenity and human health as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration), Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, as well as the Scheme's Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b>, provide further details.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment Screening, Analysis and Monitoring <b>(TR010065/APP/7.6)</b> considers the environmental impacts on protected characteristic groups, such as children and older people.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>2c 9 Road drainage and water environment</p> <p>Road drainage : The flat nature of the land around the scheme means that drainage can be slow— from the road surface National highways have already identified the risk of toxic contaminants.</p> <p>Question 2c 9 a) How will National Highways ensure that road drainage is efficient and puddling around the embankments in particular does not lead to concentration of contaminants and build up in the soils ?</p> <p>Question 2c 9 b)— there are many small watercourses around the scheme in addition to the main River Trent. Where will drainage from the road be coursed/directed ?</p> <p>Flood attenuation :</p> <p>The floodplain areas upstream of Newark on both streams of the River Trent are crucial to the protection of Newark and settlements downstream yet issues relating to this floodplain seem to hold a 'follow-up' place in the planning of this scheme.</p> <p>It is clear if you trace the development of this road scheme that the challenge of engineering this route corridor choice across the floodplain was not taken into account until later stages. Indeed, the original route corridor was assumed to be cheaper because it was shorter ! (para 2.5.10 2020 report ).</p> <p>The PEI report claims that, “ .. a change in flood level of 10 to 50mm would rate as “minor adverse”. Riverside residents would suggest that any increase could be very 'adverse' for Newark Town where the town floodgates were within millimetres of being breached during flood conditions in recent years. Capacity of the floodplain needs to be developed before any floodplain at all is lost.</p> <p>Currently available plans show three different versions of the proposed flood compensation areas and 'borrow pits' , with no detail at all about what we might expect to see/experience. This appears to be a major engineering project in itself yet we have no detail to comment on. At least one of the 'borrowpit' areas already floods quickly, it would seem unrealistic to envisage that this might be 'returned to grassland'.</p> <p>Question 2c 9 c) When can we see proper plans for all stages of the flood attenuation work including reparation work?</p>	2C	N	<p>With regards to road drainage, the Applicant acknowledges Newark-on-Trent is located within a low-lying area with little change in topography. The Scheme has an elevation change of approximately seven metres between its highest and lowest points (Farndon Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout respectively). As such, areas of medium risk of surface water flooding (as defined by surface water flood risk mapping) have been identified within the Order Limits, shown in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 9a, the drainage systems have been designed in accordance with national standards, relating to minimum gradients of swales and basins. Where there is insufficient space for a swale to convey run-off, filter drains or piped systems would be provided.</p> <p>With regards to contaminants, an individual assessment has been carried out for the outfalls required for the Scheme to assess the potential effects from sediment and soluble pollutants within the surface water run-off.</p> <p>The results of this assessment conclude that the Scheme's drainage strategy and proposed mitigation is considered sufficient to not cause a significant adverse effect on the receiving watercourses. Further information is presented in Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 9b, there are 17 outfalls in the Drainage Strategy. Two of these are to the River Trent, five are to the Old Trent Dyke, three are to tributaries of the River Trent, two are to the Slough Dyke, three are to The Fleet, one is to an existing A1 highway ditch and one is to an existing highway ditch by Winthorpe.</p> <p>Surface water run-off would be attenuated in attenuation basins and discharged to the local watercourses at a restricted rate. This has been agreed upon with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. It is not anticipated that there would be an increased flood risk to the watercourses as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the drainage strategy can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and locations of the attenuation basins, swales and wetlands provided as part of this can be found in the Outline Drainage Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.6)</b>. A water quality assessment has also been undertaken to assess the impacts on watercourses, taking into account the current conditions. Further information regarding this can be found within Appendix 13.3 (HEWRAT Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comments in relation to flood attenuation, the Applicant has developed the design of the floodplain compensation areas in consultation with statutory environmental bodies, including the Environment Agency accounting for the existing floodplain areas within the Scheme's design.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment in relation to the selection of the route corridor. During route selection, cost was only one of the factors considered when selecting the preferred route. Other factors included environmental aspects such as impact on communities, noise, ancient monuments and existing habitats. An allowance was made for the provision of floodplain compensation in addition to the cost of the route itself. Alternative routes would still have required flood mitigation, as they all pass near and over major watercourses and the floodplain.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's comment relating to changes in flood levels, a Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme of floodplain compensation areas has been developed to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This identifies the future uses for land required for floodplain compensation areas. Details of this assessment are included in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team. The floodplain compensation areas are to be constructed prior to the rest of the Scheme as set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The locations of the floodplain compensation areas are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelham and Averham</li> <li>• Farndon West</li> <li>• Farndon East</li> </ul> <p>The locations of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment relating to the different versions of the plans showing the floodplain compensation areas and borrow pits as part of the statutory consultation. The <i>Consultation Brochure</i>, <i>General Arrangement Drawings</i> and the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation, contained plans showing the areas identified for floodplain compensation.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>With regards to question 2c 9c, more detailed plans relating to flood attenuation work (including floodplain compensation areas) is included within Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which is available as part of the development consent application.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Climate; Route corridor	<p>2c 10 Climate</p> <p>Carbon emissions The construction emissions alone are predicted to be 254,536 tCo2e. In the year of opening, the carbon emissions are predicted as 10,411 tCo2e.</p> <p>Carbon emission figures are absent for the operation of the road other than opening year. But the scheme is built on anticipated increased capacity, so it is imperative that the long term carbon impact of the scheme is assessed. In a climate emergency, is this level of increased carbon acceptable? The Engineers informally acknowledge (Kelham Nov 2022) that the current scheme will require an enormous amount of engineering and complex concrete</p>	2C	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments in relation to construction emissions. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. The assessment includes both construction and operational impacts.</p> <p>Construction impacts include the embodied carbon emissions of materials, transport of materials to site and the use of construction plant. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2e</sub>, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment (254,536 tCO<sub>2e</sub>) as presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>structures to support the road carriageways. Newark Sherwood District Council declared a climate emergency in 2019.</p> <p>Question 2c 10 a) What work is being done to examine the new A46 scheme in relation to carbon and NSDC's broader carbon reduction priorities?</p> <p>Our examination of another road scheme of a similar length reveals carbon emissions for construction that are far lower than for the Newark A46 bypass. For example, the A47 North Tuddenham scheme in Norfolk is 5.5 miles in length and the construction emissions are 87,727 tCo2e. Newark's scheme comprises 4 miles and 254,536 tCo2e. This is a big difference (nearly three times as much).</p> <p>We suggest that this carbon cost is so very much higher because of the intense concentration and complexity of infrastructure being built.— 6 substantial bridges, 2 high fly-overs, new roundabouts , high embankments throughout the route etc etc.</p> <p>Question 2c 10 b) A key question is whether this level of construction carbon emissions is justifiable for a route that is only 6.5km, and indeed whether the right route corridor for the scheme has been chosen?</p> <p>Question 2c 10 c)— do the last calculated 'carbon cost' figures include the most up-to-date revisions of the scheme plans (and allow for the likelihood of removing floodplain material and bringing in new material to build the high embankments)?</p> <p>Question 2c. 10 d) what is the carbon cost of the floodplain dig-out, and reparation ? b) has the floodplain engineering project been fully built into the total carbon cost currently predicted?</p>			<p>Following amendments to the Scheme since the statutory consultation, it is now estimated that carbon emissions during the first year of operation would be 7,995 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment in relation to the carbon emission figures shown in the statutory consultation materials. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that particular stage. Chapter 15 of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> provided information relating to climate that was available at the time.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the carbon emissions (as a result of vehicle use, greenhouse gas emissions associated with maintenance and operational energy use and land use change emissions) over a 60-year assessment period. In addition, it compares road user emissions in the opening year and 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment in relation to the climate emergency.</p> <p>The Applicant is required under law (Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (National Policy Statement for National Network) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'.</p> <p>As per the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraph 5.17 and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> document <i>LA 114 - Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment has been reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). The contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant, less than 0.007%, and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the United Kingdom Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets. Accordingly, the assessment has concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not be significant.</p> <p>With regard to question 2c 10a, as previously noted, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. The assessment includes both construction and operational impacts.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), sets out any likely significant climate effects for both construction and operation. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2e</sub>) during construction and operation. Construction of the Scheme is estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2e</sub>, demonstrating a 44% reduction in emissions compared to the initial baseline assessment presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> (254,536 tCO<sub>2e</sub>).</p> <p>This reduction is the result of significant efforts to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon, such as reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound. The</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080</i> best practice, via an iterative system which repeatedly evaluates the Scheme, for example, the use of low carbon solutions or techniques that reduce resource consumption. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>As outlined, emissions associated with the construction of the Scheme are now 44% lower than initially reported in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. This reduction is the result of significant efforts by the Applicant to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Scheme design and identify opportunities to improve resource efficiency and reduce carbon. Such measures include the reuse of existing carriageway infrastructure, the use of precast materials where possible and provision of renewable energy for the site compound.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges and is aware of the climate emergency declared by Newark and Sherwood District Council. Ongoing engagement has taken place with the council throughout the Scheme's development, including workshops focusing on resource efficiency and low carbon opportunities. For example, discussions took place regarding the opportunity to reuse material from other construction sites or industry in the area. In addition, the earthworks have been optimised to reduce the volume of material to be imported. Further information on the reuse of materials can be found in Chapter 10 (Material Assets and Waste) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton dualling scheme. Construction emissions can vary depending on a range of factors for example the intensity of the construction associated with the earthworks as (noted by the Consultee), the number of structures associated with the Scheme design, the volume of earthworks and the amount of existing assets that are able to be reused. This means that no two schemes are comparable.</p> <p>National Highways' <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including 'net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. These initiatives have not been factored into the assessment conclusions of the above carbon outputs and therefore the assessment conclusions can be considered suitably precautionary.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2c 10b, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. No significant effects upon climate are predicted during the construction or operation for the Scheme. This assessment includes predicted emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction which are estimated to result in 143,887 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>As noted previously, the carbon management and mitigation approach for the Scheme aligns with <i>PAS 2080</i> best practice. This includes consideration of other corridors or alignments. The output is a Scheme which is optimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>The construction emissions of the Scheme, alongside all other potential impacts, will be considered by the Examining Authority during Examination and the Secretary of State at the decision-making stage and taken into consideration in deciding whether to grant development consent for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2c 10c, the carbon calculations presented within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) use the most up-to-date revisions of the Scheme plans (and allow for the likelihood of removing floodplain material and bringing in new material to build the high embankments).</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2c 10d, the construction carbon assessment includes the earthworks required for the Scheme including the floodplain dig out. As described in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the earthworks across the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					entire construction are a large contributor to the emissions, at 51,404 tCO <sub>2</sub> e, but have shown a reduction through design optimisation. No significant effects upon climate are predicted during the construction of the Scheme.
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme; Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	<p>It would seem that National Highways has not built on-going review into their development model at-all - not the sort that feeds information back to affect the scheme.</p> <p>The information provided to stakeholders thus far gives little or no firm indication of mitigation measures - just 'floppy' promises that National Highways might consider. This scheme should be independently reviewed. If it is deemed bad NOW for the environment, for people's health, for the town heritage and landscapes, for biodiversity , involve massive working of the floodplain, cost so much in concrete ..... is this really a 'future-proof' project that embodies 'sustainable-planning' ?</p> <p>Question 2 d a) This scheme plan and PEI is full of contradictions and examples of failure to inter-relate impacting factors - whose job is it to take a scheme overview? This project appears to be badly managed which is frightening (- this is not a plan for a children's tea party!)</p> <p>Question 2d b). Like the fable "The Emperors New Clothes" - should we not admit that the Emperor is naked if that is the truth? If this scheme is so "adverse " in so many ways, is no-one within the scheme brave enough to honestly question it? [ameliorating language like 'adverse' and 'sensitive receptors' conveniently veil the reality - why not say 'bad'/'dangerous/negative' etc and 'people, animals, plants, air, our homes etc. ?-]</p> <p>Are National Highways ready to be cited by the Coroner on death certificates and taken to court for manslaughter because they ignored the growing body of scientific evidence demonstrating the links between road noise, bad air, reduced amenity etc. and human health?</p> <p>Question 2d c) Does the cost benefit analysis of the scheme include any estimates of cost to the NHS and social care, or working days lost to poor health etc.; how can these costs be reduced/ prevented ?</p> <p>Re: Your (National Highways) request for suggestions of 'measures or opportunities' to 'further minimise the impact on the environment or local community - Para 3.1 of the 'Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 , July 2019 states that "the responsibility for the management of noise from road traffic sources lies with the highways authorities." There is plenty of guidance and advice about how National Highways might go about this - do we really have to tell you? (we could but your response to questions thus far has been entirely unhelpful - just vague promises.)</p> <p>Question 2d d) - at what point are clear plans for mitigation going to be shared with the hundreds/ thousands of local residents impacted.? Lack of concern by an imposing authority is very stressful to people - this only adds to health pressures on individuals.</p> <p>Question 2 d e) Do professional engineers and scientists at National Highways really require us to tell them what ALL the options are in relation to reducing road noise, air pollution, habitat loss, carbon cost etc. from the A46 around Newark? We could, but you are employed as experts to do it.</p> <p>What has the PEI report work cost to date? (£)</p>	2D	N	<p>The Applicant's well established development process includes eight stages that cover an initial feasibility study, options identification and development (including a preferred route announcement) and construction.</p> <p>Regular reviews are also undertaken by the Department for Transport who assess the Scheme against a range of criteria including value for money, environmental impact and stakeholder views.</p> <p>If the Scheme is constructed, a Post Opening Project Evaluation would take place (approximately one year following the Scheme's opening), to ensure the project is on track to deliver the anticipated benefits over the lifecycle of a project.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The principles of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. avoid, mitigate, compensate and enhance) are embedded within the assessment process. The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss and land take as far as possible to minimise the impact on people's health, the town's heritage, landscape, biodiversity and floodplain.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and Appendices 8.1 to 8.13 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>), summarise the results of the surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and assessment. Please note that some ecological Appendices are confidential, in order to protect species from persecution, but these have been provided directly to the relevant stakeholders. Mitigation measures for both construction and operation can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Scheme accords with the principles of sustainable planning and spatial planning. Consideration has also been given to national policy including the National Planning Statement for National Networks within the Legislation and Policy section for each of the environmental topics (Chapters 5 to 15) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) where relevant.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's comments under question 2d a, as previously noted, the information presented in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> was preliminary and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. The purpose of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> was to enable consultees to understand the likely significant effects of the Scheme. Technical specialists that were responsible for drafting the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> worked closely with one another in order to fully understand any inter-related impacts between the different environmental disciplines. The Applicant does not consider that the information presented was contradictory. Further assessment on interrelating impacts can be found within Chapter 15 (Combined and Cumulative Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>As noted, an Environmental Impact Assessment is part of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's question 2d b, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The benefits of the Scheme (for example reduced congestion, improved safety and improved facilities for walkers and cyclists) have been weighed against any adverse impacts. The Applicant considers that the benefits of the Scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the adverse impacts identified within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> that would remain following mitigation.</p> <p>As noted, regular reviews have been undertaken by the Department for Transport throughout the Scheme's development.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate will consider whether the Applicant has complied with the pre-application requirements in deciding whether or not to accept the application for examination, including considering the adequacy of consultation. If accepted, the Scheme would be independently examined by an Inspector or panel of Inspectors (known as the Examining Authority) who will assess the Scheme based on a range of factors before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State on whether or not the Planning Inspectorate considers it should be granted development consent.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the language used within the materials produced for statutory consultation. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>The Applicant considers terms such as 'adverse' and 'sensitive receptors' to be standard terminology. A glossary of terms was included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> which provided definitions of any technical language.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments in relation to noise, air quality and amenity related health impacts. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health. An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity or human health effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's question 2d c, the cost benefit analysis does not specifically account for costs to the NHS and social care or working days lost due to poor health. However as noted, significant adverse human health effects have not been identified as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant has a responsibility to manage noise impacts as a result of the Scheme (as per the Environmental Noise Regulations 2006 (amended 2018)) and provide mitigation solutions where appropriate. Details of the noise assessment and mitigation measures can be found within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Consultees responding to public consultation often have specialist or detailed local knowledge that can be useful in the development of a project. As such, it is standard practice to ask those responding for suggestions regarding local opportunities or possible measures to further reduce the environmental impact.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's question 2d d, if the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's question 2d e, as noted, questions of this nature are asked in public consultation as specialist local knowledge can often be helpful within the development of a project.</p> <p>The Applicant is unable to give a specific figure with regards to the cost of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> at the time of statutory consultation. The cost of this work is factored into the overall budget for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Air quality; Noise and vibration; Population and human health; Route corridor	Question 2 d f) - in 2022/3, in light of current and anticipated legislation, and the growing scientific understanding of the links between health and noise, health and fine particulates, health and 'place'; would a new 4 lane highway be planned to run 50m from peoples homes- which is essentially what National Highways are proposing? Please refer back to our comments in Section 2b are 'simplistic' and premature corridor selection.	2D	N	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives for the Scheme alignment which informed the current design. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>If an option performs well against its Scheme's objectives (which align with Government strategies), the National Policy Statement for National Networks, and Department for Transport's <i>Early Assessment and Sifting Tool</i>, then it could be selected for delivery, even if it was within 50m of residential properties.</p> <p>The approach towards option selection for the Scheme aligns with the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance</i>. This is a requirement for all road schemes deemed to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the links between human health and noise, air quality and place impacts. The Scheme design has been developed and informed iteratively by the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment process, which has enabled the inclusion of embedded mitigation to ensure a sustainable design that aligns with the Applicant's design principles in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 103 - Introduction and general requirements for sustainable development and design</i>, which outlines general requirements for sustainable development and design for highway and all-purpose trunk road projects.</p> <p><i>The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> is a series of 15 volumes that provide standards, advice notes and other documents relating to the design, assessment and operation of trunk roads, including motorways in the UK, and is therefore the relevant standards for this Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been designed to reduce the Scheme's impact on people. Mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concluded that the Scheme would not have a significant effect on particulate matter at sensitive human health receptors during operation. This conclusion is based upon modelling at worst-case human health receptors located within 200m of the Scheme's affected road network.</p> <p>Further information relating to the topics raised by the Consultee is provided in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration), Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Landscape and visual effects	Question 2e a) Surely if needed/required environment protection, mitigation and reparation work cannot be part of the plan, then that is a failure of the full scheme ?	2E/2F	N	<p>In relation to question 2e a and the Consultee's comments in relation to planting, Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) has been developed since statutory consultation in the context of the broader Scheme</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Tree planting - all existing vegetation and new tree planting needs to be considerably 'beefed up' and made to include a significant proportion of trees that retain leaves longer and evergreens. The current screens fail in winter in terms of both light and noise pollution BECAUSE THE LEAVES FALL OFF!</p> <p>National Highways need to develop a more sophisticated approach to help capture fine pollution particles - including on bridges and flyovers (there is much science available on this – look it up!)</p> <p>Planting needs to be extensive and informed, and needs to start well before 'first dig' –. Planting should be managed so that trees do not fail. This should be happening anyway as part of National Highways declared intention to reduce road noise, yet our previous experience indicates that tree planting is one of the most poorly funded areas of National Highways. National Highways do not protect the existing tree coverage they are responsible for in this vicinity. Past schemes have removed vital vegetation without consultation. This does not bode well for the future, when more houses will be impacted by this new intrusive road.</p> <p>Borrow pits - should be covered in 'riparian woodland' - this will provide habitats, help to increase biodiversity in these areas, help to stabilise the soil, help to absorb noise and offer some 'carbon payback'. [reference/ talk to The Environment Agency, the River Restoration Centre, The Woodland Trust, Wildlife Trust etc.]</p> <p>Question 2f a)- what budget allowance is there in this scheme for building 'environmental enhancement' into mitigation measures? This cannot be 'left to chance'.</p>			<p>development and outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment has informed appropriate mitigation required both during construction but also operation. Further details are presented in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Plant species are chosen with the surrounding landscape character in mind to aid landscape integration and the use of inappropriate species not found in the local area is avoided. In addition, growing conditions and biodiversity value have also been considered. Large scale use of evergreen species would not be considered in keeping with the area and nor would it provide the biodiversity and habitat value required by the Scheme. The Applicant is required under Requirement 6 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> to ensure that any tree or shrub planted as part of the landscaping scheme which is removed, becomes seriously damaged, diseased, or dies (within five years of planting) is replaced in the next available planting season. This would be funded by the Applicant. Following the end of the five-year aftercare period, maintenance of planting would fall under the general maintenance regime for the strategic road network.</p> <p>Planting is typically not used for noise attenuation or mitigation as this is not shown to be a successful means of minimising noise is therefore not relied upon in the noise mitigation strategy i.e. noise barriers or bunds are used instead where necessary to avoid significant effects. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development. Further information relating to noise mitigation can be found within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to planting in relation to the lighting impacts. Planting is not specifically used to mitigate against associated light impacts however, it is acknowledged that screening would be more effective during the summer months.</p> <p>The requirements for road lighting have been determined based on ensuring safety for all road users. The design of which would seek to minimise adverse impacts and effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nocturnal species (for example bats)</li> <li>• The existing landscape and visibility from nearby properties and dwellings after dark</li> <li>• The setting of features associated with the historic environment (for example listed buildings)</li> </ul> <p>As part of the ongoing design process, information regarding lighting proposals is being developed following the statutory consultation. Details are included within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regard to its approach to the capture of fine pollution particles. The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>health receptors within the study area. Changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed during operation.</p> <p>Where possible, early planting works would be undertaken, however this would only be possible in areas unaffected by construction works, which are few in number. Planting would however be implemented at the soonest practicable opportunity, within the next available planting season (November to March) following completion of construction works.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the suggestion with regard to borrow pits and can confirm that the Applicant is in discussion with statutory environmental bodies including Environment Agency and The Woodland Trust. Appendix 4.3 (Record of Environmental Engagement) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010066/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b> summarise the Applicant's stakeholder engagement with statutory environmental bodies.</p> <p>Farndon East and Farndon West would be provided as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple ecological benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. For these areas in particular, public access is not provided in order to maximise the biodiversity value of the areas (reducing stresses presented by public use, such as dog walking) and also to reduce health and safety risks posed by ponds (former borrow pits which would hold standing water).</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2f a, while some environmental enhancements have been identified as possible across the Scheme, these enhancement measures have been discounted when determining significance of effects because they are over and above what is required to mitigate the adverse effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>Any environmental enhancement to be brought forward would be over and above that required for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Road drainage and the water environment; Route corridor	<p>Please refer to section on drainage too</p> <p>We suspect that in 2018 /2020 the scheme designers underestimated the impact of the floodplain on this corridor choice as we cannot find mention of this in the documentation of that time. Work on this area of project planning seems to well behind; clearly this is a massive civil engineering project in and of itself.</p> <p>Question 2 g a) - What is the projected timescale and budget allocation for this floodplain work - including reparation?</p> <p>Question 2 g b) - what organisations are involved in planning this work and the reparation work that should be part of it?</p>	2G	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regard to the impact of the floodplain on the selected route corridor. Impact on the floodplain was considered as part of the route selection process. The detail around the earlier route options assessment is contained within the <i>A46 Newark Bypass Options Summary Report November 2020</i>, which is available on the Scheme webpage.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's question 2g a, if the development consent application is accepted, the main construction works are due to commence in the summer of 2025. Construction is expected to be completed in the summer of 2028. Further details of the construction timeline are provided in Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>The overall cost of the floodplain work is included within the latest cost estimate for the Scheme which is set out in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to question 2g b, the Applicant has, and will continue to work closely alongside the Principal Contractor in relation to the associated floodplain works. In addition, the Applicant has engaged relevant statutory environmental bodies, including the Environment Agency, with regards to the design of the floodplain.</p> <p>Details of engagement with environmental stakeholders including the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, also Newark and Sherwood District Council is detailed within Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Appendix 4.3 (Record of Environmental Engagement) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Overall scheme	<p>We are interested in the 'headline' scheme budget - said to be about £490,000,000 - and monitoring this in relation to what we see evolving.</p> <p>Question 2h a) Taking the 'headline budget - what date and stage of the plan does this refer to, is it fixed? Is inflation built in? Is the developing scale of the project built in e.g. the floodplain and reparation work?</p> <p>Question 2 h b) - What is the relationship between the Contractors and the 'headline budget'?</p> <p>Question 2 h c) - Is this a 'Design and Build' project contract ?</p> <p>Question 2 h d) - How will the budget spend be scrutinised in an on-going way?</p> <p>Question 2 h e) - What safeguards are built into the budgeting/contracting process to ensure that proper, thorough environmental damage prevention, mitigation and reparation will take place and not be "short-changed' because its "difficult" / "expensive" etc. ??</p>	2H	N	<p>In response to Consultee question 2h a, the figure referred to relates to the estimated cost of the Scheme during the preliminary design stage. It includes all works associated with the Scheme including the floodplain and reparation work. Allowances for inflation are also included within the cost estimate. As this figure is an estimate, it is not fixed. The most up to date cost estimate is included in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee questions 2h b, the contract for the delivery of the Scheme was awarded under the Applicant's Regional Delivery Partners framework. This sets out the relevant governance processes and contractual obligations that the Principal Contractor must meet as part of the Scheme's delivery. At the point the Principal Contractor is appointed there is a stated budget for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2h c, as noted, the Scheme has been awarded under the Applicant's Regional Delivery Partners framework which is a design and build style contract.</p> <p>In relation to question 2h d, as part of the Applicant's Regional Delivery Partners framework, the Principal Contractor is required to provide monthly updates to the Applicant. The governance process ensures that appropriate checks and balances are in place meaning that the budget spend is scrutinised as the Scheme develops.</p> <p>In relation to Consultee question 2h e, in order for the Applicant to comply with the Development Consent Order, if granted, the Applicant is required to ensure that all essential environmental mitigation is provided as set out in the application documents. This is covered in the Scheme budget contained in the Funding Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/4.2)</b>. Further, any environmental damage caused by the Applicant would be covered by the usual regulatory controls which will require the Applicant to comply with and rectify where necessary.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVY-3	Consultation - general; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Consultation - negative feedback/experience	<p>The 'Glossy brochure' posted to some households - and available to collect - is remarkably uninformative regarding the potential environmental impacts and their proposed mitigation.</p> <p>For example: The introductory double page on 'Environment' is mainly taken over by a full page picture of a woman in National Highways 'High Viz' clutching a tape measure. The facing page has 200 words of very uninformative 'blurb' - the first paragraph says NH are 'continuing to gather' information about impact; the next three paragraphs list the 3 levels of report that are/will be produced - but use difficult to access language to do so, e.g.. "We've also produced an NTS of the PEI Report which provides a summary of the likely significant effects reported by each topic area". (page 34 para 3). ?????</p> <p>Question 2i a)- Please explain why the Environmental Information seems to be presented in a way that does NOT follow the Gov UK guidance 2016, updated 2022, "Content Design:, planning, writing and managing content." ?</p> <p>Question 2i b) - What was the 'readability level' target for the consultation document? Explain why this differs to the Government Guidance and also seems to breach the RIS2 declared statement of 'Accessibility' ("It is important that stakeholders can understand and engage with metrics published ... and the process to reach them") ??</p> <p>The 'Environmental Information' provided in this 'first line' Consultation Documents is given</p>	2I	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regard to the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and environmental information presented as part of the statutory consultation.</p> <p>A variety of materials (using a range of both technical and non-technical language) were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The <i>Consultation Brochure</i> provided a high-level summary of the Scheme. Page five of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> noted that further information was contained within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>With regards to Consultee question 2i a, the Applicant considers that the environmental information presented during the statutory consultation aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information, Environmental Statements</i> as well as the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>10 pages - one per 'topic' - but many of the column lengths are largely empty. High volume, no/little informative content.</p> <p>eg. Under 'Population and Human health' (page 43) there is one sentence on the impact on human health in the operational stage of the scheme, this says, "Changes to traffic flows once the scheme is operational has the potential to have positive or adverse effects on population and human health". This sentence is a completely uninformative truism ! It would be more meaningful to say something like : "x households/ y residents are anticipated to experience noise levels that are widely recognised to increase risk of a, b,c,d ....., for approx.. 66 households the noise level increase is expected to be so high that ....."</p> <p>eg. Under 'Noise and Vibration' (p42) there are three sentences on the impact in the operational stage of the scheme. It says, "There is potential for changes to traffic flows to result in both increased and decreased noise levels at sensitive receptors. Assessment work is on-going to understand the likely adverse and beneficial effects of the scheme for noise sensitive receptors. Any identified adverse effects will be reduced through mitigation measures such as through the use of low noise road surfacing and noise fencing where appropriate."</p> <p>In the 'second line' consultation document, 'Non-technical Summary' (28 pages, only available if you know about it/can find it online) ) - whilst the presentation is not consistent, it is not 'nontechnical' and is a very selective 'summary'. It does not present facts/metrics clearly, it tends to avoid the 'facts' and present selected comments rather 'unclearly'/confusingly. Again, lots of truisms : re: "Noise" it says : "Without mitigation, changes in traffic flows and road alignment can potentially result in changes at noise sensitive receptors, particularly from road noise traffic. These impacts can be beneficial or adverse. Measures to mitigate the impacts of noise and vibration during the operation phase include the use of noise barriers and earth bunds. Sound insulation packages for residences will be offered where significant impacts remain after incorporation of reasonably practicable mitigation measures. The preliminary operational assessment indicates that the scheme has potential to result in significant residual adverse effects at noise sensitive receptors, thus suitable mitigation will be considered. Operational vibration is not considered to lead to significant adverse effects and has already been scoped out of requiring further assessment."</p> <p>We contend that this is not open and accessible information to affected stakeholders - for whom this impact could be life-changing in a negative way. It uses jargon and technical language and is not informative in an accessible way. 'People' are consistently referred to as 'noise sensitive receptors', which is insulting jargon and obfuscation ; phrases like 'result in both increased and decreased ...' and "can potentially result in .. beneficial or adverse impacts' are completely unhelpful truisms.</p> <p>Question 2i c) - Because this is not 'meaningful information in clear and accessible format', or metrics in understandable form', what can the general resident population learn from this so that they can meaningfully make a response comment ? What is the National Highways response to this serious issue?</p> <p>Pages 30/31 of the document claims to show changes in traffic flows with/without the scheme and also journey times. National Highways have stated that improved journey time is a key objective of the scheme.</p> <p>Question 2i d). - Despite the title on the page, there appears to be no information given on journey times. Please explain this gap - or tell us where on the diagram it is? Consultees cannot comment in relation to this key objective without data.</p> <p>Question 2i e) How can value for money be ensured when the team structure and process of work seems to be 'stage' and 'tick-box' orientated , presenting but not apparently open to evaluating this preliminary work - yet cloaking it in gobbledygook !?</p> <p>Question 2i f) - Why are there no 'taken from the ground' 'photomontage' illustrations in the</p>			<p><i>Content design: planning, writing and managing content</i> guidance published by the Government Digital Service.</p> <p>Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2i b and 2i c, the Applicant considers that consultation materials were produced in a way that was accessible to consultees, covering a range of reading comprehension levels. Whilst a level of technical understanding was required to fully understand some of the information contained within the consultation materials, a glossary of terms was included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> to provide definitions of any technical language used.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff, including technical experts, were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>In addition to this, throughout the development of the Scheme, the Applicant has had a dedicated Scheme email address available for questions to be sent to as well as a Customer Contact Centre telephone number that can be used to ask any questions about the Scheme.</p> <p>As noted, the Applicant considers that the information provided enabled consultees to develop an informed view and provide comment on the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the layout and content of information contained within both the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. The <i>Consultation Brochure</i> set out where printed and online copies of consultation materials could be accessed, including the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i>. Information was laid out in a way that the Applicant considered to be easily understood, allocating one page per environmental topic and individual columns showing the potential impacts during the construction stage and the operational stage.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> assesses the impact of the Scheme on the local community, taking into consideration effects regarding land requirements, accessibility, and amenity. It concludes that no significant effects would be experienced in relation to human health as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment has been completed and noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme. This would vary from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that would be implemented to control noise and vibration are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>scheme consultation document - or displays mounted at consultation events to show people what the scheme might actually look like to them and how it will visually impact the town and surrounding area? Why were these images hidden away on tables, which people could miss? Why have only a weak handful of such images been produced? Is it satisfactory for the images that were made available to be presented only at the latter consultation events, and only published on National Highways' website midway through the consultation period?</p> <p>Question 2i g) The illustrations show off the road design in an 'ideal' way – once vegetation has had a chance to be established. There are no photomontages to indicate what it might actually look like at scheme completion, nor in the winter. How can Newark residents reasonably respond to a consultation without such key visuals? How do National Highways consider the consultation event displays to be FAIR in representing the scheme for people to evaluate ?</p> <p>Question 2i h) At the last Consultation Event at the Town hall we were waiting around to talk to someone who could answer questions and saw 2 booklets on a side table .... Curious, we examined and saw that they were intended for people whose homes would be most affected ... (clear blue covered, "Your Property and our Road Proposals", and "Your Property and Part 1 Compensation" ). Picking them up and taking them home to study was most interesting - sheer luck! Why were these not posted to the households that are likely to be most affected by this scheme?</p> <p>At Consultation Events there are plenty of glossy posters and people in high viz who talk jargon. The Liaison team members were not able to answer the questions; the Engineers/designers/science folk often can't either - they 'need to find out' or 'refer to someone else ....') Personnel show no respect for time and efforts of consultees trying to meaningfully engage. When we pointed out how completely uninformative the Consultation Document actually was - if you could unpick it eg. See page 42 - a representative simply laughed and agreed ... and suggested we mention it in our response.</p> <p>When we complained that the first weekend of Consultation involved paying £9 per person to enter a 'Food' event at the Showground a member of the Liaison team just replied "It was a good show, there was some lovely food"... there were then no more events for over a week. The following week the events were 'clumped' (which meant that for anyone unavailable for a few days you missed them all) ..... then it was over to Kelham .... Then the end 2 events of the Consultation. Notably there was no event near to the 'Windmill Viaduct' where the scheme will have great impact - and the 'drop off/collection point at the pub there was closed for refurbishment for most of the consultation time.</p> <p>Over the weeks we emailed questions in to the Team - initially this elicited a 'bounce-back' messages saying we would hear within 10 days (hardly helpful in a time limited consultation); indeed it took well over a week. Then, in response to questions we were told to go to an event to ask the questions ... we turned up to an event to then be asked to send in questions via email ..... have sent some questions, told to go to an event ... we sent notice to say we were going to an event with questions about x and asked whether there would be someone there to answer them .. were told 'yes', we turned up ... to be told that questions need to be asked in follow up because the person who could answer wasn't there .... (to justify why the information was not available). This circuitous charade is unacceptable for a statutory consultation.</p> <p>Question 2i l) How will this 'Consultation' be evaluated by the Scheme team? What measures will be utilised to determine how successful, or not, the consultation has been?</p> <p>Question 2i j) - Why are Local Health Services apparently not consulted (the HospitalTrust and Medical Centres ?)</p> <p>Question 2i k). How do National Highways England justify this as ACCESSIBLE CONSULTATION? 61% of the 420 residential properties within the LIA (local impact area) represent the two most deprived socioeconomic cohorts. How is this consultation information and events matched to the target population?</p>			<p>As noted, statutory consultation materials presented information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that an oversight was made with regards to the fact that the forecast traffic flow diagram on pages 30 and 31 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> did not indicate that the figures related to daily traffic counts. Following the statutory consultation, an updated version of this document was published on the Scheme's webpage. More information relating to traffic forecasts is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>With regards to question 2i d, the expected journey time savings that were referenced on page 29 of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> were based on information that was available at the time. The traffic modelling has further developed since the consultation. The main extent of the A46, between Lodge Lane (south of Farndon roundabout) and Brough Lane (north of Winthorpe roundabout), is forecast to bring journey time savings of between two to seven minutes in each direction during peak periods by 2043 (15 years after Scheme opening). Detailed journey time savings are presented in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to question 2i e, the need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>. The benefits and costs are combined to produce a benefit to cost ratio which informs an overall Value for Money assessment. The breakdown of the benefit to cost ratio is presented in the Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant's well established development process includes eight stages that covers an initial feasibility study, options identification and development (including a preferred route announcement) and construction.</p> <p>Regular reviews are undertaken by the Department for Transport who assess the Scheme against a range of criteria including Value for Money, environmental impact and stakeholder views.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regard to the artist impressions in questions 2i f and 2i g. <i>Artist impressions from selected locations</i> along the Scheme were produced following requests from stakeholders and made available online and at consultation events from 16 November 2022. The artist's impressions were for illustration purposes only and showed the Scheme based on the preliminary design proposals at statutory consultation.</p> <p>A <i>Scheme Fly-through video</i> was produced for the statutory consultation which provided an indication of the size and scale of the Scheme in the context of the local area and surrounding infrastructure. The <i>Scheme Fly-through video</i> was available from the beginning of the consultation period.</p> <p>The Applicant ensured that all consultation materials were displayed at consultation events in a consistent manner, were easily accessible and visible to event visitors. Event staff explained to event visitors what materials were being presented at the public consultation events and where they could be found.</p> <p>Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>. Photomontages have been produced for Visual Receptors 3, 24, 41 and 43. Locations of these receptors are depicted on Figure 7.4 (Visual Receptor Location Plan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Photomontage locations have been chosen to show a representative sample of existing conditions and provide a visual representation of the scale of the proposed Scheme within its setting. The photomontages present both the Scheme at Year 1 (2028, the year the Scheme is open to traffic) and at Year 15 (2043, 15 years from Scheme opening) during winter. The photomontage locations include:</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Question 2i l) - Response forms request a post code. Will responses be analysed in relation to post codes in order to help evaluate both the representation of responses and the 'success' of the consultation?</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View south-east from Marsh Lane representative of views from residential properties to the north-east of Farndon and users of Public Right of Way Farndon Footpath FP5</li> <li>• View north from Sandhills Park representative of views for residents</li> <li>• View south from the northern end of Winthorpe Road representative of views for residents, workers and visitors of the boarding kennels</li> <li>• View south from Public Right of Way Winthorpe Footpath FP2 representative of views for users of the footpath</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the Consultee's question 2i h, letters were sent directly to persons identified as having an interest in land, informing them where information regarding land, property and compensation guidance could be accessed online. The letter also outlined how copies of consultation documents would be available for inspection at consultation events and were also available upon request from the project team.</p> <p>Due to there being seven different land, property and compensation guidance brochures, these were not sent out with the letters mentioned above due to the environmental disbenefits associated with large scale printing. Further, the large amount of information available within the separate brochures is not necessarily relevant for each of the persons identified as having an interest in land.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments regarding the Consultee's experience at consultation events, including interactions with staff. The objective of these events was to provide the local community and other stakeholders with multiple opportunities to view and discuss the project with various members of the team, including technical experts.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding the consultation events that took place at Newark Showground during the Gift and Food Show.</p> <p>A total of 14 consultation events took place throughout the publicised consultation period. Twelve were held in person and two online. The first two in-person consultation events took place at Newark Showground during the Gift and Food Show, which was a ticketed event.</p> <p>The Gift and Food Show was chosen as a location for events due to the large number of visitors that attend the show, providing a prime opportunity to engage with regional and local stakeholders to promote understanding of the Scheme and the consultation period.</p> <p>In addition to the Gift and Food Show events at Newark Showground, there were also events in this area of the Scheme (i.e. 1.3 miles away in Winthorpe village) which took place during the consultation period.</p> <p>The consultation event locations were chosen deliberately so that they were spread out across the length of the Scheme. Suitably sized venues with available car parking were selected and it was ensured that locations were easily accessible for the public both via walking and public transport.</p> <p>Event locations were also selected based on their proximity to affected residents. The consultation event held nearest to the Windmill Viaduct (approximately one mile away) was at Farndon Memorial Hall on 8 November 2022.</p> <p>Further details regarding the consultation events can be found in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the closure of one of the deposit locations during the consultation period.</p> <p>For 28 days during the 47-day consultation period, the Lord Ted was inaccessible as a deposit location due to refurbishment works. This closure was not communicated to the Applicant by the venue when the deposit location was organised and only took place for part of the advertised 47-day consultation period. Signage was erected at the deposit location site</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>informing visitors of the reason for the closure, where alternative deposit locations were available and how consultation materials could be viewed online.</p> <p>Due to this deposit location being unavailable for only part of the consultation period, six other locations being available (two of them being within two miles of the Lord Ted) and no other suitable deposit locations being available in this area, the Applicant considered a new location was not required to replace the Lord Ted as a deposit location.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments regarding emails that were sent during the statutory consultation. The Applicant's standard correspondence process allows for a total of 10 working days for a response to be sent.</p> <p>Standard procedure during a consultation period is to make anyone contacting the Applicant aware of consultation events taking place.</p> <p>The Applicant engaged directly with the Consultee at consultation events and also during a one-on-one meeting. Follow up engagement also took place via email.</p> <p>With regard to Consultee question 2i I relating to an evaluation of the statutory consultation, as part of the development consent application, the Applicant is required to produce a Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>) which sets out how the Applicant has complied with the pre-application consultation requirements within the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate will consider whether the Applicant has complied with the pre-application requirements in deciding whether or not to accept the application for examination, including considering the adequacy of consultation.</p> <p>If accepted, the Scheme would be independently examined by an Inspector or panel of Inspectors (known as the Examining Authority) who will assess the Scheme based on a range of factors before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State on whether the Planning Inspectorate considers the Scheme should be granted development consent.</p> <p>With regard to question 2i j relating to consultation with local healthcare services, the Applicant has consulted The Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board and The National Health Service Commissioning Board as required under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. Further information can be found within Annex G (List of prescribed consultees identified and consulted) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>Other local healthcare services that were identified within the statutory consultation distribution areas and were therefore consulted with under section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, included the Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust and medical centres near to the Scheme. More information regarding the consultation material distribution areas is detailed in Chapter 4 (Statutory consultation) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's question 2i k relating to accessible consultation, the Applicant engaged with host local authorities to seek expertise on these issues. As prescribed by section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant prepared a Statement of Community Consultation setting out how it proposed to consult with stakeholders that would be affected by the Scheme. The Applicant also set out how it proposed to consult with seldom heard from groups.</p> <p>The Statement of Community Consultation notes that an Equality Impact Assessment for the Scheme was undertaken, as well as engagement with Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council in order to identify and engage with local organised or demographic groups with specific needs.</p> <p>A variety of methods were used to ensure the consultations were informative, accessible, engaging and suitable for the intended audience. These included a range of publicity</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>methods to promote the consultations, and information presented in a range of consultation materials, in person and online consultation events, as well as individual meetings.</p> <p>The Applicant produced consultation information using non-technical language supported by more technical documents. Information was also provided in video format and alternative formats were also available on request.</p> <p>The Applicant made provisions for the translation of the <i>Consultation Brochure</i> and <i>Consultation Response Form</i> into braille and the four other key languages spoken across the Scheme – Polish, Romanian, Lithuanian and Latvian.</p> <p>A copy of the Statement of Community Consultation can be found within Annex E (Published SoCC) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant's engagement with the local authorities including meetings undertaken with Newark and Sherwood District Council's Community Liaison Officer is summarised Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>In relation to question 2i I, postcodes were requested from consultees that completed online or printed copies of the <i>Consultation Response Form</i>. This postcode data was used by the Applicant in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To monitor the locations of those submitting consultation responses, allowing the Applicant to ensure stakeholders within the area of the Scheme were aware of the statutory consultation</li> <li>• To identify an area of the Scheme or specific location that a consultee referred to in their consultation response</li> <li>• To support the identification of affected stakeholders where required including local residents, business and persons with and interest in land.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has not used the postcode data to infer any level of interest from a group of consultees. As noted, statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was developed in consultation with the relevant local authorities.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Questions: NB. The public consultation should not close before we have the answers.	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments and has provided the answers requested below within this document.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022, allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Environment - general	1."A scheme-specific diffusion tube monitoring survey is currently underway and is due to completed in November 2022": has this been completed? Where can it be read?	N/A	N	<p>A Scheme specific diffusion tube monitoring survey for NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) concentrations has been undertaken to support the air quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The monitoring survey commenced in May 2022 and was completed in November 2022. This survey updated the Applicant's monitoring survey that had been undertaken previously in 2016 and supplements the local authority NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring undertaken by Newark and Sherwood District Council within the area as there is minimal local authority monitoring along the A46. Monitoring was undertaken at 27 locations along the Scheme alignment and surrounding areas. The monitoring locations are shown in Figure 5.6 (Air Quality Monitoring Locations) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Further detail on the monitoring survey is presented in Appendix 5.3 (Air Quality Monitoring Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Biodiversity	2.The scheme will "contribute to biodiversity net gain" Could you please describe in full how the scheme will do this?	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset. The Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme and has been developed in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Traffic forecasts; A17/A46/A1	3."The scheme is predicted to reduce flows in the centre of Newark where lots of people are present." When will your updated set of traffic forecasts be available? 4.A key issue is how the A46 interacts with major roads such as the A1 and A17 in this	N/A	N	<p>The updated traffic forecasts are available in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		vicinity. What analysis has been undertaken to assess whether the new scheme will make conditions better or worse on these routes?			<p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken to assess the Scheme and how the Scheme interacts with the surrounding road network.</p> <p>Traffic modelling outlined in the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>) predicts a decrease in traffic using the Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts as a result of the Scheme, due to the A1/A46 Crossing removing traffic from the roundabouts. This would significantly reduce delays and improve journey times for traffic travelling to and from the A17 in both directions, including HGVs.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken shows that traffic flows are likely to increase on the A17. However, driver delay is expected to decrease with the Scheme, with the most significant decrease happening on the A17 northbound approach of Friendly Farmer Roundabout.</p> <p>Changes to the existing A1 slip roads were considered during the options development stage of the Scheme, prior to the preferred route announcement, where it was decided to retain the existing layout due to the reduced traffic in the area resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>The current queues on the A1 slip roads are caused by traffic congestion at the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), forecasts that due to the new A1/A46 Crossing there would be a reduction in traffic using Brownhills Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout adding extra capacity. Therefore, the traffic coming from the A1 slip roads would have less opposing traffic to enter the roundabout and reduce the queues on the slip roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken microsimulation of the forecast traffic movements at these junctions to understand how the new flows and turning movements at these junctions would impact their operation. In a microsimulation model, each vehicle is simulated individually. This model allows for a more detailed understanding of traffic flows and its impacts on queueing and journey time delay. This modelling has been used to inform modifications to the Friendly Farmer and Brownhills roundabouts to optimise their operation, such as changes to signing and road markings. The traffic modelling undertaken also forecasts that traffic queues on the A1 slip roads are not predicted to extend onto the A1 mainline.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Biodiversity	5.NH are "preparing an Ecological Mitigation Strategy": has this been completed? When can we see it?	N/A	N	<p>Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). This document includes the ecological mitigation commitments detailed within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Climate	6. Carbon emission figures are absent for the operation of the road other than the opening year, but the scheme is built on anticipated increased capacity so it is imperative that the long-term carbon impact of the scheme is assessed. When will this be done?	N/A	N	<p>The UK Government has set carbon budgets that place a restriction on the amount of greenhouse gases the UK can emit over a five-year period. An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets available for comparison (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). The carbon emissions for the Scheme have been calculated from the traffic modelling completed for the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>Further details are provided in Chapter 4 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), which presents the net greenhouse gas emissions over a 60-year appraisal period in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Noise and vibration; Population and human health	7.NH predict that when the scheme is completed c. 3,500 residential properties will experience noise levels above World Health Organization Guidelines for levels that put health at risk. What is the proposed mitigation strategy for this danger to health?	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> guidelines. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that there would be no residual significant adverse effects during the construction or the operation of the Scheme. The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i></p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>is a series of 15 volumes that provide standards, advice notes and other documents relating to the design, assessment, and operation of motorways and all-purpose trunk roads in the UK. It is therefore the relevant standard to apply for this Scheme.</p> <p>The World Health Organizations <i>Environmental Noise Guidelines</i> have been considered within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. It is noted however, that these guidelines do not account for sustainability which is a key element of the Noise Policy Statement for England (and UK Government policy). Noise levels with/without the Scheme and the associated noise level changes (short and long term) are presented for all areas relevant to the Scheme within Figures 11.5 to 11.10 of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide noise screening. These can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts during construction and operation including for noise and vibration. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Air quality; Population and human health; Overall scheme	8.Fine particulate air pollution (PM 2.5) for residents living close to the intended development is a very serious health hazard for THREE YEARS and ONGOING indefinitely due to increased tyre and road particulates. Air pollution costs health and lives. Why is this not built into the cost benefit analysis of this scheme?	N/A	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> of 200 and 1,000 respectively.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures will not have a significant effect in air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust will be mitigated using best practical means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme would also not have a significant effect on PM (particulate matter) during the operation of the Scheme. The main pollutant emitted from road traffic is NO<sub>x</sub> (nitrogen oxides). NO<sub>x</sub> is primarily made up of NO (nitric oxide) and NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide), the latter being of most concern due to its impact on human health and as such monitored by local authorities across the UK. NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the study area are well below the annual mean objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup> and as PM concentrations from road traffic are a magnitude lower than NO<sub>x</sub>, the assessment has demonstrated based on background PM data available from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs that concentrations are low and the impact from the Scheme would not have a significant effect on PM.</p> <p>This is supported by the latest annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentration recorded by Newark and Sherwood District Council being 21.8µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which is well below the objective of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This concentration was recorded on Portland Street in 2018, which is the year Newark and Sherwood District Council's PM<sub>10</sub> unit was destroyed in a road traffic collision. Newark and Sherwood District Council has not yet replaced the unit and as such 2018 is the latest year with PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring data available.</p> <p>Nonetheless, impacts from PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations associated with the operation of the Scheme have been quantified as part of the cost benefit analysis. The approach to monetise the impacts has followed the 'Damage Cost' approach in accordance with the <i>Transport Planning and Appraisal Guidance (2018)</i> and the Department for Transport's <i>Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, May 2022</i>. Further detail on the damage cost assessment is provided in Chapter 5 (Economic Case for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Road drainage and the water environment; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	9.Much of the highway is built on a high embankment across the floodplain. The floodplain is crucial to the protection of Newark and settlements downstream. Why is this not fully addressed in the current scheme consultation documents? When will full information be made available?	N/A	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> did identify that floodplain is present and the importance of floodplain is set out for example in the legislation and policy context section.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, a Flood Risk Assessment has been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> including mitigation in the form of floodplain compensation area to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation as due to design refinement. The locations of the floodplain compensation areas are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Detailed hydraulic modelling has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment contained in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> is submitted as part of the development consent application.
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Environment - general	10.The Environmental Impact work is being carried out by the contractor; how is scientific impartiality/validity ensured?	N/A	N	<p>All subject matter experts who have carried out the Environmental Impact Assessment and who have authored their respective chapters of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> are members of professional bodies who are required to comply with legislation including the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and <i>Design Manual for Road and Bridges</i> guidance which is the relevant standard for highway schemes.</p> <p>All documentation published by the Applicant as part of the Development Consent application is subject to review by the Examining Authority during the examination period. Inspectors work within the principles of openness, fairness and impartiality as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Code Of Conduct</i>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	We could go on and have at least 20 more urgent and valid questions, especially in relation to destruction of the natural environment and habitats. However, it should be abundantly clear from the above that the current information available does not enable the public to be fully informed and therefore we have not been adequately consulted. We request that the public consultation be extended until all the necessary information is available.	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022, allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>As well as the information provided within the consultation materials, staff were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing. Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDC-U	Biodiversity	<p>Further comments:</p> <p>PNGS is appalled to read these sections of A46 Newark Bypass Preliminary Environmental Information Volume 3:</p> <p>Trees: "Four veteran and 10 notable trees have been identified within, or directly adjacent to, the draft Order Limits (of which 1 veteran and 9 notable trees are located at Kelham). Three veteran trees are currently in conflict with the scheme footprint. • Extensive areas of Tree Protection Orders (TPOs), 3 of which will be in partial conflict with the scheme footprint (TPOs 116, 152 and 153). " "the loss of semi-mature and mature trees present within the roundabout and to the south of the A46, likely to be of use to nesting birds and commuting bats." Please note that it is not 'likely to be of use'! Winthorpe roundabout is home for a large, established rookery, which is decades old, and must be protected.</p> <p>Habitats: "The scheme will result in permanent habitat loss and fragmentation of habitat at multiple LWSs including Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Great North Road Grasslands, Newark Dismantled Railway, and Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway. Construction activities could also increase the risk of a pollution incident, such as contaminated run off, spills/leaks of oils and fuels, and increased airborne pollutants.</p> <p>The scheme will result in loss of priority habitat consisting of deciduous woodland, wood pasture, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, lowland meadow and lowland fen. It has the potential to result in indirect effects on other priority habitats due to construction activities</p>	N/A	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that particular stage. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought, along with detailed habitat and species surveys undertaken to inform the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the assessment of likely significant effects upon ecological receptors. Mitigation measures for biodiversity during construction and operation can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Whilst Scheme design iterations have resulted in the retention of all veteran trees, there would be an unavoidable permanent adverse impact to three veteran trees. This is due to the direct impact to their root protection areas and the proximity of one of these veteran trees to the Order Limits, which would require a minor crown lift (&lt;0.5m). It is anticipated that, with arboricultural supervision to ensure works are undertaken in line with best practice, the level of disturbance stated above can be tolerated by these trees. It is difficult to predict this with certainty and therefore ongoing monitoring would be undertaken to inform any remedial action.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>required for the scheme and vegetation clearance required to Regional Delivery Partnership A46 Newark Bypass Preliminary Environmental Information Volume 3 14 facilitate construction.</p> <p>Additional indirect impacts may also affect habitats through airborne pollution, run-off, and compaction of root systems.</p> <p>Site clearance and construction activities may have an adverse effect on protected species where commuting, foraging, breeding and rearing habitats are lost. These protected species include otters, water voles, aquatic invertebrates, barn owls, badgers and bats. Construction related run-off could indirectly impact the water quality of local water courses inhabited by species such as water vole and otter. Night works would directly disturb nocturnal species and terrestrial invertebrates due to increased lighting pollution, noise and vibration. This disturbance could potentially contribute to the displacement of a number of species from the area. Additional impacts on species include mortality or injury through construction activities and indirect impacts. Changes in water levels has the potential to alter how bankside habitat can be used for water vole burrowing and otter resting sites. Nightworks and associated lighting have the potential to cause disturbance to bats, badgers and barn owls.”</p> <p>What possible justification, in a climate and ecological crisis, could there be for this level of habitat destruction? Increasing the speed and number of lorries as they pass by Newark is no justification whatsoever and is a dreadful perpetuation of the approach that has created the climate and biodiversity crisis. The ‘mitigation’ you purport to offer is dismally inadequate and ineffective.</p>			<p>Further details of these measures can be found in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, and more information is available in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>With reference to the mitigation hierarchy, the latest Winthorpe Roundabout design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery within Winthorpe Roundabout and much of this habitat would now be retained. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season. The availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) would support the rookery.</p> <p>In relation to habitats, the Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. The compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Sites. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>The <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> has been applied to the Scheme, with the aim to achieve a net gain in biodiversity value. The <i>Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1</i> includes trading rules for priority habitats such as woodland, wood pasture, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, lowland meadow and lowland fen in order to achieve a net gain. Some of this would be achieved through habitat creation on site, but there is insufficient space to fully compensate specifically for woodland habitat within the Scheme Order Limits and therefore it has been necessary to consider other options.</p> <p>The requirement could be met by new woodland planting, but this would need land use change in excess of 20 hectares and would take a relatively long time to establish. Meeting it through woodland enhancement requires only 8 hectares with no change of land use and would provide the required habitat more quickly. Woodland enhancement would be carried out at Doddington Hall within an area that has a sufficient area of woodland of a type and quality suitable to deliver the required enhancement. This is outside the district but within the same National Character Area. A benefit of this element of the proposals is that these woodlands sit within an extensive network of woodland habitat and their enhancement would contribute to improved habitat quality and connectivity. It would also support aspirations of the Greater Lincolnshire Local Nature Partnership to undertake habitat restoration in the area between Doddington Hall Estate and Whisby Nature Park.</p> <p>Local landowners have been consulted; however the Applicant is not aware of any others able to help achieve the habitat compensation requirement. Further details such as methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores can be found within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>In relation to protected species, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. If a potential significant effect is identified in relation to an ecological receptor, mitigation has been applied in line with the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts where possible.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts on the environment from the construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, air pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) the need for the Scheme and how it complies with the relevant planning policy such as the National Policy Statement for National Networks and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017).</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Cultural heritage	Totally inappropriate for an historic market town	2B	N	<p>The assessment of Scheme effects on cultural heritage has been undertaken in line with relevant legislation, policy and guidance which is detailed in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>The historic town of Newark-on-Trent is identified broadly by the designated conservation area boundary. Its connection with the wider landscape is most easily articulated through its connection with Civil War sites and monuments, and historic and modern transport networks including road, river and rail. Each individual asset has been mapped and their relationships understood. Thereafter, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks, identified impacts have been assessed to determine levels of harm, and weighed against public benefit.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Overall scheme	designed to move more heavy traffic by Newark faster not designed to improve traffic congestion in Newark	2B	N	<p>In March 2020, the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> included a commitment to improve the A46 'Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor' between the M5 and the Humber Ports, as a mechanism for underpinning the wider economic transformation of the country.</p> <p>The need and economic case for the Scheme is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables (<b>TR010065/APP/7.2</b>), which sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In line with Department for Transport modelling guidance, traffic flows have been forecast up to 2061. This modelling forecasts that the A46 is not predicted to be over capacity within these timescales if the Scheme is implemented. The traffic modelling predicts that there would be less through traffic going through the centre of Newark-on-Trent as more traffic would use the widened A46 with reduced delays along the Scheme section. In addition, the junctions along the Scheme would not be congested as they are currently, which would benefit local users gaining access to the widened A46 and across it.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Climate	this scheme seems to have emerged from a 1990s mindset, rather than the 21st century when we are in a climate and ecological crisis the most innovate and creative solutions are needed to reduce congestion on the bypass with the environment and climate change at the heart of the solutions	2B	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) sets out that there is a need to increase capacity and reduce traffic congestion on the existing A46 around Newark-on-Trent. The Scheme would directly contribute to national, regional and local Government's transport and economic growth plans by improving connectivity from Lincolnshire to the national motorway</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>network, and improving route standard consistency for the widened A46, providing a consistent high standard dual carriageway between the Midlands and Lincoln.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as the climate emergency declared by Newark and Sherwood District Council. The Applicant has sought to minimise carbon emissions as far as possible in order to contribute to the UK's net reduction in carbon emissions. A hierarchical approach to carbon management has been applied, which applies the principles of build nothing, build less, build clever, and build efficiently (as described in <i>PAS 2080: Carbon Management in Infrastructure</i>). Details relating to this hierarchical approach to carbon management can be found within Section 14.10 (Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures) of Chapter 14 (Climate) within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested	What is there is appalling in itself but too much of your information is incomplete, vague and ambiguous` and supposedly coming after the public consultation ends. It is essential that the public consultation period is significantly extended if this is not simply a box-ticking exercise	2C	N	<p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022, allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Road layout	scrap this half a £billion scheme which has such significant adverse effects on our town, its people and the environment. Sort out the problem of traffic congestion on the bypass in the way it should have been done when built. Duel it. No 8m flyovers or other nonsense.	2D	N	<p>High traffic flows at the existing junctions are the cause of the majority of congestion between Farndon Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout, therefore only dualling the carriageway would not solve this issue.</p> <p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, assessed current and future traffic flows. Modelling included the year the Scheme is open to traffic (2028) and 15 years on (2043). The junctions as part of the Scheme design performed well for both scenarios.</p> <p>The Scheme design adheres to the principles of the design and mitigation hierarchy outlined in the standards for highways document <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. The first principle of this document is to avoid</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>potential adverse effects where possible, before seeking to minimise or mitigate any unavoidable impacts. This has formed a well-developed embedded and essential mitigation strategy.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme. It covers topics including air quality, cultural heritage, biodiversity, noise and vibration, and population and human health.</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Landscape and visual effects	plenty - but your scheme will have destroyed most of them	2E/2F	N	<p>The Scheme has sought to minimise the extent of land required temporarily and permanently. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought. The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to minimise habitat loss with a focus on avoiding high value and/or irreplaceable habitat present. The design and construction methodology has been developed to limit the removal of existing vegetation wherever possible. All veteran or notable trees within or in close proximity to the Order Limits would be retained. The environmental design for the Scheme proposes a variety of planting types including tree and shrub planting, hedgerows and grasslands, this can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
ANON-559H-RWG7-J	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	consultation period must be extended until you have the full information we need to be adequately informed and consulted	2I	N	<p>The statutory consultation for the Scheme took place from 26 October to 12 December 2022, allowing a total of 47 days for responses to be received. The Applicant considered this duration to be more appropriate than the required minimum period for statutory consultation which is 28 days. The Applicant considers that adequate time was allowed for responses to be received.</p> <p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at that time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials was appropriate and provided sufficient detail for consultees to develop an informed view and provide comments on the Scheme at that stage.</p> <p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDA-S	Introductory text; Biodiversity	<p>Objection – direct loss of veteran trees</p> <p>As the UK's leading woodland conservation charity, the Woodland Trust aims to protect native woods, trees and their wildlife for the future. We own over 1,000 sites across the UK, covering over 30,000 hectares and we have over 500,000 members and supporters. We are an evidence-led organisation, using existing policy and our conservation and planning expertise to assess the impacts of development on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees. Planning responses submitted by the Trust are based on a review of the information provided as part of the consultation.</p> <p><b>Veteran Trees:</b> Natural England's standing advice on veteran trees states that they "can be individual trees or groups of trees within wood pastures, historic parkland, hedgerows, orchards, parks or other areas. They are often found outside ancient woodlands. They are also irreplaceable habitats. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has significant decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its exceptional biodiversity, cultural and heritage value." We consider that not all veteran trees are ancient, but all ancient trees are also veteran trees. The Woodland Trust strongly objects to the preferred route alignment on account of proposed direct loss of veteran trees.</p> <p><b>Planning Policy:</b> The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NNNPS) Paragraph 5.32 states: "Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss. Aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is unavoidable, the reasons for this."</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 180, states: "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;" Further to this, paragraph 174 of the NPPF states the following: "Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures". Where an application involves the loss of irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees, net gain for biodiversity cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Highways England's (now National Highways) Biodiversity Action Plan (2015) outlines key environmental goals for minimising environmental impact: "Biodiversity is entrenched within the Government's Road Investment Strategy and Highways England's Strategic Business Plan. In particular, the Road Investment Strategy states that by 2020, the company must deliver no net loss of biodiversity and that by 2040 it must deliver a net gain in biodiversity." As such, by putting forward a proposal of this nature, National Highways is in direct contravention of its own biodiversity policies.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides an assessment of the potential arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme. Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has been further developed, meaning that no veteran trees are expected to be lost.</p> <p>However, there would be an unavoidable permanent adverse impact to three veteran trees due to the direct impact to their root protection areas and the proximity of one of these veteran trees to the Order Limits, which would require a minor crown lift (&lt;0.5m). It is anticipated that, with arboricultural supervision to ensure works are undertaken in line with best practice, the level of disturbance stated above can be tolerated by these trees. It is difficult to predict this with certainty and therefore ongoing monitoring would be undertaken to inform any remedial action.</p> <p>Measures such as arboricultural supervision and use of ground and barrier protection would be implemented to reduce impacts where construction activities conflict with the root protection area of a veteran tree.</p> <p>These measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts on the environment from the construction and operation of the Scheme. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment undertaken can be found in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and includes a review of national policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks.</p> <p>With regard to biodiversity net gain, Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides a detailed summary of the biodiversity net gain assessment to date and the methodology used. The habitat creation and provision associated with the Scheme would result in a predicted overall net gain.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDA-S	Climate	<p>Reducing Carbon Emissions:</p> <p>The Woodland Trust supports an increase in UK woodland cover from its current 13% of land area to 19% by 2050 to tackle this country's biodiversity and climate crises. The value of woodland in sequestering carbon emissions has been recognised by Government, yet further erosion of ancient and mature woodland by government-led road projects would further undermine its ability to meet net zero obligations. Indeed, in England, ancient woodland has been shown to hold 36% more carbon per hectare than all other woodland.</p>	N/A	N	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comments with regards to the net zero carbon goal set by the Government. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> includes a review of international and national legislation, and UK</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>A number of important developments in UK climate change policy have occurred in recent times. Meeting the recently adopted target of net zero carbon by 2050 represents a major policy challenge of which transport is a central component. The UK Committee on Climate Change (CCC) reports that transport emissions increased by 6% between 2013 and 2019 and were 4% higher than in 1990. Road transport accounts for 91% of the UK's domestic surface transport emissions. Although vehicles have become more fuel efficient, this has been offset by increasing travel demand.</p> <p>To overcome such trends, the CCC Net Zero report highlighted the need for new policy frameworks to be developed. The Department for Transport acted on this recommendation, publishing a Green Paper, 'Decarbonising transport – setting the challenge', in March 2020. This includes recognition that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network." The Government has further committed to tackling the issue by the publication of 'Decarbonising Transport – A Better, Greener Britain' in July 2021. A successful strategy to reduce transport's carbon emissions must include measures to manage road travel demand, not accommodate its growth, and we would challenge whether the A46 Newark Bypass is consistent with this approach.</p> <p>Any decision regarding the A46 Newark Bypass scheme must be consistent with the UK's international commitments regarding carbon emissions. The court decision concerning plans for a third runway at Heathrow highlighted the need for consistency in the Government's legal objectives regarding emissions cuts and major infrastructure development proposals which are predicated on increasing transport movements. While the court decision was recently overturned, the Government must lead the way in cutting emissions if the UK is to remain credible at climate negotiations.</p>			<p>Carbon Budgets and, where required, has provided the necessary information demonstrating how the Scheme is compliant with applicable policies and legislation.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes the Consultee's comments regarding the need to manage road travel demand in addition to the reports published by the Department for Transport and the UK Government. Both the <i>Decarbonising Transport – Setting the Challenge</i> and <i>Decarbonising Transport – A Better, Greener Britain</i> publications have been taken into consideration as part of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). A carbon budget places a restriction on the total amount of greenhouse gases the UK can emit over a five-year period.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037)). The UK Government carbon budgets have been set to support the UK in reaching its net zero target. The relevant carbon budgets for the operational phase of the Scheme are carbon budget 5 (2028-2032) and carbon budget 6 (2033-2037). The estimated emissions from the Scheme for carbon budget 5 are 76,573 tCO<sub>2e</sub> and for carbon budget 6 are 41,991 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.</p> <p>As per paragraph 5.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the requirement of the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i>, the greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes no likely significant effect. The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> document states: 'assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets'. The assessment has identified that the contributions of the Scheme to the UK's carbon budget for the relevant carbon budget periods are not significant, less than 0.007%, and therefore it can be concluded that the greenhouse gas emissions impact of the Scheme would not have any material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>Traffic modelling, completed as part of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, predicts an increase in traffic on the A46. Without the Scheme, the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> concludes that this higher demand would result in long queues forming. The design of the Scheme would improve traffic flow through the road network and assist with the higher demand originating from the increase of traffic on the A46.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010065/APP/7.1)</b> and National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b> set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The Applicant's statutory remit is to manage and maintain the strategic road network, and the delivery of the Scheme seeks to enable traffic to stay on strategic routes, thereby reducing delays and congestion.</p> <p>The problems along the existing A46 need road improvement solutions consistent with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, as pursued via the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> for upgrading the A46 to a high-quality dual carriageway between Lincoln and Gloucestershire.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDA-S	Biodiversity	<p>Mitigation for veteran trees:</p> <p>Trees are susceptible to change caused by construction/development activity. As outlined in 'BS5837:2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction' (the British Standard for ensuring development works in harmony with trees), construction work often exerts pressures on existing trees, as do changes in their immediate environment following construction of any new infrastructure. Root systems, stems and canopies, all need allowance for future movement and growth, and should be taken into account in all proposed works on the scheme through the incorporation of the measures outlined in the British Standard.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has developed, meaning that no veteran or notable trees are expected to be lost. There would, however, be an unavoidable permanent adverse impact to three veteran trees due to the direct impact to their root protection areas and the proximity of one of these veteran trees to the Order Limits, which would require a minor crown lift (&lt;0.5m). It is anticipated that, with arboricultural supervision to ensure works are undertaken in line with best practice, the level of disturbance stated above can be tolerated by these trees. It is difficult to predict this with certainty and therefore ongoing monitoring would be undertaken to inform any remedial action.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>While BS5837 guidelines state that trees should have a root protection area (RPA) of 12 times the stem diameter (capped at 15m), this guidance does recognise that veteran trees need particular care to ensure adequate space is allowed for their long-term retention. It is imperative that Natural England and Forestry Commission's standing advice on root protection areas for veteran trees is taken into account in planning decisions.</p> <p>This advice states: "For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area. Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone."</p> <p>We also note reference to the potential loss of numerous notable trees recorded within the route boundary. Although not afforded the same protection in planning policy as ancient and veteran trees, notable trees are likely to develop veteran features if afforded time and space. As such, we ask that these trees are identified, retained and afforded suitable root protection areas in line with Natural England and Forestry Commission's standing advice to ensure their future longevity and protection.</p>			<p>Measures such as arboricultural supervision and use of ground and barrier protection would be implemented to reduce impacts where construction activities conflict with the root protection area of a veteran tree. The Applicant can advise that as outlined in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>, the root protection area of veteran trees is calculated at 15 times the stem diameter.</p> <p>These measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDA-S	Biodiversity; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Veteran trees are irreplaceable habitats, once lost they are gone forever. Any development resulting in loss or deterioration of veteran trees must consider all possible measures to ensure avoidance of adverse impact. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the proposals in more detail ahead of the next phase of the project; if you would like to get in touch, our contact email is [redacted]</p>	N/A	N	<p>Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides an assessment of the potential arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme. Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has developed meaning that no veteran trees are expected to be lost.</p> <p>Measures such as arboricultural supervision and/or use of barrier fencing would be implemented to reduce impacts where construction activities conflict with the root protection area of a veteran tree. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment includes a review of national policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks. Where required, it has provided the necessary information to demonstrate how it aligns with these policies.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to future engagement. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee's representatives to offer a means for the Applicant to seek the technical and local expertise on relevant design issues if necessary.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Introductory text	<p>We are commenting on the published Plans, not subsequent comments by the design team. We hope that a proper dialogue ensues about how to increase Active Travel around the eastern fringe of the Newark on Trent urban area.</p> <p>Introduction The Government has enacted a legal target of zero emissions by 2050, and has stated that many more local journeys are going to have to be made using Active Travel options or public transport.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to dialogue around active travel routes to the east of Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>Engagement has taken place throughout the process with local active travel representatives as part of an A46 Active Travel Working Group on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals for the Scheme to consider their suggestions for improved provision. This group included the Applicant and the A46 Active Travel Partnership. The A46 Active Travel Partnership includes Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers, Newark Sports Association, The British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Sustrans and Nottinghamshire Footpaths Preservation Society.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to the Government's zero emissions target and has included consideration for improvements to active travel within the Scheme objectives, one of which is to 'build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected'.</p> <p>The objectives of the Scheme are presented in Chapter 3 (The Need for the Scheme) of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Yet even existing users wanting to make journeys on the eastern side of Newark face big access problems because of the A1, A46 and A17, all increasingly busy trunk roads, meeting on the east side of Newark at the complicated interchange involving local roads as well. These roads and the interchange are a serious barrier to anyone intending to make a journey on foot, cycle or horse out of Newark to the east or even to the Newark &amp; Notts Showground.</p> <p>To the north of the A46 there exists a good route to Winthorpe and from there access north along to the Trent Valley. This area between the River Trent and the rail line to Lincoln is an important green area with the Trent Valley Way Long Distance footpath and Trent Vale Trail cycleway/footway passing through it to the Fledborough Viaduct where the Dukeries Trail, which connects Lincoln and Shirebrook, crosses the River Trent. It is an increasingly important corridor with a chain of small villages and nature reserves connected in a chain by the two Active Travel routes.</p> <p>To the south-east of the A46 the situation is very poor, with only the public route away from the road being the public footpath from Winthorpe to Coddington, although it does cross the A46 at grade across the carriage way and then goes south across the development sites. The only access from Newark to the wider rights of way network is through the A1, A46 &amp; A17 junction where there is a shared use footway/cycleway at the side of the carriage. This gives access to Drove Lane which leads to the bridleway to Danethorpe and beyond that to the rights of way network and quiet lanes. This route also gives access to the Newark Showground and employment sites around the showground.</p> <p>The Active Travel Partnership was brought together so that the different users and community groups, who share a common interest could make the case for Active Travel by identifying the most serious problems within the interchange area and proposing the best solutions.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The new walking and cycling routes in this area are detailed on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved walking and cycling routes throughout the Scheme, as well as reducing severance between Winthorpe and the Newark Showground, and south of the A46</li> <li>A new walking and cycling route between Hargon Lane to provide a link to the new crossings over Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>New crossings beneath the A46 alongside the existing A1 and new crossings provided over Winthorpe Roundabout. A new walking and cycling route would connect the entrances to Newark Showground, forming a continuous new route from Drove Lane, alongside the A46, and connecting into the existing walking and cycling infrastructure at Godfrey Drive adjacent to the A17</li> <li>A signalised pedestrian crossing would be provided over the existing A46 between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts to provide access south of the existing A46. This will link to Winthorpe Footpath FP3 via a new walking and cycling route north of Friendly Farmer roundabout that links to this crossing by the existing pedestrian bridge over the A1 slip roads and the existing pedestrian crossing over the A17</li> </ul> <p>The Trent Valley Way already crosses the existing A46 on the existing Winthorpe Road, just west of the new Brownhills Junction. The Scheme would retain the existing general location of the existing trail where it crosses the A46, but would upgrade it to a 3m wide shared use walking and cycling route which would travel under the widened A46, to the south of the Brownhills Roundabout. This new shared use route would connect into the existing walking and cycling routes at either end.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Stakeholder engagement; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>We were very concerned when the Design Team did not engage with us at this initial design stage, having submitted a report to the initial consultation about the need for better routes. The result is that there are major issues about plans that have now been produced, these include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failing to correctly identify and evaluate the existing active travel routes</li> <li>Carrying out an assessment of Active Travel needs (GG 142 Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment)</li> <li>Ensuring that the changes they propose meet the needs of the Active Travel community and represent an improvement on what already exists so that the number of journeys made on foot, cycle or horse increases as a proportion of journeys made.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that the Design Team have now agreed to set up an Active Travel Working</p>	N/A	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the report provided by the Consultee and has carried out further engagement with the Consultee on the issues raised which has resulted in changes to the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details relating to changes made as a result of consultation as well as ongoing engagement undertaken by the Applicant is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) and Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>During preliminary design the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review, detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment (<b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b>), was produced. This was produced in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 142 - Walking, cycling and</i></p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		Group which is to be welcomed, but it has been made clear that there is no money in the budget and outside funding will have to be sought for essential improvements.			<p><i>horse-riding assessment and review process</i> for highway schemes on motorways and all-purpose trunk roads.</p> <p>This report assessed comments from statutory consultation accompanied by a review of site surveys and user counts. Following this, the design of the Scheme was revised in a number of locations relating to walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the engagement that has taken place with the Consultee as part of the A46 Active Travel Partnership and the efforts that been made by them in order to provide constructive comments on the Scheme design.</p> <p>With regards to the comment made by the Consultee relating to outside funding, this is in relation to the Applicant's designated funds process. This funding stream process is something that is not guaranteed as part of the Scheme and is therefore not included or assessed as part of the application.</p> <p>Further information relating to walking and cycling routes is detailed in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Given the need to meet the Government's 2050 climate targets it is concerning that no budget has been retained to maintain the standard of Active Travel routes nor make any improvements withing the road corridor.	N/A	N	<p>This Scheme would increase the capacity of the existing A46 between Farndon Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout. As a result of improving the capacity of the existing A46 by dualling the existing single carriageway, new walking and cycling routes would be created or improved in the vicinity of the Scheme. New routes and improvements to existing routes would be implemented where deemed necessary, based on survey data and other factors. Where applicable, improvements to existing walking and cycling routes will only be implemented within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Further information relating to walking and cycling routes is detailed in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Climate	<p>Statement of Case</p> <p>1. Current Government Policy – key excerpts from relevant documents – most recent first</p> <p>1a. In October 2021 Publication of 'HM Government NET Zero Strategy – Together for our Planet'</p> <p>On page 152 the following statement was made committing to an ambitious target for journeys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the share of journeys taken by public transport, cycling and walking.</li> <li>• Support decarbonisation by investing more than £12 billion in local transport systems over the current Parliament.</li> <li>• Invest £2 billion in cycling and walking, building first hundreds, then thousands of miles of segregated cycle lane and more low-traffic neighbourhoods with the aim that half of all journeys in towns and cities will be cycled or walked by 2030. As announced in the Transport Decarbonisation Plan, we will create at least one zero emission transport city.</li> </ul> <p>On page 156 the following statement was made 'We cannot simply rely on the electrification of road transport, or believe that zero emission cars and lorries will solve all our problems. As we build back better from the pandemic, it will be essential to avoid a car-led recovery. Alongside road vehicle decarbonisation, we must increase the share of trips taken by public transport, cycling and walking. We want to make these modes the natural first choice for all who can take them. As more journeys are cycled or walked, and taken by public transport, the carbon, air quality, noise and congestion benefits will be complemented by significant improvements in public health and wellbeing.</p> <p>1b. On 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021 the Government Minister, Grant Shapps made a written statement to Parliament announcing that The National policy statement for national networks, the strategic plan for major road and rail schemes was to be reviewed for net zero commitments.</p> <p>The report contained the following statement 'The current National policy statement (NPS) on national networks, the government's statement of strategic planning policy for major road and</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments. During preliminary design the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review, detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>, was produced. This was produced in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 142 - Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review process</i> guidelines for highway schemes on motorways and all-purpose trunk roads.</p> <p>This report assessed comments from statutory consultation accompanied by a review of site surveys and user counts. Following this, the design of the Scheme was revised in a number of locations relating to walking and cycling.</p> <p>Details relating to changes made as a result of consultation as well as ongoing engagement undertaken by the Applicant is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) and Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments in relation to the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet scheme. The preliminary design improvements are summarised as follows, demonstrating how the Applicant has provided improved facilities above and beyond the existing routes affected by the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved connectivity from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent, across the A46 via new, at-grade crossing points at Brownhills Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Creation of a combined walking and cycling circular route between Brownhills Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout which would also provide improved access to Newark Showground</li> <li>• Signalisation of additional crossing points on a number of junctions, including Cattle Market and Winthorpe junctions</li> <li>• Reduction of the north-south severance by providing a new signalised crossing west of Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• Retention of existing routes where possible. Where it is unsafe to retain a route, a suitable diversion would be provided</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>rail schemes, was written in 2014 – before the government's legal commitment to net zero, the 10 point plan for a green industrial revolution, the new sixth carbon budget and most directly the new, more ambitious policies outlined in the transport decarbonisation plan.'</p> <p>1c. December 2014 from National Policy Statement for National Networks :- On page 36 the following statement is made about 'Good Design' 4.31 A good design should meet the principal objectives of the scheme by eliminating or substantially mitigating the identified problems by improving operational conditions and simultaneously minimising adverse impacts. It should also mitigate any existing adverse impacts wherever possible, for example, in relation to safety or the environment. A good design will also be one that sustains the improvements to operational efficiency for as many years as is practicable, taking into account capital cost, economics and environmental impacts.</p> <p>2. Recent Government decision.</p> <p>2a. 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022 – Consent Order for the A448 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Scheme. 33. Various parties proposed additional non-motorised user ('NMU', i.e. walker, horserider and cyclist) infrastructure to that included by the Applicant, as outlined at ER 6.4.244-6.4.249. The ExA considered that there are locations where apparent gaps in NMU provision appear (ER 6.4.250) and that there would be scope to improve various existing NMU links and to fill missing links in the public rights of way network (ER 21.2.33). However, the Secretary of State agrees with the ExA that the Applicant has justified the extent of the proposed NMU infrastructure and that although additional NMU infrastructure would be desirable to interested parties, there is no robust justification for its provision (ER 6.5.26). The Secretary of State agrees that the Applicant's approach in its Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment and Review, which focuses on providing for that which is lost as a result of the Proposed Development and that for which there is an evidenced need, accords with the NPSNN paragraphs 5.215 to 5.217 (ER 6.4.251). The Secretary of State accepts the ExA's conclusions that the Applicant could have gone further to accommodate requests to encourage and facilitate NMU use but that additional NMU provision is not strictly required (ER 6.4.254). Nevertheless, the Secretary of State accepts that there is an overall improvement compared to that which currently exists (ER 6.4.255) and the Proposed Development includes adequate NMU infrastructure (ER 6.5.27).</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Localised maintenance and lighting improvements on existing routes</li> <li>New walking and cycling route adjacent to the widened A46, allowing improved connectivity to Newark Showground, as well as the opportunity for future development</li> </ul> <p>Further information relating to walking and cycling routes is detailed in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments in relation to Good Design. Further information about how the Scheme has considered and complied with the <i>Roads to Good Design</i> can be found in the Scheme Design Report <b>(TR010065/APP/7.5)</b>.</p> <p>Further details of the Scheme's compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraphs listed above can be found in the National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Tables <b>(TR010065/APP/7.2)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>3. The existing routes affected by the changes to the trunk road interchange See attached appendix of images</p> <p>3a. Route 1 Newark to Winthorpe footway/cycleway At the Winthorpe end where it goes under the A46 the western end of the existing route is recorded as a footway/cycleway on the plans. The current route then goes along Winthorpe Road which has few motor vehicle movements because it only provides access to the kennels at the end. At the western end the route goes under the A1 which is recorded as a footpath on the plans, although it is not recorded on the Definitive Map. Image 1b shows the dismount sign and barriers. Both the Trent Valley Way (Long Distance Footpath) and The Trent Vale Trail (Sustrans Route 64 cycling and walking route) make use of the route.</p> <p>Our assessment based on Active Travel needs is that the existing route is a good quality route. Winthorpe Road is wide, green and level (Image 1a) plus is a virtually car free lane making it very suitable for a wide range of users.</p>	N/A	N	<p>It is not feasible to retain the full extent of the existing Winthorpe Road at this location. Retaining the existing Winthorpe Road would require the construction of two new overbridges, one to carry the new A46 alignment and one to carry the A46 diverge adjacent to the new Brownhills Roundabout. A new 3m wide walking and cycling route would be provided at ground level to connect into the existing walking and cycling infrastructure at both ends of Winthorpe Road as detailed in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>3b. Route 2 Existing shared use footway/cycleway along Lincoln Road to Drove Lane This route has not been identified on the Plans. Between the light controlled crossing at Brunel Drive and the footway/cycleway bridge over the A1 slip road, the route is recorded as a roadside footway and the bridge (Image 2a) is recorded as a footpath. Yet Google Streetview records cycle use (Image 2b) and joint use signage (Image 2c). The Plan then identifies the section of the route to the A17 correctly as footway/cycleway (Image 2d). The route going south-east to the distributions warehouses is signed as a FW/CW not a footpath as shown on the plan.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The existing route between Winthorpe Junction (Drove Lane) and Brownhills Junction is identified on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> as a dashed line type with intermittent 'x' markings. This line type signifies an existing route that would be removed. A new walking and cycling route would be provided adjacent to Newark Showground and would connect into Godfrey Drive and then to the A17, which will in turn preserve and improve the existing connectivity.</p> <p>The Consultee is correct that the route over the A1 slip road is a shared use walking and cycling route. The General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> have been updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The route identified in the comment as 'going south-east to the distributions warehouses is signed as a FW/CW not a footpath as shown on the plan' has been updated to reflect an</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					existing walking and cycling route line type on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> .
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>3c. Route 3 Coddington/Winthorpe public footpath</p> <p>This public footpath for most of its length passes through farmland (Image 3a). After the A17 was built the footpath crossed the road at grade, but that route was diverted to the access bridge to remove the at grade crossing on safety grounds. The route now goes through a development site at the junction of the A46 &amp; A17 and then crosses the A46 at grade. The route across the A46 is obstructed by steel crash barriers on the centre reservation (Image 3b).</p>	N/A	N	<p>Winthorpe Footpath FP2, which provides a connection from the vicinity of Lord Nelson pub to the A46, was historically a direct route from Winthorpe to the Newark Showground and beyond. This route was subsequently severed by the existing A46, however the Scheme would result in Footpath FP2 being connected to a new walking and cycling route which would form part of a new circular route, connecting Winthorpe Junction and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. Please refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> for details.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>4. Do the proposed changes improve Active Travel provision?</p> <p>i.e. The key criteria we have highlighted in the Secretary of State's Decision letter on the Black Cat scheme. The Examining Authority stated that the key criteria - replacing that which had been lost and evidence based need for improvements - had not been met but the Secretary of State decided it had. So does the A46 scheme meet Secretary of State's more stringent interpretation?</p>	N/A	N	<p>Since statutory consultation the Applicant has continued to discuss walkers, cyclists and horse-riders movements across the Scheme with relevant stakeholders. Consultation with the following stakeholders has taken place as part of the design stages on this Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Highways – Studies Team</li> <li>• National Highways – Operation Directorate Workshop</li> <li>• Nottinghamshire County Council</li> <li>• Newark-on-Trent - Active Travel Working Group</li> <li>• Newark-on-Trent - Local Access Forum</li> <li>• Active Travel England</li> <li>• British Horse Society</li> <li>• Sustrans</li> </ul> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>. This includes retaining and improving walking and cycling routes throughout the Scheme, as well as reducing severance between Winthorpe and south of the A46 via a crossing beneath the A46 alongside the A1 and new crossings provided over Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>The primary active travel design improvements are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved connectivity from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent, across the A46 via new, at-grade crossing points at Brownhills Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Creation of a combined walking and cycling 'circular' route between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout which also provides improved access to Newark Showground</li> <li>• Signalisation of additional crossing points on a number of junctions, including Cattle Market and Winthorpe junctions</li> <li>• Reduction of the north-south severance by providing a new crossing west of Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• Retention of existing routes where possible. Where it is unsafe to retain a route, a suitable diversion would be provided</li> <li>• Localised maintenance and lighting improvements on existing routes</li> <li>• New walking and cycling route adjacent to A46 allowing improved connectivity to Newark Showground, as well as the opportunity for future development</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant believes that the Scheme's walking and cycling provision does meet the criteria referred to by the Consultee of 'replacing that which had been lost and evidence-based need for improvements.'</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>4a. Route 1 Newark to Winthorpe footway/cycleway</p> <p>The diverted section of the route will go around the new roundabout, across a controlled crossing then alongside the slip road connecting the A46 to the A1 and A17 before looping back to the existing tunnel under the A46 which will be retained as a slip road. Our assessment of route 1 is that the quality of the route has been very significantly downgraded when judged on key indicators:- these are Direct, Safe, Green, Journey Time and where assessable whether the route is Complete (Image 7).</p> <p>What has been lost is</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme would make Route 1 approximately 105m longer than it currently is, adding around 2 minutes to the walking time. The Applicant considers that this increase in journey time outweighs the disbenefits that would be associated with a long subway beneath the new slip road and A46 dual carriageway embankment.</p> <p>The planting of new trees and other vegetation throughout the Scheme would offset the loss of any trees and other vegetation along Winthorpe Road and help to maintain a separation between the walking and cycling route and slip road. Tree and vegetation removal would be minimised as far as reasonably practicable. New planting would be provided along the route. Details of the landscape proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The distance travelled will be 250% further than the section it replaces. A person on foot travelling at 4.8km/h would take just 4mins to traverse the diverted section of the current route. On the diverted route it would take 10mins plus the time at the crossing. As a utility route this is a significant increase that would not be acceptable for motor vehicle users.</li> <li>The route would be in close proximity to a busy slip road with significant motor vehicle traffic flows. This will greatly increase the exposure to chemical and noise pollution from the motor vehicles.</li> <li>The green route along Winthorpe Road would be lost.</li> <li>The route would be less safe for many users, particularly children going to school.</li> </ul>			<p>In order to preserve the general connectivity of the existing route, and in the absence of a separate structure along the path of the existing Winthorpe Road, it is necessary to have the route running adjacent to the Brownhills Junction Link Road, under the new A46 overhead. A signalised crossing would be provided across the new Brownhills Junction exit slip road which would provide a safe crossing point for all users including children travelling to school.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4). This includes retaining existing routes throughout the Scheme.</p> <p>The amenity of this section was also assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment, including on this section of the footway.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>4b. Route 2 Existing shared use footway/cycleway along Lincoln Road to Drove Lane</p> <p>When the existing route is formally recognised in the Plan there will be little change to most of the route. However, the problem of crossing the A17 will still exist (Image 2e ). Verbally we have been told that a crossing will be provided through the planning system but this is dependent on planning application being made. With a long term recession predicted it could be a long time before the site is developed.</p> <p>The planned diversion proposed for the route to Drove Lane is a problem. The plan identifies it as a footway next to the new A17 carriageway. The existing path (Image 2e) next to the A46 is set far enough back from the carriageway to move users out of the intense slip stream of the bowessame way as an aircraft wing gets lift. In this case it is the lower mass walker or cyclist close to the vehicle who moves with the pressure gradient pushing them towards the vehicle. Just a few metres separation is sufficient to remove most of this effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This route has not been identified on the plans</li> <li>A controlled crossing is needed on the A17</li> <li>The section to Drove Lane needs setting back from the carriage way and needs to meet the standards for footway/cycleway set out in the Government's document LTN 1/20</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The new walking and cycling routes in this area are detailed on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>A new shared-use walking and cycling route would be provided adjacent to Newark Showground from Drove Lane and would connect into Godfrey Drive and then to the A17. No new walking and cycling route would be provided to run adjacent to the A17. The existing walking and cycling track provision (and the existing separation distance) alongside the existing A17 would remain.</p> <p>A signalised crossing would be provided on the link between the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts.</p> <p>All footpaths, including the footpath to Drove Lane will meet <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) would be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>The local authority is responsible for the un-signalised A17 crossing. Surveys showed that the existing unsafe crossing of the A46 has approximately 2-3 users per day. These users would now use the new signalised crossing between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts and then utilise the existing route that crosses the A17 where usage would only increase slightly. Should usage increase significantly in the future due to reasons not caused by the Scheme, then the local authority would need to install additional provisions which may include a signalised crossing.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>4c. Route 3 Coddington/Winthorpe public footpath</p> <p>It is very hard to evaluate a route that is currently obstructed by steel barriers on the central reservation (image 3b). There is a direct route across the road and the latest version of the Highway Code has explicitly stated that users on foot and cycle have been placed at the top of the user pyramid in terms of safety and other highway users should give way to them.</p> <p>However, we are not going to argue against diversion because traffic flows and speed will increase. But the new route is very much longer, 1.24km or 720% longer, and needs a controlled crossing on the A17 before it meets up with the retained section of the public</p>	N/A	N	<p>Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and Footpath FP3 provide a connection from Coddington to Winthorpe (referred to by the Consultee as route 3), historically crossing the A46. It should be noted that prior to this Scheme, Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 were already formally stopped up where they meet the existing A46 for safety reasons.</p> <p>A Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review is detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment (TR010065/APP/7.4). As part of this assessment, walking, cycling and horse-riding user surveys were carried out at this site in late March 2023. Findings are set out in Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-Rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>footpath. So for comparison purposes the route is incomplete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The route is 1.24 km longer - that is 16 minutes of extra walking. For a two way journey this is 32 minutes.</li> <li>The route would still need 2 crossing points on the A17, neither at this stage proposed as light controlled. This will involve crossing 4 lanes of traffic at grade which is the same as the current crossing point. The only improvement will be no crash barriers obstructed the route.</li> <li>The diversion takes the route further into the trunk road interchange, increasing exposure to chemical and noise pollution.</li> </ul>			<p>Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and found very low user counts (maximum of 5 users per day) were recorded for this survey period.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a footbridge crossing was ruled out at earlier stages of this Scheme due to environmental impact, user accessibility and significant associated cost.</p> <p>Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 would now be connected by new walking and cycling routes which would form part of a new circular route, connecting Winthorpe and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. A new signalised crossing would be provided on the link between the existing Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts.</p> <p>Prior to this Scheme, Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 (referred to as route 3 by the Consultee) were already formally stopped up where they meet the existing A46 for safety reasons. There is a route across the existing A46 dual carriageway which is unsafe and daunting for users. It is acknowledged by the Applicant that route 3 is significantly longer than the current unsafe route across the A46. The increase in distance is offset by the improvement in safety for user. Routing of route 3 beneath the A1 and across the A1 slip road bridge is safe, and therefore would encourage more users than the existing unsafe route.</p> <p>The local authority is responsible for the un-signalised A17 crossing. Surveys showed that the existing unsafe crossing of the A46 has approximately 2-3 users per day. These users would now use the new signalised crossing between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts and then utilise the existing route that crosses the A17 where usage would only increase slightly. Should use increase significantly in the future due to reasons not caused by the Scheme, then the local authority would need to install additional provisions which may include a signalised crossing.</p> <p>The new walking and cycling routes are detailed on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to exposure to chemical and noise pollution.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> has been completed in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> best practice guidelines. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 - Noise and vibration</i> establishes the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects of highways noise and vibration during construction and operation. The assessment concludes that there would be no residual significant adverse effects during the construction or the operation of the Scheme with mitigation in place.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, varying in form from barriers, bunds, or a combination of both due to physical constraints along the route, as well as low noise road surfacing. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i> guidelines. This chapter provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any of the human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Consideration of impacts on population human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape, and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income and access to green space, recreation. No significant effects on amenity or human health have been identified as a result of the Scheme. Furthering this, no amenity impacts on users of Public Rights of Way have been identified as a result of the Scheme.
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>5. Assessing 'that which is lost and that which is needed' – mitigation measures</p> <p>5a. Loss of utility - affects routes 1&amp;3</p> <p>By Utility we mean for making journeys to work, to the shops, to school, doctors and other places that users need to go frequently. For these journeys time is a major constraint. There is a significant loss of utility in these routes with longer journey times. This will deter people adopting Active Travel as their default means for transport locally, contrary to the Governments legal target for 2050, or even the 2030 target. However given the complexity of the trunk road interchange it is difficult to see how the routes could be shortened at reasonable cost. This is a case where mitigation measure are needed elsewhere to improve the Active Travel network overall.</p>	N/A	N	<p>Prior to this Scheme, Winthorpe Footpaths FP2 and FP3 (referred to as route 3 by the Consultee) were already formally stopped up where they meet the existing A46 for safety reasons. There is a route across the existing A46 dual carriageway which is unsafe and daunting for users. It is acknowledged by the Applicant that route 3 is significantly longer than the current unsafe route across the A46. Loss of 'utility' is not only related to journey time but also perceived safety and the routing of route 3 beneath the A1 and across the A1 slip road bridge is safe and therefore would encourage more users than the existing unsafe route.</p> <p>The Scheme would make Route 1 approximately 105m longer than it currently is, adding around 2 minutes to the walking time. The Applicant considers that this increase in journey time outweighs the disbenefits that would be associated with a long subway beneath the new slip road and A46 dual carriageway embankment.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (TR010065/APP/2.5) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010065/APP/2.4).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to mitigation measures being provided elsewhere on the active travel network. Building an inclusive scheme which improves routes for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected is an objective of the Scheme.</p> <p>The preliminary design improvements are summarised as follows, demonstrating how the Applicant has provided improved routes above and beyond the existing routes affected by the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved connectivity from Winthorpe to Newark-on-Trent, across the A46 via new, at-grade crossing points at Brownhills Junction and Winthorpe Roundabout</li> <li>• Creation of a combined walking and cycling circular route between Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout which also provides improved access to Newark Showground</li> <li>• Signalisation of additional crossing points on a number of junctions, including Cattle Market and Winthorpe junctions</li> <li>• Reduction of the north-south severance by providing a new signalised crossing west of Friendly Farmer Roundabout</li> <li>• Retention of existing routes where possible. Where it is unsafe to retain a route, a suitable diversion would be provided Localised maintenance and lighting improvements on existing routes</li> <li>• New walking and cycling route adjacent to A46 allowing improved connectivity to Newark Showground, as well as the opportunity for future development</li> </ul>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>5b. Amenity Value – affects route 1</p> <p>With the Trent Valley Way and Trent Vale Trail (Sustrans Route 64) passing along route 1 the current amenity value of this route is very important. Like the loss of utility above, no mitigations measures have been included in the plans to compensate for the loss of amenity.</p> <p>NPPFN Good Design Principles still require mitigation to be provided. Because the scheme has been restricted to the designated road corridor the density and extent of the trunk road interchange makes mitigation impossible inside the corridor. A simple solution exists - extending Newark BW6 (Image 5a) which follows the riverbank of the Trent through the town, but currently terminates just short of the A1 bridge over the River Trent. The bridge extends over the riverbank (Image 5b) and a field track runs through the single field to join Holme Lane at the Winthorpe Level Crossing (Image 5c). The owners also have land further</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Trent Valley Way and National Cycle Network Route 64 currently travel along the existing Winthorpe Road and under the existing A46. The new section of 3m wide walking and cycling route near Winthorpe Road would be approximately 105m longer than it currently is, adding around 2 minutes to the walking time. The Applicant considers that this increase in journey time outweighs the disbenefits that would be associated with a long subway beneath the new slip road and A46 dual carriageway embankment.</p> <p>Any loss to trees, vegetation and habitat as a result of the works in this area would be mitigated throughout the rest of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		upstream where the new bridge over the Trent will be built. This is an opportunity for the design team to engage with the landowners to leave in situ better access for anglers close to the new bridge in return for extending Newark bridleway 6.			<p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). This includes retaining existing routes throughout the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors, including walkers, cyclists and horse-riders routes and the new National Cycle Network Route 64. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment, including on the diverted National Cycle Network route.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that there is further loss of amenity that needs to be mitigated as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment with regards to Newark Bridleway BW6. Discussions have taken place during the A46 Active Travel Working Group with regards to improvements to routes outside of the Scheme's Order Limits, which includes Nottinghamshire County Council as a group member. The location where the existing Bridleway BW6 terminates at the A1 is not impacted by the Scheme and is outside of the Order Limits.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWA7-C	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Stakeholder engagement	5c. A second mitigation opportunity exists south of the A46. The existence of Coddington FP2 passing through the development site east of the A17, the existing bridge over the A17 (Image 6a) and the existing access bridge towards Beacon Hill under the A1 (image 6b) provide an opportunity to provide a new Active Travel route that would take users well away from the trunk road interchange plus provide a route with a much higher utility and amenity value. We realise that this is not in the remit of the design team, but needs evaluating with input from National Highways, Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highways Authority, Newark and Sherwood Council as the Planning Authority, the Active Travel Partnership and the landowners and parish councils through the Active Travel Working Group that is being set up.	N/A	N	Discussions have taken place during the A46 Active Travel Working Group with regards to improvements to routes outside of the Scheme's Order Limits (including the route mentioned by the Consultee). Coddington Footpath FP2, terminates south of Beckingham Road, which is over 2km away from the Order Limits and therefore not affected by the Scheme.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWD6-E	Introductory text	<p>Dear A46 Newark development team</p> <p>The response below is from the British Horse Society however our volunteers in the county may also respond at a local level.</p> <p>The British Horse Society is the UK's largest equestrian Charity, representing the UK's 3 million horse riders. Nationally equestrians have just 22% of the rights of way network and are increasingly forced to use busy roads to access them.</p> <p>Between 29.02.2020 – 28.02.2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,010 road incidents involving horses have been reported to The British Horse Society</li> <li>• 46 horses have died</li> <li>• 118 horses have been injured</li> <li>• 130 people have been injured</li> <li>• 45% of riders were victims to road rage or abuse</li> <li>• 80% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too closely to the horse</li> <li>• 43% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too quickly</li> </ul> <p>This illustrates the importance of protecting, improving and extending safe off-road provision will help to prevent these numbers from increasing in the future.</p> <p>DEFRA has recorded a population of 633 horses just in the immediate NG24 postcode area (2021). This equates to a contribution to the economy of £ 3,511,884 (BETA, 2019) therefore equestrians are significant stakeholders in the area and their access needs should be included in the plans.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Consultee including the reference to the population of horses in the NG24 postcode area.</p> <p>Existing equestrian routes would not be impacted by the Scheme once constructed. The surveys undertaken by the Applicant on the routes in and around the Order Limits showed that equestrian use of these routes was very low.</p> <p>Further details relating to the user count surveys are included within Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. This was produced in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 142 - Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review guidelines</i>.</p> <p>This report assessed comments from the statutory consultation and is accompanied by a review of site surveys and user counts. This count data provided a basis for route demand by users and the low equestrian count meant that no improvements to existing equestrian routes were required as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD6-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Infrastructure developments should provide opportunities to improve and extend the bridleway and byway network for the shared enjoyment of equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. Where there are plans for cycle lanes or walking and cycling paths, equestrians should be included to make these multi-user routes otherwise the scenario is horses sandwiched between MPV traffic on one side and cyclists on the other. NCN 64 route features in the plan; Sustrans have a Paths for Everyone commitment therefore the route would need to continue to be accessible for equestrians as this provides a valuable link to the bridleway network.</p> <p>Active travel does include equestrians. Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018: "We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders". According to BETA two-thirds of equestrians are women and Church et al (2010) found 37% of women who are horse riders are over 45 years of age and over a third would pursue no other physical activity.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to how equestrian routes should be considered as part of improvements included as part of the Scheme. Existing bridleway connectivity would be maintained as part of the Scheme and would not be impacted by the Scheme once constructed. The surveys undertaken by the Applicant on the routes in and around the Order Limits showed that equestrian use of these routes was very low.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, assessed the impacts of the Scheme on walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. It concluded that construction of the Scheme was likely to have a temporary significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 and Newark Footpath FP48#1 as a result of the 24-month diversions in place.</p> <p>The only walking, cycling or horse-riding route to be temporarily closed during construction is located alongside the River Trent at Windmill Viaduct. A diversion route would be included within the development consent application. Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>For an overview of the Scheme in this area, reference should be made to the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> submitted with the development consent application.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment regarding the National Cycle Network 64 route. The Scheme would impact the route between the existing A1 underpass along Winthorpe the Road to the existing underpass beneath the A46. The route would be diverted beneath the new Brownhills Underbridge and retains the current functionality for walkers and cyclists. Equestrians are not able to use this section of the route due to the constraints that exist at the existing A1 underpass. No changes are being made to the section of National Cycle Network 64 that is accessible to equestrians.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWD6-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>The existing bridleways that are impacted by the A46 plan, are Newark BW2,5,6. The BHS seeks assurance that any newly constructed paths would be integrated/physically linked with the existing public rights of way network where possible and clearly waymarked and recorded on either the definitive map or another publicly accessible map as appropriate. Any</p>	N/A	N	<p>All new public use paths would be integrated with Newark Bridleways BW2, BW5 and BW6 and would be clearly waymarked. Following construction completion, publicly accessible routes would be recorded on the definitive map or other publicly accessible mapping as appropriate. Any diversions, temporary or permanent, would be appropriate for equestrian</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		diversions, temporary or permanent, should be appropriate for equestrian use in terms of dimensions and surfaces and additional barriers/structures on the routes should be avoided.  <a href="https://www.bhs.org.uk/go-riding/leaflets-and-downloads/">https://www.bhs.org.uk/go-riding/leaflets-and-downloads/</a>  In addition, the scheme presents an opportunity to extend the bridleway network from the north-east end of Newark BW6 under A1 to Holme Lane using the track along Winthorpe rack.			use for the required period of the diversion.  The Applicant notes the comment with regards to Newark Bridleway BW6. Discussions have taken place during the A46 Active Travel Working Group with regards to improvements to routes outside of the Scheme's Order Limits, which includes Nottinghamshire County Council as a group member. The location where the existing Bridleway BW6 terminates at the A1 is not impacted by the Scheme and is outside of the Order Limits.
BHLF-559H-RWD6-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Stakeholder engagement	A WCHAR Assessment (GG142) should be undertaken as part of the planning process to 'facilitate the inclusion of all walking, cycling and horse-riding modes in the highway scheme development process from the earliest stage, enabling opportunities for new or improved facilities and their integration with the local and national network(s). This could include the creation and/or improvement of facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians that are separate from the highway.' Engagement with horse riders and other users at a local level should inform the plans and improve the off-road network and the interface with the road infrastructure.	N/A	N	During preliminary design a Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review has been undertaken, detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.4</b> ). This was produced in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges GG 142 - Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review process</i> for highway schemes on motorways and all-purpose trunk roads.  This report assessed comments from statutory consultation accompanied by a review of site surveys and user counts. This count data provided a basis for route demand by users. User counts within the report account for equestrian use in the area. Following this, the design of the Scheme was revised in a number of locations relating to walking and cycling routes. The report also identified a number of other improvements which will not be taken forward as part of this Scheme as they do not form part of the scope and are outside of the Order Limits.  Details relating to changes made as a result of consultation (including to walking and cycling routes) is detailed in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report ( <b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b> ).
BHLF-559H-RWD6-E	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Construction	Should the scheme progress, the construction phase of any major development is often the most disruptive. The BHS seeks to clarify how equestrians would be safeguarded during this phase, particularly where existing routes may be diverted along or over the road network and where MPV traffic will be in close proximity. If the construction schedule were to be outside of peak time, this may well coincide with times that equestrians are active on the bridleways and local highways network to reach the off-road routes. Appropriate signage would be advisable for construction and other traffic to warn them of equestrians and other vulnerable road users in the area. Maintaining safe access to the bridleway network during construction with equestrians in mind rather than only walkers and cyclists is essential.	N/A	N	The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ) as part of its Development Consent application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ) provides details of how the construction works for the Scheme would be phased and how the temporary traffic management measures, including closures and diversions, would be implemented for each phase of the Scheme.  The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. During construction, in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ) a Traffic Management plan would be put in place to minimise the health and safety risks to the local community resulting from construction operations, including the impacts of (intended and unintended) traffic diversions onto the side road network. The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ) submitted with the application.  In the event that an equestrian route would be directly impacted by construction activities, an example being Newark Bridleway BW2 adjacent to the River Trent, a temporary diversion route would be identified, with appropriate direction signage for the duration of the disruptive works in that area. At Nether Lock, signage would be provided to warn construction operators and vehicles of equestrians nearby.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Introductory text	Transport Action Network (TAN) would like to OBJECT to the proposed A46 Newark Bypass scheme. Our objection includes the following:	N/A	N	The Applicant notes the objection from Transport Action Network.
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Traffic forecasts	Traffic increases The proposed scheme would lead to increased traffic due to suppressed demand. This runs counter to the Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP) that requires a reduction in car usage, and to increase walking and cycling and the use of public transport. The long term solution to the transport problems at Newark is for National Highways and the Department for Transport to work together and invest in projects and policies that reduce traffic.	N/A	N	<p>The Scheme is included within the Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020 to 2025</i> programme of works which sets out the long-term strategic vision for the network. The Department for Transport's <i>Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025</i> aims to make the network safer and more reliable with a strong focus on the differing needs of road users whilst supporting the Government's wider plans for decarbonising road transport. In addition, National Highways' <i>Net Zero Highways: Our 2030/2040/2050 Plan</i> details the Applicant's strategy to reduce emissions across the network. This sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, include that '<i>net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset</i>' and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040.</p> <p>The traffic modelling does show an increase of traffic along the Scheme but some of the increase in traffic is rerouted traffic from the centre of Newark-on-Trent. With traffic removed from an urban area in the centre onto a more suitable A-road, it would make it a better environment for people to use active travel.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to reducing car use. Following statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to engage with active travel groups as part of the A46 Active Travel Working Group. This group includes representatives from Nottinghamshire County Council – Countryside Access Team, Sustrans, Nottinghamshire County Council – Local Access Forum, British Horse Society, Newark Sports Association, Cycling UK and Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers.</p> <p>The Applicant has included consideration for improvements to active travel within the Scheme objectives which is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Build an inclusive scheme which improves facilities for cyclists, walkers and other vulnerable road users where existing routes are affected'</li> </ul> <p>Further details relating to walking and cycling routes are detailed on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and Streets Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>). Changes made as a result of consultation (including to walking and cycling routes) and ongoing engagement undertaken by the Applicant are detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) and Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Climate	Climate change The construction of the scheme would lead to an extra 254,536 tonnes of carbon (15.11.4 of PEI report) when the UK urgently needs to reduce carbon emissions by 68% (on 1990 levels) by 2030. These emissions will all occur in the 4th carbon budget when we need to make the deepest and most urgent cuts.  As the scheme would increase traffic there would be an increase in user carbon emissions. In the opening year, the scheme would generate an extra 10,350 tonnes from extra traffic. The carbon emissions over the lifetime of the scheme (60 year appraisal period) are not given, which is unusual and unacceptable as it denies the public the ability to fully understand the full impact of the road proposal.  No assessment against local and regional carbon budgets is given in the PEI report, to show the significance of the emissions resulting from the scheme, as recommended by the 2022 IEMA guidance. Neither is there an assessment against the reductions needed, counter to the 2022 IEMA guidance. To fully inform the public about the impact of the scheme the full carbon emissions should be given, a comparison given with local and regional carbon budgets, and a comparison with the reductions needed at a national, regional and local level.	N/A	N	<p>The development consent application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010065/APP/7.1</b>) and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>), the need for the Scheme and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017).</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) reports a 44% reduction in emissions (143,887 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction compared to the baseline figure set during a previous stage of the Scheme and reported during the consultation (254,536 tCO<sub>2</sub>e).</p> <p>The Applicant is required under law (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017) and policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p> <p>The assessment over the 60-year period relies upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation set as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the construction of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation. This is secured through the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regards to the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidance. The assessment follows the methodology as per <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> as the standard required to be followed as the relevant guidance for a road project in the UK. <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i> aligns with the six assessment steps advised by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment advises that the crux of significance is 'whether it contributes to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory toward net zero'. The only relevant trajectory to net zero is that set by the national carbon budgets, which is the trajectory advised by <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 - Climate</i>: 'the assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in greenhouse gas emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.'</p> <p>As per <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i>, an assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Scheme emissions with the relevant United Kingdom Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget most in the future available for comparison.</p> <p>The greenhouse gas emissions assessment reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, concludes no likely significant effect, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 – Climate</i>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Biodiversity	Biodiversity The proposed scheme would lead to the permanent habitat loss and fragmentation at two Local Wildlife Sites including Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark and Great North Road Grasslands (9.11.3 of PEI report). The scheme would also lead to the loss of veteran trees.	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> concludes that in relation to habitats, the Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. The compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Sites. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified. Further information regarding mitigation measures are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Loss of any habitat of conservation value within the Local Wildlife Sites would be replaced like-for-like (in condition) as a minimum requirement providing a greater area than was lost or enhanced where possible detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides an assessment of the potential arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme. Since the statutory consultation, the design of the Scheme has developed meaning that no veteran trees are expected to be lost.
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Landscape and visual effects	Adverse visual impact There will be a very large adverse visual impact with a 8 metre high flyover at the town's cattle market, right by people's homes at Sandhills Park Road. The A1 flyover would be 10.9 metres high and would impact on the setting of this historic town. When the height of vehicles travelling on the road is also included the impact will be even greater. At Winthorpe there would be ten lanes of traffic by the village.	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects), of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the landscape and visual impacts associated with the Scheme including potential impacts upon Sandhills Park and the village of Winthorpe. Details of the landscape design proposals are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> and detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the colour of the design of the Cattle Market Junction to reflect finishes on existing structures such as that of Smeaton's Arches just to the north of the new junction. Details of this can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Planting of trees and shrubs has also been considered and incorporated wherever feasible. This would help break up the visual mass of the structure, with planting softening the built form and aiding screening over time, particularly from properties such as those in Sandhills Park, affording near distance views and considered likely to experience significant residual effects at Year 15 (2043, 15 years after Scheme opening) given the scale of the junction in close proximity to the receptor group. Further information on landscape proposals for the Scheme is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Views from Winthorpe village towards the existing road network are well screened by existing mature vegetation. Mitigation to reduce any adverse effects would include substantial additional planting, particularly to the west, between Lowwood area and the A1 in order to extend the parkland/woodland characteristic of Winthorpe Conservation Area, and to provide a strong visual buffer in this location. Any views of the new bridge should be reduced to glimpse views. Landscape bunds along the Scheme would be planted and aid screening of the A46 over time as well as providing noise mitigation to residents in Winthorpe. With mitigation in place, it is considered that the impact on Winthorpe Conservation Area would be reduced to moderate or slight. Further detail is provided within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Long views of Newark-on-Trent are largely screened by trees, both by those along the roadside and by those in the distance. Nonetheless, the grade separation may block views of the Church on the approach to Newark-on-Trent. The Castle is visible once south of the roundabout and therefore views of the castle on the approach into Newark-on-Trent would remain unaffected.</p> <p>Given that wider views of the conservation area are screened on the approach to Newark-on-Trent by trees, existing road infrastructure and modern development, it is not felt that there would be a wider visual impact on the setting and significance of listed buildings and Newark Conservation Area.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Air quality; Noise and vibration; Population and human health	Air and noise pollution As there will be an increase in traffic, there will be an increase in air and noise pollution. There will be a particularly adverse impact on the local population at Winthorpe village, due to the ten lanes of traffic.	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> details the noise assessment undertaken for the Scheme. Mitigation in the form of noise bunds, low noise road surfacing and acoustic barriers have been incorporated into the Scheme design; the locations of these are detailed in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and are shown where appropriate in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Suitable noise mitigation measures would be provided along the Scheme, and these include barriers, bunds, or a combination depending on the physical constraints associated with the section of the route. In addition, low noise road surfacing would be implemented along the length of the Scheme. These measures (excluding low noise road surfacing) are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. Requirement 16 of the Draft Development Consent Order</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p><b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b> secures the noise mitigation needed for the operation of the authorised development.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>• Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>• At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>• Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>• From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Three landscape bunds at a height of 2.0-2.5m would be included north of the A46 section between the A1 and Winthorpe Roundabout which would provide noise screening.</p> <p>This would yield no significant adverse effects for noise and vibration.</p> <p>Low noise surfacing is generally considered to be an effective mitigation measure for traffic moving at speeds above ~75 km/h. Low noise surfacing would be provided throughout the A46 as part of the Scheme design. While cumulative levels from all highways including the A1 have been considered as part of the assessment, it is understood the A1 does not currently incorporate low noise surfacing and control of noise emission from this source is outside the scope of the Scheme. Impacts from the Scheme in Winthorpe would generally be negligible due to the proposed mitigation and proximity to the A1, which in noise terms would have a negligible change in traffic.</p> <p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers both construction and operational phase effects and has been prepared in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 - Air quality</i>. The <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> contains information about current design standards relating to the design, assessment and operation of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads in the UK. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides information on the potential impacts and assessment of the effects of the Scheme on receptors sensitive to air quality changes around the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of emissions from construction traffic is not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given that the maximum heavy-duty vehicle annual average daily traffic and overall annual average daily traffic movements are below the screening criteria presented in <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> of 200 and 1,000 respectively.</p> <p>The assessment also confirms that temporary traffic management measures would not have a significant effect in air quality, this is due to the temporary nature of overnight road closures and temporary reductions in speed limits not significantly affecting emissions. Impacts from construction dust would be mitigated using best practicable means such as wetting down, and effects are not predicted to be significant. The mitigation measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>Human health receptors have been chosen within 200m of the air quality affected road</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>network, in line with <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>, which is the standard used for all highways in England. The affected road network is made up of the roads which meet <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i> traffic scoping criteria i.e. 200 and 1,000 movements per day respectively for heavy duty vehicle and total daily traffic, as well as changes in speed band and carriageway alignment of at least 5m.</p> <p>Winthorpe village is located over 200m away from the affected road network and therefore has not been included in the assessment. However, human receptors along the A46 and A1 on the outskirts of Winthorpe, which are within 200m of the affected road network, have been included in the assessment. The concentrations at these receptors, which are predicted to experience the highest predicted concentrations or the greatest changes, are all below the air quality objectives.</p> <p>The highest annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the vicinity of Winthorpe along the A46 and A1 is predicted to be 29.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Do Something scenario (with Scheme). The greatest changes in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub>, at modelled receptors along the A46 and A1 outside of Winthorpe, are predicted to be a decrease of 2.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and increase of 0.5µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>During operation of the Scheme there are not predicted to be any exceedances of the (NO<sub>2</sub>) or particulate (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) air quality objectives (40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>) at any human health receptors within the study area and changes in air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. As part of the human health assessment, it considers the impact of the Scheme on amenity, which builds on the noise, air quality, and landscape and visual assessments to identify impacts on human health.</p> <p>An amenity effect is identified where two or more significant residual (post-mitigation) effects, stemming from changes in noise, air quality and/or landscape and visual amenity, combine at the same location/receptor. Significant adverse amenity effects have not been identified as part of this assessment.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Landscape and visual effects	Landscape character There will be a significant adverse impact on landscape character in this rural landscape due to the concrete flyovers and viaducts. The proposed borrow bits for the flood mitigation would particularly impact on the rural landscape at Kelham, Averham, Farndon and Brownhills.	N/A	N	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) provides an assessment of likely effects upon landscape character and visual amenity both during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme has identified measures to mitigate adverse effects such as planting along the length of the route including tree planting, shrub and grassland. Where landscape bunds would be provided alongside the Scheme, these would also be planted with trees and shrubs, which over time would further aid screening of the Scheme. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas are designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas includes the essential mitigation measures, which can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>Non-Technical Summary (NTS)</p> <p>The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) is a long document, is overly complicated and full of technical jargon, and does not include key information and figures. For instance, the key figures buried in the PEI report on carbon emissions are not present in the NTS. The total figure of emissions caused by the construction of the scheme (254,536 tonnes) is not included in the NTS. The estimated carbon increases from the increased traffic are not included, despite being quantified in the climate chapter of the PEI report. We do not believe that this document meets the criteria for a non-technical summary and needs to be rewritten.</p>	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments with regards to the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> available at statutory consultation. The Applicant considers that consultation materials (including the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i>) were produced in a way that was accessible to consultees covering a range of reading comprehension levels. Materials were produced following the Applicant's standard style guide and Tone of Voice guidance as well as in line with the UK Government's <i>Consultation Principles</i> and best practice communications standards.</p> <p>Whilst a level of technical understanding was required to fully understand some of the information contained within the consultation materials. A glossary of terms was included within the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> which provided definitions of any technical language.</p> <p>In the <i>Non-Technical Summary</i>, information was laid out in a way that the Applicant considered to be easily understood, showing the potential impacts during the construction stage and the operational stage for all environmental disciplines including climate. The <i>Non-Technical Summary</i> provided a summary of the findings of the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> where the technical information (including the preliminary carbon figures could be found).</p> <p>Staff, including technical experts, were available at consultation events in order to explain and answer questions about technical aspects of the Scheme. In addition to this, the Applicant had a dedicated Scheme email address available for questions to be sent to as well as a Customer Contact Centre telephone number that could be used to ask questions about the Scheme and information provided during statutory consultation.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWDS-B	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	Overall, the consultation needs to be rerun with proper information on carbon emissions and other impacts. It also needs to be presented in an easily digestible format with a non-technical summary that is not full of technical jargon.	N/A	N	<p>A variety of materials were produced for the statutory consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's <i>Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements</i> and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Introductory text	<p>Please find below a collective initial response from the CLRA addressing key areas that will potentially affect all residents during and after the construction of the extension to the A46 Newark Bypass. This document is in response to the statutory consultation that takes place by the National Highways and [redacted] regarding the project and after taking all the provided information into account and attending several of the consultation events, (as a group at the Farndon Memorial Hall event 8th November 2022). The Association also held a group meeting on 30th October 2022 where our collective views were aired and discussed, and our list of initial points of concerns and objections were mooted by the group.</p> <p>As an opening gambit, the CLRA collectively are all in favour of the project and agree that the development will serve Newark, its residents, and the greater surrounding area positively. Offering a much-needed solution to the longstanding issue of major traffic congestion in the area and all the knock-on effects that this problem has and continues to bring to the area. That said, Cress Lane and the residents therein are the closest conurbation to the project and as such feel that there are a significant number of issues that need to be overcome and mitigated to ensure that they are treated and compensated fairly, due to the negative elements that such a close proximity major development will bring.</p> <p>These issues (but not limited to) are listed below:</p>	N/A	N	The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments and addresses the concerns raised by the Consultee below.
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Landscape and visual effects; Biodiversity; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>ENVIRONMENT IMPACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the trees and copse area that acts as a barrier to current A46 and the potential removal thereof of mature/ historical trees. (how much? and what replanting is planned?)</li> <li>the destruction of wildlife habitat and the displacement of species living in this area i.e. Roe Deer, Muntjac Deer, Badgers, Bats, numerous bird and insect species etc.</li> <li>Increased flooding risk to the Cress Lane paddock and the wider area.</li> <li>Foliage and tree planting after completion. Sapling and semi-mature tree percentage?</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The retention of existing vegetation is being sought wherever possible. Where vegetation is removed, replacement planting would be provided to aid landscape integration and visual screening with the use of trees and shrub planting. The Scheme design has been developed to limit vegetation clearance to the west of the A46 adjacent to Crees Lane properties and limit impacts upon biodiversity. The landscape and biodiversity mitigation have been developed to limit adverse impacts wherever practicable. Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) summarises the specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as bats, badgers and birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. If a potential significant effect is identified in relation to an ecological receptor, mitigation has been applied in line with the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts where possible.</p> <p>The impacts upon deer have not been assessed as part of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) as they are not a protected species by law. However as outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1), directional planting has been designed to mitigate mammal vehicle collisions. The assessed all mammals are protected species however all mammals would benefit from directional planting. The indicative location of directional planting is detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (TR010065/APP/6.2).</p> <p>The Crees Lane Paddock would be partially utilised during the construction of the Scheme, and flood risk mitigation measures would be put in place so that there is negligible increase in flood risk as a result of the Scheme. Details of the flood risk mitigation measures are provided in the Flood Risk Assessment, found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3) outlines trees to be retained and associated protection measures during construction, as well as those trees suggested for removal to accommodate the Scheme.</p> <p>Some mature tree planting would be considered as part of the planting specification. However, smaller stock has greater resilience to transplanting, often establishing more successfully than mature planting. It also tends to can grow quicker and can outgrow larger stock if growing conditions are favourable.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Noise and vibration	<p>NOISE POLLUTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increase in noise due to the addition of other lanes to the highway closer to resident's houses. What barrier type/ height will be used?</li> <li>Noise created during construction of the project (working hours etc)</li> <li>Vibration, noise and damage mitigation</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>A noise assessment has been carried out for the Scheme. Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) sets out where mitigation is considered necessary to reduce the impact of noise and further details of the noise assessment that has been undertaken.</p> <p>Permanent noise barriers at a height of 2m from the road surface (or from local ground) would be provided at various locations along the Scheme. These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge</li> <li>Along the southbound entry slip from Cattle Market Roundabout extending part way down the west side of the Great North Road south of Cattle Market Roundabout</li> <li>At the southbound entry slip road at Brownhills Junction</li> <li>Along the northbound carriageway from the Brownhills Junction to the Esso Service Station</li> <li>From the Esso Service Station to the Winthorpe Roundabout at the northern extreme of the Scheme, transitioning at the midpoint from barrier at the roadside to barrier on the crest of the adjacent bund</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the mitigation being provided in the location of Windmill Viaduct, the existing eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise.</p> <p>Construction noise mitigation would be present in the form of site hoardings, plant control and where necessary, adjustment to plant usage and working hours. These mitigation measures can be found in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Landscape and visual effects	<p>LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased light from additional traffic. Proposed mitigation?</li> <li>The change in the angle of traffic with the new lanes and late-night traffic with dipped/ full-beam headlights.</li> <li>Construction lighting (when and where)</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The existing eastern and new western parapet of the Windmill Viaduct would have a solid infill panel to reduce noise. These measures would help prevent light pollution, reducing it below levels currently experienced.</p> <p>Temporary task lighting would be required for night work that takes place during the construction period. Temporary tower lighting would be placed to illuminate the task area only, however it is possible that some residents may still be able to see the light source. Further detail on lighting can be found in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Construction	<p>CONSTRUCTION ACCESS ROAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What will be required temporarily?</li> <li>What route this will take (options)</li> <li>What damage/ destruction of trees/ habitat will take place and what mitigation thereof?</li> <li>What will be required permanently?</li> <li>Security aspects as the area has had historical issues with plant and machinery theft</li> <li>Will there be a restriction for residents entering/ leaving Cress Lane?</li> <li>Emergency Vehicle 24hour access</li> </ul>	N/A	Y	<p>Temporary possession of land would be required around the existing pedestrian underpass and for a vehicle holding area in the land on the approach to Crees Lane. Information relating to this is detailed in the Land Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.2</b>).</p> <p>Following the comments received to the statutory consultation, the access for works to take place at Windmill Viaduct has been removed from Crees Lane and construction traffic would now enter the site down a ramp approximately 100m north of the Farndon Underpass, thereby reducing the impact on Crees Lane residents.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation, the land required at the rear of the properties on Crees Lane has been amended to reduce the impact on land and vegetation. In addition, a retaining wall would be built from the existing pedestrian underpass approximately 100m north. This allows the existing highway drainage ditch to be retained, with no land required to the west of this, allowing the vegetation to be retained.</p> <p>Information relating to changes made as a result of statutory consultation can be found in Chapter 5 (Applicant's response to consultation feedback) of the Consultation Report (<b>TR010065/APP/5.1</b>).</p> <p>The drainage design has been amended so the requirement for a new pond has been removed and the Scheme would not affect the boundaries of planting along the rear of the Crees Lane properties.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures would be introduced from Farndon Roundabout to Windmill Viaduct along the northbound verge in the form of noise barriers. In addition, the existing</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>eastern and new western parapet would have a solid infill panel which would help reduce noise on Crees Lane.</p> <p>Access to Crees Lane would be available at all times for residents and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Further information relating to the design of the Scheme in this location can be found in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Road layout	<p>COMPLETED PROJECT MAINTENANCE ROAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What would be the permanent access road for ongoing maintenance of the new road/ bridge?</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The route would be the same as it is for the existing bridge. Access would be gained from Farndon Road via FP3 and then via the access road next to the River Trent.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Air quality	<p>PM2.5 PARTICULATE MITIGATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is being put in place to mitigate the potential increase in particulates in the short or medium term with potential tree/ vegetation removal?</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> undertakes an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on air quality. The relevant air quality objective thresholds which must be met are 40ug/m<sup>3</sup> for NO<sub>2</sub> and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 20ug/m<sup>3</sup> for fine particulates (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). During construction and operation, the concentrations of the above pollutants across the human health receptors are expected to be below these air quality objective thresholds.</p> <p>The maximum modelled concentration for NO<sub>2</sub> in the opening year of the Scheme is predicted to be 31.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>. The maximum modelled concentration for PM<sub>10</sub> in the base year of the Scheme is predicted to be 28.9ug/m<sup>3</sup>. Although PM<sub>2.5</sub> was not modelled in the air quality assessment (as detailed in Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, when considering the maximum modelled road contribution of PM<sub>10</sub> in the base year of 4.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, combined with the maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentration of 9.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> across the study area, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold of 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is not exceeded. Considering PM<sub>2.5</sub> is also a constituent part of PM<sub>10</sub>, vehicles emission factors, and therefore the existing road contributions, for PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be even lower than those for PM<sub>10</sub>. As well as this, PM<sub>2.5</sub> background concentrations are expected to continue falling in the future. The predicted effects from the operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are therefore concluded to be not significant, so no mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>During construction, mitigation measures would be in place to prevent significant air quality effects, as outlined below.</p> <p>The construction mitigation measures in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or cover, seed or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washes</li> <li>Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The Principle Contractor would be responsible for ensuring the above mitigation is adhered to through daily inspections across the construction site.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>The predicted effects from operation of the Scheme on local air quality at all human health receptors are concluded to be not significant. The assessment does not consider tree/vegetation cover and its effects on air quality in any modelled scenario as this is not a requirement of <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 – Air quality</i>, which promotes a conservative assessment as to the interaction between air quality and vegetation and is still subject to ongoing research.</p> <p>By excluding the effects of vegetation from the Do Something modelled scenario, the assessment predicts a worst case with Scheme concentrations. As such, no mitigation measures are required in order to prevent significant adverse effects in relation to human health receptors. Similarly, no operational monitoring is required as operation of the Scheme is compliant with air quality objective thresholds. The Scheme does not affect the UK's reported ability to comply with the <i>Air Quality Directive</i>, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Construction; Air quality	<p>CONSTRUCTION DUST AND DIRT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What mitigation is being put in place to deal with the impact of dust/ dirt on the roads and in the air? (obvious seasonal considerations)</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>The mitigation measures for construction dust in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid double handling of materials</li> <li>Minimise height of stockpiles and profile to minimise wind-blow dust emissions and risk of pile collapse</li> <li>Locate stockpiles out of the wind (or cover, seed or fence) to minimise the potential for dust generation</li> <li>Ensure that all vehicles with open loads of potential dusty materials are securely sheeted or enclosed</li> <li>Provide a means of removing mud and other debris from wheels and chassis of vehicles leaving the site. This may involve a simple coarse gravel running surface or jet wash, or in the case of a heavily used exit point, wheel washes</li> <li>Maintain a low speed limit on site to prevent the generation of dust by fast moving vehicles</li> <li>Damp down surfaces in dry conditions</li> <li>Water to be sprayed during cutting/grinding operations</li> <li>All vehicle engines and plant motors to be switched off when not in use</li> <li>High dust generating activities within site compounds should be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible</li> </ul> <p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for ensuring the above mitigation is adhered to through daily inspections across the construction site.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>REDIRECTION OF THE NEWARK-FARNDON-NEWARK FOOTPATH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the proposed rout of the temporary footpath?</li> <li>What elements are being put in place to ensure adherence? Ensuring Cress Lane remains secure, safe and private.</li> <li>What will be left in place after completion?</li> </ul>	N/A	N	<p>Following comments from the targeted consultation, the temporary diversion of the Newark Bridleway BW2 would be for use by equestrians only. Walkers and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane, which they would be directed to through the use of signage.</p> <p>There are no design proposals to modify Crees Lane.</p> <p>After construction completion the existing walking and cycling route would follow the same general alignment from Farndon to Newark-on-Trent, travelling underneath the A46 as per the current conditions.</p> <p>Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWZW-5	Stakeholder engagement	The CLRA would like to request a specific Cress Lane meeting with [redacted] and Highways representatives both in attendance to address the above issues impacting the residents directly. As mentioned, the CLRA are in overall favour of the project, however, they are concerned that the construction of a new three-span bridge for the extension of the northbound carriageway will have significant impacts on their daily lives both in the short and longer term. Notwithstanding just the points above, there is the issues of 'Blighting' on Residents' properties and the impact this will have on current houses values, the potential future residual values and the impact on mortgages, insurance etc. We look forward to your response and working with all parties to come to agreeable resolution to all of the above and enjoying all of the benefits this finished project will bring to the area.	N/A	N	<p>The Applicant has met with members of this community group and discussed the content of the plans relating to the statutory consultation and the targeted non-statutory consultation.</p> <p>Provisions for compensation are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: '<i>Your property and compensation or mitigation for the effects of our road proposals</i>' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RW72-W	Biodiversity	<p>We have assessed the A46 Newark Bypass Preliminary Environmental Information Volume 1 report and we find the scope of protected species surveys being progressed and those proposed to be satisfactory. Mitigation proposed for species informed by survey work is also satisfactory. We look forward to reviewing the results of outstanding/ongoing surveys and associated mitigation when available. The results of the surveys should provide current information on the ecology of the proposed development site to support the ecological impact assessment to be included in the Environmental Statement. We would expect that once the ecological baseline for the site has been fully assessed, any ecological receptors that are likely to be significantly impacted by the proposed development will be identified. The completion of outstanding ecological surveys for protected species is required to understand the full effects of the scheme on the biodiversity of the area. Upon completion of the required surveys and establishment of the baseline, the potential significant adverse effects should be assessed for all receptors. Paragraph 9.12.1 states 'Monitoring requirements will be determined within the ES once significance of effects have been fully assessed'.</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, such as birds, but also to inform and shape the Scheme design. If a potential significant effect is identified in relation to an ecological receptor, mitigation has been applied in line with the mitigation hierarchy to avoid impacts where possible. This hierarchical approach dictates that the following system is applied in identifying and applying mitigation, in line with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 - Environmental assessment and monitoring</i>. This sets out the requirements and procedures that should be followed when assessing, reporting and monitoring the environmental effects of projects in line with the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoidance and prevention of the effect: alternative design option or avoidance entirely</li> <li>• Reduction of the effect: application of specific mitigation to lessen the magnitude or significance of an effect</li> <li>• Remediation of the effect: application of measures to offset the effect</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that during construction, of the assessed ecological receptors, residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>). Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>).</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>To summarise, the following general measures or principles will be adhered to during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Ecological Clerk of Work will be employed to provide advice and monitor adherence to mitigation measures</li> <li>• A pre-works search by the Ecological Clerk of Work prior to vegetation clearance/brush removal to check for notable faunal species such as hedgehog and toad resting places</li> <li>• Toolbox talks on protected species and control of invasive species are to be delivered prior to construction</li> <li>• Staged grass cutting and directional clearance of vegetation</li> <li>• Application of a Pollution Prevention Plan and Erosion Prevention and Sediment Management Plan for works near watercourses</li> <li>• The timing of works to avoid periods of flooding or sensitive fish spawning seasons</li> <li>• Best practice measures to minimise impacts on mammals such as covering excavations over night or adding mammal ladders within excavations</li> <li>• Restrictions on night working or lighting</li> <li>• Use of dust suppression or screening methods to minimise dust exposure and dispersal</li> </ul>
ANON-559H-RW72-W	Biodiversity; Construction	<p>We are concerned about the damage and direct loss of habitat within Local Wildlife Sites (LWS).</p> <p>Paragraph 9.7.1 states 'the scheme has the potential to cause damage and the loss of habitats within LWSs. Nine LWSs, designated as SINCS, are located within draft Order Limits. Construction activities could increase the risk of a pollution incident, such as contaminated</p>	2C	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) concludes that, in relation to habitats, the Scheme would result in the unavoidable direct loss of habitats within four Local Wildlife Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy Farm Railway Strip, Newark</li> <li>• Great North Road Grassland</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>land run-off or spills/leaks of oils and fuels and increased airborne pollutants. This has potential to impact the primary reason for the sites' designation through degradation of habitats and therefore of the protected species which they support.'</p> <p>In addition, works could also result in siltation and increase water turbidity of riparian and aquatic habitat within draft Order Limits.</p> <p>Within Paragraph 9.13 Conclusions it is stated that 'Overall, during the construction phase significant effects are currently anticipated for Newark Trent Grassland LWS, Great North Road Grasslands LWS and, Dairy Farm Railway Strip Newark LWS due to the loss of habitat within LWSs required for construction.' and 'based on the current design and understanding of baseline conditions, during construction a significant adverse effect is anticipated for lowland fen due to habitat loss. A significant adverse effect is anticipated due to the loss of veteran and notable trees.'</p> <p>In addition, Paragraph 9.11.3 states 'The scheme will result in temporary habitat loss and fragmentation at LWSs in works areas associated with construction including Newark Dismantled Railway and Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway'. Details should be provided in the Environmental Statement (ES) on how the areas of temporary habitat loss will be restored. Consideration should be given to enhancement of the wider area of LWS where appropriate during restoration works.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.11.3 states: 'It is currently anticipated that approximately 0.95 hectares of LWS habitat will be lost as a result of the scheme, primarily from the Great North Road Grassland (approximately 0.83 hectares lost)'. We are of the opinion that the mitigation hierarchy is pertinent at this stage of the proposal. The four steps of the mitigation hierarchy are avoid, minimize, restore and offset.</p> <p>We note that the conclusions of the preliminary assessments as well as ongoing ecological surveys will feed into further design development to help shape and inform the avoidance, mitigation and compensation proposals that are developed. We encourage the HA to consider further options to reduce impacts on LWS.</p> <p>LWS are at the very least of county importance and some in the county may be of SSSI quality but not designated as such due to the SSSI designation process, that is, only examples of habitats are designated as SSSI, not all sites that meet the SSSI criteria. We are of the opinion that these sites should not only be protected but actively conserved and maintained in favourable management in perpetuity through an appropriate funding mechanism. Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection through the NPPF due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. The East Midlands has the lowest coverage of SSSIs in England and Wales (approximately 3% compared to approximately 7% nationally). Nottinghamshire has approximately 1.9% coverage of SSSIs, with the largest being in the Sherwood area and the southern Trent Valley. LWS therefore provide a critically important reservoir of irreplaceable critical natural capital. These sites also form the basis of colonisation resources, should opportunities arise for landscape-scale habitat re-creation in the future. In this context, the proposed destruction or degradation of LWS is all the more unacceptable. Mitigation and compensation habitats must be backed up by legal agreements or statute.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newark (Beet Factory) Dismantled Railway</li> <li>• Old Trent Dyke</li> </ul> <p>The compensation planting design comprises habitats equivalent to those lost within the Local Wildlife Site for which the site was designated or habitats which supports fauna for which the site is designated for. The compensation planting would be located as close to the source of loss as possible to create a continuation of the habitats equivalent to those lost from the Local Wildlife Sites. Some of the habitats lost within the Local Wildlife Sites are not habitats for which the Local Wildlife Site was designated. The location of Local Wildlife Site habitat compensation is detailed in Figure 8.4 (Compensation Planting for Loss of Local Wildlife Site Habitats) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> and the species mix is detailed in the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) are identified for the Great North Road Grassland Local Wildlife Site only. Once operational, of the assessed ecological receptors, there are no residual significant effects (following application of mitigation) identified.</p> <p>Loss of any habitat of conservation value within the Dairy Farm Railway Strip and the Great North Road Grasslands Local Wildlife Sites would be replaced like-for-like (in condition) as a minimum requirement providing a greater area than was lost or enhanced where possible as detailed in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b> along with indicative compensatory planting to be finalised with Natural England.</p> <p>Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible, has been a key principle within the design from the outset, so the Applicant has worked with stakeholders (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) to develop a biodiversity and landscape mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p> <p>To summarise, the following general measures or principles will be adhered to during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Ecological Clerk of Works will be employed to provide advice and monitor adherence to the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan and construction mitigation measures</li> <li>• A pre-works search by the Ecological Clerk of Works prior to vegetation clearance/brush removal to check for notable faunal species such as hedgehog and toad resting places</li> <li>• Toolbox talks on protected species and control of Invasive Non-native Species to be delivered prior to construction activities</li> <li>• Staged grass cutting and directional clearance</li> <li>• A Pollution Prevention Plan and Erosion Prevention and Sediment Management Plan will be prepared as detailed in commitments RDWE2 and RDWE3 of this First Iteration Environmental Management Plan. Techniques could include the use of oil booms on the River Trent during construction of the new outfall</li> <li>• Outfall construction (integrated into an existing headwall) on the River Trent (adjacent to Nether Weir) to be undertaken between mid-June and October. This will allow higher winter flows to wash silt through the system before the next coarse fish spawning season (15 March to 15 June)</li> <li>• Use of best practice measures set out in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (to be produced as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to</li> </ul>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>minimise impacts on mammals such as covering excavations over-night, or securing mammals ladders within excavations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restriction of night working, where possible along the majority of the working width to minimise the requirement for artificial lighting to be used</li> <li>• Use task and directional lighting with cowls to minimise light splay to the River Trent and its banks outside of the works area</li> <li>• Use low noise/vibration piling set-up and a slow start-up, where possible, for all night works and sheet piling adjacent to the River Trent</li> <li>• Use of screening, dust suppression measures, vegetating or covering of spoil heaps to minimise dust exposure and dispersal, with focus on areas in the vicinity of Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul> <p>The Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan will detail the working methodology for protected and notable species during construction. Where necessary, protected species licences would be applied for and a Method Statement would be provided in the licence package which would need to be adhered to.</p>
ANON-559H-RW72-W	Road drainage and the water environment	We are supportive of the proposed floodplain compensation. The areas have the potential to deliver a wide range of services and benefits to create better places for people and wildlife. SuDS will maximise wildlife, water and landscape benefits for people and support wider ecosystem function at the same time. Natural Flood Management measures in the river channel or on its bank or floodplain seek to improve the ability of rivers to manage those flood waters. This is achieved by restoring a more natural hydrological response and regime, for example, by slowing flows (e.g. re-meandering or the use of instream structures) and reducing excessive supplies of fine sediment, or by increasing the potential for the floodplain to store water (e.g. by decreasing the confinement of the river and reconnecting the floodplain).	2G	N	<p>Farndon East and Farndon West would be provided as floodplain compensation area sites. Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas, including the essential mitigation measures can be seen on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>The main habitats to be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees. Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided.</p> <p>For these areas in particular, public access is not provided in order to maximise the biodiversity value of the areas (reducing stresses presented by public use, such as dog walking) and also to reduce health and safety risks posed by ponds (former borrow pits which would hold standing water).</p>
ANON-559H-RW72-W	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Sustainable Drainage Scheme</p> <p>Paragraph 9.10.3 states 'There are a number of opportunities for further embedded mitigation that will be considered during the development of the ongoing scheme design. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where technically feasible, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be implemented to effectively manage pollution risk associated with road run-off.</li> <li>• Drainage systems should be designed in accordance with industry standards, with particular emphasis on appropriate pollution prevention and control measures. 'NWT can see a range of ecological benefits through the creation of a Sustainable Drainage Scheme (SuDS). If designed appropriately, a SuDS scheme can incorporate pollution control measures, attenuate runoff volumes and can provide real biodiversity benefits. The scheme should be designed following good practice criteria. Where space allows, multiple basins of varying size and shape are preferable. Shelves and shallow graded sides, undulating surfaces and convoluted edges provide greatest wildlife value. A species-rich grass and flower mix appropriate to soil conditions and the locality should be sown. Dead wood habitat piles for invertebrates, reptiles and small mammals will also add further biodiversity interest. Spoil can be used to vary ground levels to maximise structural and habitat diversity.</li> </ul>	2H	N	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems would be provided throughout the Scheme where possible, including a system of swales, basins and ponds, of varying sizes, depths and shapes. Details of the Drainage strategy can be seen within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The mitigation for the Scheme would include appropriate mitigation measures to attenuate surface water run-off from the additional hard surfacing, such as attenuation basins, the locations of which are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The attenuation basins have been designed to the Sustainable Drainage System manual standards and follow the design proposed by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (multiple varying sized basins, shelves where possible, Sustainable Drainage System and nature-based solutions where possible).</p> <p>These have been sized to attenuate the run-off from the highway and discharge into the nearest watercourse at a restricted rate, agreed by Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority, including the Slough Dyke and The Fleet. Details of surface water conveyance can be found within Section 4.2.18 (Conveyance) within Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Attenuation basins have been sized to the upper limit of the MicroDrainage Quick Storage Estimate requirement (a conservative approach). Additional calculations and a detailed drainage model, to ensure the attenuation volume is adequate, would be undertaken during the detailed design stage. Water quality assessments (using the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool) have also been undertaken to assess the impacts on all watercourses where outfalls are proposed within the Scheme (including the Slough Dyke and The Fleet). The proposed drainage system adequately treats the run-off from the highway to 'pass' the water quality assessment.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
					<p>Mitigation to prevent potential pollution spill events, including the installation of Penstocks, have been incorporated in the design at the base of each swale which would be closed by the emergency services in case of a pollution event. These would not be opened until the polluted water and sludge have been removed from the swales. The swales would be formed with impermeable material to act as a barrier to infiltration. A Spillage Risk Assessment has been undertaken for all outfalls throughout the Scheme (including those to the Slough Dyke and The Fleet) and all outfalls 'Pass' the assessment - the risk of spillage is adequately mitigated for within the drainage system.</p> <p>Such mitigation measures are outlined in the Register of Actions and Commitments in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) and will be implemented during all works. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>Throughout evolution of the design, opportunities to enhance Sustainable Drainage System areas for biodiversity have been included in the Scheme, with reference to the <i>Urban Wetland Design Guide</i> (produced by Enfield Council). Landscape proposals shown in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) include permanently wet ponds and associated reedbeds within attenuation areas, the sowing of species rich grassland adjacent to ponds and the addition of log and brush piles around ponds, to act as refugia/hibernacula. A variety of pond sizes would be provided and opportunities for varied pond depths and shapes would be explored further at detailed design stage.</p>
ANON-559H-RW72-W	Biodiversity	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>We note that biodiversity net gain calculations will be conducted with the aim of determining precise areas of loss for each habitat and informing proposals for appropriate habitat enhancement and creation.</p> <p>The NPPF (2021) is pertinent here. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. To ensure biodiversity net gain is achieved through the project we recommend reference to DEFRA's Biodiversity Metric.</p> <p><a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5850908674228224">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5850908674228224</a></p> <p>The scheme should aim to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG. In Nottinghamshire there is an aspiration to achieve 20% BNG and we therefore encourage HA to aim for the higher figure. The generally accepted principle is that it should be delivered as close to the point of impact as possible, as this is likely to be the best outcome for nature but is also the most socially equitable outcome. A BNG Plan will be required as part of a planning application, which will show what units of habitat will be created and how they will be managed over 30 years, whether on or off the development site. This Plan should be translated into a final version, likely to be called a Management and Monitoring Plan, that will form part of the legal agreements for the site. Where BNG delivery is offset onto land outside the development site boundary, there will usually be the need for a Conservation Covenant to be in place to secure that land. As a rule, a replacement area should be similar in terms of ecological features and ecological functions that have been lost or damaged, with appropriate management can reproduce the functions and conditions of those ecological features. Compensation should be provided as close as possible to the location where effects have occurred and benefit the same habitats and species as those affected. The delivery of compensation measures, including biodiversity offsets, is likely to involve access to land, or land purchase, outside a scheme footprint and a commitment to long-term management through legal agreements. The HA should seek to identify large blocks of land adjacent to existing features of biodiversity value that could be used for habitat creation as ecological compensation for the losses in this scheme, most appropriate would be arable reversion to species-rich grassland,</p>	2H	N	<p>The Applicant has worked to maximise biodiversity improvements across the Scheme and has worked in collaboration with stakeholders to develop the habitat provision. Such stakeholders include, but are not limited to, the local authority county ecologists and landscape architects, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. The Scheme would achieve a net gain in habitat units within the Order Limits of the Scheme with the exception of the areas of impact and compensation for lowland meadow. Further information is contained within Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>).</p> <p>Throughout evolution of the design, opportunities to enhance biodiversity have been included in the Scheme, with reference to the <i>Urban Wetland Design Guide</i> (produced by Enfield Council). Proposals shown in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) include permanently wet ponds and associated reedbeds within attenuation areas, the sowing of species rich grassland adjacent to ponds and the addition of log and brush piles around ponds, to act as refugia/hibernacula. A variety of pond sizes would be provided and opportunities for varied pond depths and shapes would be explored further at detailed design.</p> <p>The biodiversity net gain assessment contained in Appendix 8.14 (Biodiversity Net Gain Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) has sought to align with local priorities set out in the Biodiversity Opportunity Map (produced for the Trent Valley through Nottinghamshire, highlighting opportunities for habitat creation, enhancement and linkages for woodland, acid grassland and heathland, grassland, and wetland) where possible.</p> <p>When considering compensatory grassland creation for losses around Cattle Market Roundabout, this has been located as close as possible to habitats affected. This aligns with Opportunity 374 to link grasslands in the Kelham/British Sugar area.</p> <p>Other habitat creation would contribute to opportunities 346 (wetland creation on the floodplain) and 347 (wetland creation linked to dualling of the A46 at Newark-on-Trent) by involving new wetland creation in the Trent floodplain and along the road corridor. This would include new grazing marsh, ponds and reedbed as well as the drainage network which has been designed to maximise its ecological value.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		new broadleaf woodland or wet grassland in the Trent Valley. Funds for the management of those habitats in perpetuity should also be secured, otherwise they cannot be considered to be a suitable mitigation or gain for the biodiversity lost.			The Scheme would also involve new woodland creation along the Scheme route to compliment Opportunity 525 (relating to urban tree planting in Newark-on-Trent). Some of this would be achieved through woodland creation on site but given the high area ratios of loss in comparison to the compensation areas required, it has been necessary to consider other options. The Applicant is seeking to enhance an area of approximately 8 hectares of off-site existing woodland, with a landowner willing to enter a voluntary long-term agreement. The intention is to carry this out at Doddington Hall which is outside the district but within the same National Character Area.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Response form question number	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
ANON-559H-RWVD-E	Road drainage and the water environment	I have concerns if the fields currently being used for farming are lost to flood alleviation. There are areas which are currently not used for anything such as the fields approaching the cattle market roundabout and adjacent to the sugar factory	2B/2G	N	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment has been conducted and a mitigation scheme for the floodplain compensation area has been developed that is described in Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding, which includes floodplain compensation areas.</p> <p>The Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation areas are designed to fit sympathetically into the surrounding landscape with shallow slopes back to existing ground levels. The design philosophy of the floodplain compensation areas is to ensure land can continue to be used by the landowner. This would be possible for much of the land at the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, where the infrequency of flooding means that the land can be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Farndon West would also provide essential mitigation in the form of habitat creation, enabling multiple ecological benefits. The design principles for these areas are to create high distinctiveness habitats that complement local biodiversity whilst also being appropriate to floodplain conditions and allow high confidence in successful establishment. The environmental design for these areas include the essential mitigation measures which can be seen in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>. The main habitats that would be provided within Farndon West include a network of ponds and reedbeds surrounded by marsh and wet grassland with individual trees, as well as an area of floodplain grazing marsh, together with fringe areas of species-rich grassland and planting of individual trees.</p> <p>Habitat in the form of marsh and wet grassland around the edges of the lake in Farndon East would also be provided. The Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> show all land that would need procuring and managing for the Scheme.</p>
ANON-559H-RWVD-E	Road drainage and the water environment	The river floods more now than it ever did and this project should be used to reduce the likelihood of that flooding	2C	N	<p>Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b> provides details of the Flood Risk Assessment that has been conducted. A mitigation scheme of floodplain compensation areas has been developed that is described in the Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding.</p> <p>Floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East are embedded within the Scheme design to account for any loss of floodplain due to the Scheme. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, the results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

## N.6 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(a) - Prescribed Consultees

N.6.A: Canal and River Trust

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5U-K	Consultation - general	<p>Thank you for your consultation in relation to the proposed updates to the A46 scheme at Newark.</p> <p>Having assessed the proposed changes to the proposals, the Trust do not wish to make comment as our assets are not directly impacted by the updates.</p> <p>Our previous comments in relation to parts of the scheme that do impact the Trust would still stand, however.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or require further information.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has responded to the previous comments made and these can be found in Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWDN-6.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5T-J	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above mentioned amendments to the DCO and please find our response detailed below.</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>We have no further comments to add to those already provided from our specialist teams other than some general comments from our flood risk team which are detailed below.</p> <p>Flood risk comments The Environment Agency continues to work closely with the design team through attendance at the monthly Drainage and Flood Risk Steering Group meetings. The revised draft order limits include areas that have been discussed in detail within the Steering Group meetings.</p> <p>Due to the extensive spatial extent of the proposed development, the additional areas do not change the overall strategic approach to the assessment and mitigation of flood risk of the scheme. Detailed hydraulic modelling is being continually developed to ensure the impact of the proposals on flood risk to the surrounding area is accurately understood and represented.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling will be reviewed by the Environment Agency and a pragmatic approach taken when considering the third party impacts of the scheme. This approach is particularly relevant to the proposed floodplain compensation area close to the village of Kelham, which is part of the additional area included in the revised draft order limits. Initial hydraulic modelling undertaken by the design team indicates very limited benefits of a floodplain compensation area at Kelham and the Environment Agency will consider its position on this matter as further evidence is presented.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments and welcomes the ongoing review and dialogue in relation to the flood modelling.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment which can be found within Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) setting out a mitigation scheme to ensure that the Scheme does not increase the susceptibility of local receptors to flooding. This mitigation scheme has a reduced footprint to that shown during statutory consultation due to design refinement, with floodplain compensation areas at Kelham and Averham, Farndon West and Farndon East. Detailed hydraulic modelling of the floodplain has been undertaken with a range of storm events simulated, in consultation with the Environment Agency's Evidence and Risk Team, results of which have informed the Flood Risk Assessment.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5B-Z	Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested; Construction; Winthorpe Roundabout	<p>While our Parish Council does not have any specific observations on the recent Targeted Consultation undertaken by National Highways on the A46 Newark Bypass, we would request some clarification with regard to Area Plan 5. My minute is below and I would be grateful if you could respond to the second paragraph:</p> <p>'Members noted the additional consultation received on the A46 dualling. It was noted that the scheme boundary was proposed to be altered to include additional land for temporary use as a vehicle holding area during construction, as outlined in Area Plan 6.</p> <p>In terms of the alteration to the proposed scheme boundary to enable an alternative route to be used as a temporary bridleway diversion during the construction, the Clerk was asked to seek further information as Area Plan 5 appeared to who the bridleway diverting down a private driveway, into a locked car park (on both sides) that would restrict usage.'</p> <p>I have previously submitted concerns regarding the removal of the Winthorpe roundabout as part of the proposals for the A46 Bypass Scheme.</p> <p>There is an established rookery that has been on the roundabout for decades and should not be lost. Please advise what mitigation measures you are taking to protect this colony.</p>	N	<p>Regarding the Consultee's comments relating to Newark Bridleway BW2, the temporary diversion of the bridleway would be provided to avoid temporary severance of the existing Public Right of Way route during the construction of the new bridge over the River Trent. The diversion would only be in place for the duration of the construction works in this area. After completion of the construction works, the existing Bridleway alignment would be restored. This diversion is expected to have a significant impact on users during the 24-month diversion. Temporary diversions can be found in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>The design has evolved since the statutory consultation to minimise impacts on the rookery and much of this habitat would now be retained within the centre of the new roundabout. There would not be a significant effect on the rookery, but a slight adverse effect based on the removal of suitable habitat outside of the breeding season, the availability of other suitable habitat in the surrounding areas during construction and the planting of new woodland which (once established) would support the rookery.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies indirect impacts to breeding birds including disturbance from construction activities (noise, visual and vibration). Further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme, are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5D-2	Landscape and visual effects	<p>Looking at the maps presented I feel there is very little impact on existing woodland within that area though there are some small liner woodlands alongside the development that show on the NFI (National Forest Inventory), and looking at your concept maps I assume these will not be touched so at this point I have no issues.</p> <p>Just to point out that any new planting above 0.5 hectare will need an Environmental impact assessment done and submitted to ourselves for and opinion.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee and can confirm that the following areas of woodland recorded on the National Forest Inventory are impacted by the Scheme. These features are presented in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) as G045, G046, G047, G049, G045, G078, G080, Pruning G126, G114, G116, T137, G138, G142, G143, G140, G270, G287, G244, G247, T655, G883.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's comments regarding new planting above 0.5 hectare, the total approximate area of woodland block planting (excluding hedgerows and individual trees) is 13.4 hectares. New woodland blocks over 0.5 hectare would be provided.</p> <p>Information regarding the landscape proposals for the Scheme is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>).</p> <p>These proposals have been accounted for within the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY52-G	Landscape and visual effects; Consultation - general	<p>Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on the updates to this proposal. As the Governments forestry experts, we endeavour to provide as much relevant information to enable the project to reduce any impact on irreplaceable habitat such as Ancient\semi natural Woodland as well as other woodland.</p> <p>We have looked at the updates and note that the woodland shelter belt beside the A46 near the junction with the A1133, between the A46 and the Newark &amp; Notts Showground is still within the order limits, also there are other woodland shelter belts included in the new order limits. Specifically an area on the access to [redacted] and another small area along Hargon Lane, which may be affected by the creation of the walking and cycling route.</p> <p>We would refer you to our previous comments submitted on 15th September 2022 regarding deforestation, compensatory planting and biodiversity net gain.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes that this response from the Consultee was the second response to targeted consultation received from the Forestry Commission alongside Response ID reference BHLF-AUZX-HY5D-2.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee regarding woodland shelter belts and can confirm that the following areas of woodland recorded on the National Forest Inventory would be impacted by the Scheme. These features are presented in Appendix 7.4 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (<b>TR010065/APP/6.3</b>) as G080 and G078 (woodland shelter between the A46 and the Newark Showground), T655 and G883, H013, H018, G019, G016 and H017 (Hargon Lane).</p> <p>Comments received from this Consultee to the statutory consultation have been responded to in Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) against Response ID reference ANON-559H-RW6N-R.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5W-N	Cultural heritage	<p>Thank you for your letter of 15th March 2023 as targeted (re)consultation to us. We are Historic England (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) Government's advisor on the historic environment. I remain your point of contact for this project and communications should be addressed specifically to [Redacted] our regional casework address and copied to my personal email [Redacted].</p> <p>As you will be aware we are in ongoing direct pre-application discussions with your contractor MottMac/Skanska alongside our local government curatorial colleagues.</p> <p>We are currently reviewing material prepared in respect of the assessment of heritage impacts; much work remains to be done by your contractor.</p> <p>On the basis of the as yet limited information available the proposed additional order limits appear likely to cause significant environmental effects in respect of the historic environment, including but not limited to; impacts upon buried Ice-Age landscape remains and traces of human activity in the vicinity of Farndon, later prehistoric activity more widely, the landscape of the Civil War action and sieges around Newark and setting impacts upon various designated assets. We are in dialogue regarding geoarchaeological assessment methodologies, past landscape modelling and their integration with other forms of archaeological investigation. This work also needs to be integrated with a structured understanding of setting impacts upon designated heritage assets, the landscape of the Trent and Devon was until relatively recently highly dynamic and considerable sophistication is required to effectively manage risk through this project. We note the potential for increased impacts in respect of the following assets (without out prejudice to other impacts already identified or which may emerge):</p> <p>[Redacted] is a Grade II* listed building The Church of St Michael Averham is listed at Grade I Averham Moat and Enclosure is a Scheduled Monument The Church of St Wilfred, Kelham is listed at Grade I Kelham Hall is listed at Grade I</p> <p>The Ice Age landscape and Late Upper Palaeolithic at Farndon Fields is an undesignated asset of demonstrable equivalent importance to a Scheduled Monument</p> <p>The significance of the numerous designated heritage assets associated with the Civil War in and around Newark, which share a complex archaeological and historic landscape setting</p> <p>I will be writing to [redacted] shortly in relation archaeological assessment methodologies and progress in this regard, I will also be responding positively to their request for additional dialogue in respect of setting effects. Overall an holistic approach is required to assessment of heritage impacts in which different classes of evidence and forms assessment are integrated to effectively address matters at a landscape scale, such that the design and mitigation solutions can be effectively deployed in a timely manner proportionate the importance and sensitivity of heritage assets.</p> <p>We are concerned that ancillary aspects of the scheme such as habitat creation, screening, flood compensation, borrow pits works compounds and drainage installation etc are not fixed in design or committed to with other stakeholders ahead of the necessary archaeological and heritage assessment being in place to guide their location design and detailing.</p> <p>We will continue to engage positively with MottMac/Skanska through the pre-application process, please let me know contact details for National Highways' client-side heritage consultants.</p>	N	<p>The <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</i> produced for statutory consultation provided detailed information on the environmental assessment that had been undertaken at that stage, enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at the time of development. In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) which accompanies the development consent application, provides required information on the likely significant environmental effects of the description of the Scheme for which consent is now sought.</p> <p>The principles of the mitigation hierarchy have been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design. In areas where avoidance has not been possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant adverse effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate adverse effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment considers the impacts on heritage assets mentioned in the Consultee's response as well as Kelham Hall and The Church of St Michael Averham listed buildings and Averham Moat and Enclosure scheduled monument and known archaeological assets.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Visual impacts from the property mentioned in the Consultee's response have been captured within viewpoint 51. Views south-east from the grounds of Kelham Hall representative of views for visitors to Saint Wilfrid's Church and Kelham Hall have been captured within viewpoint 58 within the assessment. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>). The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's concern around the landscapes surrounding the Scheme including The Ice Age and Late Upper Palaeolithic landscape, this area has now been removed from the Order Limits of the Scheme, following this consultation. The design of the Scheme shown during statutory consultation was preliminary and allowed for feedback to be provided by consultees and subsequent design changes made were necessary to reduce impact on the archaeological resource.</p> <p>A full assessment has now been completed is presented in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Continued discussions have been held with the Consultee and they have been reassured of the approach taken and that the design has taken into account the sensitive historic environment and that the Scheme is working to high professional standards. Geoarchaeological work has been undertaken and further archaeological work is underway. The stakeholders have been involved in these processes and have approved the work that has been undertaken. Continued engagement will occur with the Consultee if necessary, throughout the Scheme's development.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5X-P	Consultation - general	<p>I refer to your letter regarding the Proposed Development. This is a response on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET).</p> <p>Further to our response dated 10th November 2022 NGET has no additional comments. I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime, we look forward to receipt of further information and consultation relating to potential impacts on our assets.</p> <p>The information in this letter is provided notwithstanding any discussions taking place in relation to connections with electricity customer services.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Consultee has been engaged by the Applicant. Continued engagement in relation to potential impacts on the Consultee's assets will occur as necessary, throughout the Scheme's development.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5N-C	Biodiversity; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Apologies for not sending this sooner. Natural England have reviewed the documents you have provided, there will not be any impacts on designated sites or landscape so we have no objections to the proposed changes. I would like to note that [redacted] went through these changes on the last Environment technical group which demonstrated how they would reduce the impact on LWS and priority habitats which we welcome.</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 17 March 2023 which was received by Natural England on 17 March 2023</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England have reviewed the following documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Draft Order Limits Plan</li> <li>• Revised Draft Order Limits – Area Plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area Plan 1 – [redacted] access road</li> <li>Area Plan 2 – Winthorpe roundabout</li> <li>Area Plan 3 – Hargon Lane</li> <li>Area Plan 4 – Kelham/Averham floodplain compensation area</li> <li>Area Plan 5 – Farndon bridleway (BW2) temporary diversion</li> <li>Area Plan 6 – Farndon temporary construction holding area</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The proposed changes will not impact any designated sites or landscape. Although the changes are unlikely to impact protected species we are continuing to provide advice through our discretionary advice service to National Highways on protected species. Should the proposal change, please consult us again. If you have any queries relating to the advice in this letter please contact me on [Redacted].</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Consultee has been engaged by the Applicant, and will continue to be engaged in relation to potential impacts on the Consultee's assets throughout the Scheme's development, as necessary.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HYFG-P	Consultation - general	Further to our telephone conversation and your email of 2 May 2023 as below, Royal Mail considers that there will be no significant change to the risk profile of this scheme to its operations as a result of the proposed changes. So Royal Mail will not be submitting any representations during the extended targeted consultation period ending today. However, Royal Mail will continue to monitor this scheme and will review it again at DCO submission (which we note from the PINs website is scheduled for Summer 2023) when more Transportation Impact information will be available.	N	The Applicant notes this comment from the Consultee following the targeted consultation.  With regard to the Consultee's comment relating to transportation impact information, further information is available within the Outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/7.7</b> ). This outlines how the Applicant has considered and proposed mitigations to minimise impacts on the Consultee's business operations during construction of the Scheme.

N.6.I: Secretary of State for Transport

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-559H-RWUY-2	Consultation – general	This is to confirm that the Secretary of State acknowledges and notes your letter dated 26th May 2023 in relation to a statutory public consultation and targeted consultation for the A46 Newark Bypass scheme. The Secretary of State has no comments on the consultation.	N	Comments noted by the Applicant.

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5V-M	Consultation – general	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17 March 2023 inviting the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) to provide comments relating to the above Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID.</p> <p>On this occasion, we have no additional comments to provide at this stage of the NSIP application.</p> <p>We note that we have replied to earlier consultations, as listed below, and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence:</p> <p>Request for Scoping Opinion 10/10/2022 Public Consultation: Section 42 12/12/2022</p> <p>The additional information supplied does not cause any change to UKHSA's responses above.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has shown regard to the Consultee's response to the statutory consultation within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWD3-B. The Applicant's responses to the Scoping Opinion can be found in Appendix 4.1 (Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses) in the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5A-Y	Land ownership; Road layout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Road drainage and the water environment; Air quality; Biodiversity; Construction	<p>Many thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes identified in the Targeted Consultation received on the 15th March and as Chair of Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council, I am responding to the Targeted Consultation as follows:</p> <p>[Redacted] access road</p> <p>From the plans provided it appears that the change is largely the extra take of land from [redacted]. If this is the case, then we believe this directly affects [redacted] the owner of [redacted] and therefore is not something which directly affects the Parish as a whole and as a result we have no comment on this part of the consultation. However, as a wider question, we would ask is the proposal to provide the access to [redacted] and [redacted] by establishing an exit to the A1133 between the village entrance and the roundabout?</p> <p>Winthorpe roundabout</p> <p>We understand that the road layout and design is something which you are experts in and therefore the suggested changes must be to improve traffic flow and therefore reduce the time for traffic to pass through the roundabout. But to comment on this proposed change fully we would require clarification on how the roundabout will function, especially with regard to traffic lights and lane marking.</p> <p>We do not believe that the proposed cycle/footpath from Hargon Lane to the roundabout and then across to Drove Lane/The Showground is needed. We believe this over complicates the roundabout and will ultimately slow traffic, we believe unnecessarily. The proposed footpath restoration to the showground at the Friendly Farmer roundabout will facilitate village access to the showground and onto Newark and we believe this is perfectly adequate access. The installation of this new footpath/cycleway is unnecessary and is also an unnecessary additional expense to the project. We would ask you to reconsider this proposed change.</p> <p>Hargon Lane</p> <p>Obviously, the relevant plan shows an additional impact on an area of land taking up part of the South end of the existing Hargon Lane, but there is no explanation of what this would mean or what the impact would be on the residents in that part of the village. In particular what if any are the proposals for any physical construction work on Hargon Lane or direct changes to the area itself?</p> <p>In addition to these comments, we would also make the following comments:</p> <p>We are encouraged to see the road scheme contributing to some of the aims of the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan which is currently in final draft format. It would be helpful to know what the height of the embankments and bridges is in the zone between Winthorpe and Newark.</p> <p>We see the installation of the access track and the reconnection of Winthorpe footpaths 2 and 3 between Winthorpe and Coddington as very positive.</p> <p>There is still no suggestion of speed restrictions on the new road up to the Winthorpe roundabout. We would like to see what the impact and remediation of environmental concerns such as noise, water, pollution, wildlife is throughout the project.</p> <p>As the project gets nearer, we would like to understand your thinking on how the construction phase of the project is anticipated to affect the Parish and what remedial actions you are considering to lessen the impact. As I'm sure you understand this is something which is worrying many residents and we need to work together on this to ensure the least negative impact occurs.</p> <p>Following recent discussion with residents we would like to discuss the potential for the whole of the A1133 between the new Winthorpe roundabout and Langford Village to become a 40mph zone. Obviously, this would also require discussion with and agreement from the highways team at Nottinghamshire County Council and we are beginning this dialogue in the next few weeks. Your support on this would be very helpful as over recent years we have experienced several near misses and a small number of incidents at the junction onto Gainsborough Road into Winthorpe</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee and carried out further engagement with them following the targeted consultation to discuss the issues raised.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments relating to the property and access road, a two-way access from the A1133 would be provided and the existing access from the A46 would be closed. The change to the Order Limits only affects the property and not the Parish. The Order Limits have been changed to move the access to the property further south along the A1133 approximately 50m from Winthorpe Roundabout. This is shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments relating to the Winthorpe Roundabout, the roundabout copes well with more traffic flow passing through it than it does in the Do Minimum scenario. More information on this can be found in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Road marking and signal stop lines are shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The walking and cycling route around the east side of Winthorpe Roundabout to the Showground entrance is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide a route to the Showground from Winthorpe</li> <li>• provide a safe crossing point for cyclists crossing the A46 to and from Drove Lane and the A1133</li> <li>• provide a circular walking route that was requested by many of the Winthorpe residents</li> </ul> <p>This is further detailed in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>The walking and cycling crossings would not slow down traffic as the traffic signals required for the roundabout operation will provide natural breaks in traffic to allow the crossings to operate.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments in relation to Hargon Lane, the Order Limits extend into the western verge of the lane in order to provide powers to add additional space, should this be required at the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>Construction works would only occur on the section of the lane added to the Order Limits if this was needed, as the Applicant intends to retain it as a shared use road.</p> <p>If the lane does need to be widened, this would be done to the west by approximately 2m. The Applicant would utilise grasscrete or similar material such that vehicles can safely drive across this to pass pedestrians and cyclists using the lane. Any construction work undertaken would allow users to be safely guided through the work area.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's support for the Scheme's contribution to the <i>Langford Neighbourhood Plan</i>.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's query relating to the height of the embankments in the zone between Newark and Winthorpe, the embankments on the approach to the A1 crossing are up to 10.8m high from existing ground level. The A1 bridge height has been set as low as possible to cross the A1 and the road level is approximately 9.6m above the A1.</p> <p>Regarding the speed restrictions on the new road up to the Winthorpe Roundabout (Friendly Farmer Link Road), a speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified. The proposed speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> and illustrated on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.8)</b>. The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement for this section of road would be provided in the form of average speed cameras to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments in relation to making the area between the Winthorpe Roundabout and Langford village a 40mph zone, speed restrictions along the existing A1133 and Drove Lane are the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highways authority, and not the Applicant. The concerns raised by the Consultee would need to be raised with Nottinghamshire County Council directly.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		from the A1133. I'm sure you are already aware but the speed limit through Langford Village is already 40mph.		<p>Consideration of impacts on population and human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. The assessment takes into consideration accessibility, land requirement implications and effects on amenity (which considers the co-occurrence of noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual amenity impacts). The human health part of the assessment considers a range of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors that influence human health status. This includes neighbourhood quality, access to services, health and social care, social capital, employment and income as well as access to green space and recreation.</p> <p>The assessment assessed all locations within 500m of the Order Limits, which include the village of Winthorpe. No significant impacts were found on population and human health receptors in this area, barring land take from agricultural farms and access to routes for walking, cycling and horse-riding.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> which accompanies the development consent application. The Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme. Chapter 8 considers the construction and operational impacts on biodiversity, Chapter 5 considers the impacts on air quality, Chapter 11 considers noise and vibration, and Chapter 13 considers road drainage and the water environment. A Flood Risk Assessment has also been completed as part of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures required to be implemented before and during construction, and during operation of the Scheme are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>. The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>

## N.7 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(b) - Local Authorities

N.7.A: Nottinghamshire County Council

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY56-M	Road drainage and the water environment; Cultural heritage; Stakeholder engagement; Road layout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Flood risk comments</p> <p>The proposed changes do not affect surface water proposals. However, as Lead Local Flood Authority we continue to liaise with the design team to ensure the final proposals do not put the development at risk of flooding nor does it increase the risk of flooding to the surrounding areas. We expect our involvement to continue through the lifetime of the design process to ensure our Flood Risk considerations are met.</p> <p>Archaeology comments</p> <p>We are increasingly concerned at the manner in which the A46 scheme is being progressed. Concerns are mainly around the archaeological issues, but more also generally about who is and who is not involved and the process of dealing with the environmental issues.</p> <p>At the last Technical Environmental Working Group meeting, Wednesday 12th April, we were informed that it was intended to apply for the DCO in June or July. Detailed plans were now in place and shown to us of tree and shrub planting, drainage swales, borrow pits and balancing ponds. We were told the red line area had decreased in size. However, there has as yet been no archaeological evaluation by trial trenching. This is scheduled to take place in June or July.</p> <p>Geophysical survey has revealed two significant Roman/Iron Age settlements. One end of the scheme has an internationally significant Late Upper Palaeolithic site, where the earlier A46 scheme discovered (eventually) in situ scatters of flint tools. The archaeological potential of this scheme is massive. This cannot be emphasised enough.</p> <p>Since the first meeting in September, we have been pressing for geoarchaeological work, to look at the floodplain deposits of the Trent which are key to working out where the archaeology will be.</p> <p>We have just finally been presented with a proposal for undertaking this work, which is completely inadequate, and to which we will be rejecting. HE have also expressed their discomfort at what is proposed.</p> <p>The principles of dealing with archaeology in the planning process, as described in NPPF and HE's guidance are being completely ignored. Understanding the archaeological resource needs to be a pre-requisite of designing the scheme not an afterthought.</p> <p>While the priority of Biodiversity net gain is admirable, planting trees may not be appropriate over buried archaeology or in a landscape which is a nationally significant for its survival of Civil War earthworks, the sites of which were chosen for their intervisibility in an open and largely unwooded landscape.</p> <p>The main point of contact is [redacted]. Who has been attending the Technical Environmental Working Group meetings for the scheme since September last year. However, [redacted] within the conservation team, has recently confirmed that he has not been invited to any of the Environmental Working Group meetings.</p> <p>How have key environmental stakeholders been identified? NCC conservation colleagues should have been fully involved with the development of the scheme and its environmental mitigation plans.</p> <p>The processes the project team are following are far from transparent and appear to be deeply flawed on a number of fronts. Further details can be provided on the issues with the approach to archaeology, but hopefully comments so far give a measure of the deep concern.</p> <p>Rights of Way comments</p> <p>We are aware that the Rights of Way team have held recent meetings with Mott MacDonald and the wider Active Travel Group and colleagues from the team will be responding separately following approval by Chair of Planning and Rights of Way Committee.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged the Consultee, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, regarding the development of the Scheme design, which has enabled the Applicant and the Consultee to agree on a suitable attenuation volume and a volume displacement principle in the areas of the Scheme within the floodplain. Continued engagement with relation to the Consultee's flood risk considerations would occur if necessary, throughout the Scheme's development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's concerns regarding archaeology on the Scheme. Since statutory consultation further engagement has taken place with the Consultee regarding the issues raised. The Applicant has reassured the Consultee of the approach being undertaken on the Scheme with regard to archaeology. The Applicant has taken onboard the suggestions of the Consultee and where appropriate has included them in the archaeological works.</p> <p>A specific meeting was undertaken to address these concerns demonstrating how the archaeology had been included within the development consent application documents and that the proper archaeological process was being followed. The Applicant met with the Nottinghamshire County Council County archaeologist to review and agree the scope and specification for proposed geophysical and metal detector surveys and to discuss the contents of the proposed Archaeological Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.8</b>). The Applicant has continued to have ongoing engagement with the Nottinghamshire County Council county archaeologist as the Scheme has developed.</p> <p>Geoarchaeological work has been undertaken by the Applicant and further confirmatory archaeological work is underway. This further work would form the basis of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy which must be prepared by the Applicant in accordance with Requirement 9 of the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>) prior to any work on the Scheme commencing.</p> <p>The Consultee has been involved in all these processes, which included Nottinghamshire County Council Senior Practitioner Archaeology, Newark and Sherwood District Council Historic Environment Officer and Historic England and have approved the work that has been undertaken.</p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes).</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's Public Rights of Way comments, the Applicant has received a response from the A46 Active Travel Partnership to the targeted consultation and has shown regard to this within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) against Response ID reference BHLF-AUZX-HY5H-6.</p> <p>Provision for additional bus stops have been investigated following the Consultee's suggestion for these to be added to the Friendly Farmer Link Road. However, this placement was deemed unsafe upon investigation. In ongoing engagement with the Consultee, it was agreed that the Consultee would investigate other bus stop location options with third parties in the Winthorpe area of the Scheme to accommodate for future need.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>Local transport comments</p> <p>Our interest is specifically referring to the provision of improved bus stop accessibility for access to Newark Show Ground. In December, [redacted], [redacted], working on behalf of National Highways, reached out to our team to share feedback from a resident action group looking to use the proposed new road running adjacent to the A46 south-west of Winthorpe Roundabout to improve the access of local bus services to Newark Showground.</p> <p>Following a meeting directly with the resident action group, our team concluded we would like to propose the introduction of a pair of marked bus stops on the proposed road running parallel with the A46 as it created an ideal opportunity to improve access to the Showground, both to staff and to visitors for events.</p> <p>Please note, we have fed this back directly to [redacted], but given the request for County Council consultation feedback, we thought it sensible to share this here too. Included is an annotated map (Figure 1) that was previously provided by [Redacted] that identifies an area within which we'd like to locate the bus stops.</p> <p>However, it is predicated on the establishment of a pedestrian entrance into the showground close to this location along with sufficient available space to accommodate the necessary bus stop facilities and adequate footway widths. It's noted from the consultation maps that the southern footway may be shared use, so this will need to be factored into any design. We also shared with [redacted] the following regarding infrastructure requirements:</p> <p>Northbound: Boarding area of minimum 2m wide with bus stop pole, timetable case and flag; raised boarding kerb; uncontrolled crossing point to footway opposite. If it was likely that cars would park along this road (especially during a show), we would ask the bus stop was marked with an enforceable bus stop clearway and 24/7 timing plate.</p> <p>Southbound: Boarding area of minimum 2m wide with bus stop pole, timetable case and flag; two bay cantilever bus shelter with full sides and courtesy lighting; raised boarding kerb; uncontrolled crossing point to footway opposite. If it was likely that cars would park along this road (especially during a show), we would ask the bus stop was marked with an enforceable bus stop clearway and 24/7 timing plate. In addition, we'd be interested to consider a digital information display that would provide passengers with next bus information. The power needs for the lighting and digital display could be provided by solar power and from a carbon neutrality perspective, this would be our preference.</p>		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY54-J	Winthorpe Roundabout; Road layout; Newark Showground; Stakeholder engagement; Cultural heritage; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>In response to the Targeted Consultation, many thanks for consulting the Council on the proposed changes to the design of the A46 Newark Bypass. Following this morning's update meeting with your colleagues we were pleased to hear the efforts that had been made to contact relevant consultees, homeowners and landowners to gain an understanding of their position on the proposals within the Targeted Consultation. These are the comment that have been prepared following internal discussions with officers and Members.</p> <p>Winthorpe Roundabout: With regard to the proposed changes to Winthorpe Roundabout, as you know we have previously raised with you concerns regarding option 3C looking and feeling very different from the preferred route option consulted on at the Statutory Consultation stage. The additional visualisation of movements and flows you have now provided, alongside examples of similar design solutions elsewhere on the UK network is helpful and should have certainly aided the targeted consultation process in advance of the formal DCO submission. As a non-highway authority, it will be of course for National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council to satisfy themselves on the highway impacts of proposed option 3C.</p> <p>With respect to the Council in its capacity as affected landowner/developer, we look forward to continuing to coordinate on any proposals at Newark Showground and the A17. As you are aware, the Council continues to work with National Highway colleagues to understand the impact of the A46 improvements on the current lorry park (including its access from the Great North Road), and the potential replacement site. It will therefore be important to continue to work together in order to achieve the optimal outcome.</p> <p>With regard to heritage, we have made the following observations:</p> <p>[Redacted] We have noted the potential extent of the Draft Order Limits adjacent to the lodge entrance to [redacted]. This is a significant Grade II* John Carr designed country house with extensive parkland, including a tree lined avenue and curtilage listed lodge at the A46 entrance. Impact on this important listed building complex and associated parkland should therefore be taken into account.</p> <p>Winthorpe The latest iteration of the Winthorpe roundabout suggests that it will still be enlarged, but now signalised with additional lanes, including a lane through the middle of the roundabout. This change in design has the potential to have impact on the wider setting of Winthorpe Conservation Area (CA) and setting of [redacted]. Opportunities for mitigation, notably in terms of tree planting, should be considered to assist screening the roundabout from both the CA and [redacted].</p> <p>It is also noted that the more detailed technical drawings show a bund and footpath arrangement encroaching into the edge of the Winthorpe CA. No detail is offered on the relative height of this. The footpath/cycle route have the potential to make the parkland to the south of the CA more accessible, which is positive, but additional engineering works could be a visual distraction in addition to the main roadworks.</p> <p>Cattle Market Roundabout It is noted that the latest plans show a more modest impact on Smeaton's arches on the north side of the roundabout, which is welcomed. I trust this letter offers the sufficient comfort requested to enable you to progress with the work required to prepare the DCO.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee with regard to the design of Winthorpe Roundabout presented as part of the targeted consultation. The Applicant further notes the comments relating to the information provided by the Applicant that has assisted the Consultee's understanding of the roundabout design.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council have also responded to the targeted consultation, and the Applicant has shown regard to their comments against Response ID reference BHLF-AUZX-HY56-M.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regard to further engagement concerning Newark Showground, the A17 and the Newark lorry park. Ongoing engagement has taken place with the Consultee on these issues as part of regular meetings. Further information about engagement that has taken place with the Consultee outside of consultation is detailed in Chapter 3 (Ongoing engagement) of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010065/APP/5.1)</b>.</p> <p>The potential impacts upon the property mentioned in the Consultee's response been taken into account and addressed in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Landscape bunds with tree and shrub planting would be provided between the property and Winthorpe Roundabout and the A1133 as it heads north-east. Further detail is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures <b>(TR010065/APP/6.2)</b>.</p> <p>Since targeted consultation, design of the landscape bunds around Winthorpe Conservation Area have subsequently evolved. The bund and access route have been removed from the conservation area. Photomontages would be submitted with the development consent application to provide an interpretation of expected views from Winthorpe Conservation Area within all phases of the Scheme. Four photomontages have been produced to inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, these are shown on Appendix 7.3 (Key Visual Receptor Photographs and Photomontages) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Woodland planting would be provided south of Winthorpe Conservation Area and adjacent to the listed building in the area. Works within the parkland are limited to reduce visual intrusion and alterations to the character of the parkland landscape. Assessments have concluded that there would be temporary moderate adverse effects to Winthorpe Conservation Area and the building referred to in the Consultee's response, during construction. However, landscape mitigation including planting, as it matures, would ensure that there would be no permanent significant adverse effects on these two assets.</p> <p>The Scheme would include a new shared access walking and cycling route between Hargon Lane and a point approximately opposite the Esso Service Station. This would then continue south and pass beneath the new A46 adjacent to the A1 before returning to the existing A46 between Brownhills and Friendly Farmer roundabouts. A walking and cycling route would also be provided from Hargon Lane heading to the A1133 where it would pass around the eastern side of Winthorpe Roundabout onto Drove Lane where it ceases at the first Showground entrance. These routes connect to the new walking and cycling route alongside the Friendly Farmer Link Road and provide a circular route that connects with the existing Winthorpe Footpath FP2 and Winthorpe Footpath FP3 locations.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on walking, cycling and horse-riding users of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes during construction and operation. The operation of the Scheme is expected to have a beneficial impact on access to green space, recreation, and physical activity due to the reduced congestion and improved journey times that the Scheme would deliver. However, there is expected to be a significant adverse impact on users of National Cycle Route 64 and the Trent Valley Way along Winthorpe Road due to a new 105m diversion.</p> <p>Any environmental impacts associated with the construction of the walking and cycling route have been considered as part of the Environment Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>. Mitigation measures required to be implemented to minimise associated impacts from the construction of the walking and cycling route are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
				The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b> ) will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order ( <b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b> ).

## N.8 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an Interest in Land

### N.8.A: Persons with and interest in land

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5M-B	Land ownership; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Population and human health; Biodiversity	<p>Regarding the proposed temporary diversion to the Farndon Bridleway (BW2), I would not support or recommend the new proposals for the following reasons:</p> <p>The lane provides the only access to our house and land. This access lane is used by numerous vehicles each day, ranging from cars and vans to large lorries. Due to the very narrow width, it is impossible to drive down and have pedestrians or horses on it at the same time. As there is no space to turn at the end, you have to either reverse down or reverse up, reversing with the potential for pedestrians, horses or dogs on the lane increases the danger and risk of serious accidents. This is compounded in the winter due to the dark nights. Due to the width of the lane, anything behind your vehicle is a massive blind spot.</p> <p>The local council have refused to drive their refuse lorries down as they had an encounter with a pedestrian once and that is without it being a temporary bridleway. Another local company who deliver our heating fuel have also refused to drive down for the same reason. Both the council and the delivery company were happy for years to drive down it and due to encountering pedestrians, they stopped due to health and safety risks. Once they make their decision, it's impossible for it to be changed and this had led to great inconvenience to us already. These are not just short term inconveniences, we have to drag our heavy bins down the lane twice each week and manually move a tonne of heating fuel each delivery, forever.</p> <p>By increasing the risks, more drivers will refuse to drive down to our house, not just for the duration of the works but forever.</p> <p>The river is seen as a great attraction and playground for children of all ages, especially in the warmer months, this proposed route will be their only way to quickly get to the river and this will increase the risk of an accident. Children will be more tempted to try and squeeze past a lorry/van rather than wait. The risk of serious injury to people is going to be high.</p> <p>The lane also gives access to the local fishing club whose members drive up and down the lane to their carpark, along with the local farmer who access their fields via the lane, all adding to the traffic and risks already mentioned above.</p> <p>Pedestrians and horse riders will effectively have the right of way down our access lane, this will impact our ability to enter and leave our own property but also once again impact deliveries.</p> <p>When offloading, lorries frequently block the lane due to their length. Once you give right of way to pedestrians, cyclists and horses, friction will inevitably occur and places me in an impossible situation.</p> <p>As pedestrians and horses effectively have right of way, during the busy summer months, we could be stuck trying to get into and out of our house which again creates friction.</p> <p>There is [redacted] and numerous fox and [redacted]. They have dug routes under the boundary fences across the lane. People who bring their dogs down the lane without leads will risk disturbing these [redacted] and potentially harming these protected animals.</p> <p>There are horses in the fields on both side of the lane, three on our side and some on the other side. Having 'strange' horses walking down the lane could cause any of them to be spooked resulting in riders being thrown off and injured. We have already found that having 'strange' male horses in the vicinity causes unpredictable issues with both the male and female horses. All existing fences on both sides of the lane are not designed to stop a horse bolting.</p> <p>My understanding is that the originally proposed route was ruled out due to the width of the path for horses and pedestrians to pass side by side. The new proposal changes this to horses/pedestrians and vehicles which is a substantially far more dangerous situation. My suggestion would be to either:</p> <p>Reroute the path via "Path (um)" on your plan. This is already a public footpath and has no traffic or</p>	Y	<p>Following feedback and consideration of the options suggested, the temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 would be for use by horse-riders only. Walkers and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane, which they would be directed to by signage.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment from the Consultee with regard to the risks associated with use of the lane during the evening. The Applicant surveyed current equestrian use of Newark Bridleway BW2 over a one week period, from 6am to 10pm during the week and weekend. The survey showed that up to three horses utilised this route daily.</p> <p>The Applicant further acknowledges the Consultee's concern regarding horses being present within the fields either side of the lane. However, this is not unusual along many bridleways and is not perceived as an issue. Walking, cycling and horse-rider survey results can be found in Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors, including access to residential receptors. It assessed the impact of the Scheme on access to residential properties via Fosse Road and Crees Lane and concluded that there was unlikely to be significant impacts on access to residential properties via these routes during construction or operation.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the species-specific surveys which have been undertaken to assess the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecological receptors, which includes effects on badgers. As the temporary diversion is applicable only to equestrians, no increase in wildlife disturbance as a result of dog walkers is anticipated. No further issues or risks were raised in this area. Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the ecological surveys undertaken to inform the Scheme design and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed to avoid impacts where possible. Avoiding biodiversity receptors and providing suitable measures to mitigate where avoidance has not been possible has been a key principle within the design from the outset. Where impacts cannot be avoided then mitigation measures would be in place. Full details of mitigation measures and how they will be implemented are detailed in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>At the end of the works, the diversion would be removed and temporary signs erected to advise users that the route is no longer available, and the locked gates would be re-introduced at the end of the lane to prevent access through the fields to the river.</p> <p>The temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 is to avoid temporary severance of the existing Public Right of Way during the construction of the new bridge over the River Trent. The diversion would only be in place for the duration of the construction works in this area, up to 24 months. After completion of the construction works, the existing bridleway alignment would be restored.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes during construction and operation. The assessment finds that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 during the construction period due to the length of the diversion (700m) and the time of the diversions (24 months).</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>width restrictions, joining Long Lane and then the very short distance back onto the existing public footpath at the end of Marsh Lane. This would keep a safe separation distance between vehicles, pedestrians and horses. Horses currently walk along this stretch of Marsh Lane and down Long Lane and have done for many years without issue.</p> <p>Reroute the path alongside Chestnut cottage and onto Crees Lane, again this is mainly over an established route and Crees Lane is wide enough, and quiet enough to handle both horses and pedestrians without issue. This also removes the risk of accidents or injuries.</p> <p>If you are prepared to accept all of the risks above and decide to continue with this proposed plan, I would like assurances that you will take action at the end of the works to ensure that it is clear that this temporary diversion has finished and takes steps to stop people continuing to use this as a route to the river or the existing footpath. I fear that after people get used to walking/riding down this lane for the duration of the diversion, it will be impossible to stop it and the onus will be on me with both a financial and mental toll.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss any of the above, please let me know and I would be happy to go into more detail with you.</p>		
BHLF-AUZX-HY5S-H	Land ownership; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Population and human health; Biodiversity	[The content of this response was an exact duplicate of Response ID reference BHLF-AUZX-HY5M-B]	N/A	
BHLF-AUZX-HY5G-5	Consultation - general	<p>As Chair of Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council, I am responding to the Targeted Consultation as follows:</p> <p>We do not believe that the piece of land to the East of Winthorpe village which is owned by the Winthorpe Parish Property Trust is directly impacted the changes identified in the Targeted Consultation. As such the Property Trust do not have any specific additional comments related to this particular parcel of land owned by the trust.</p> <p>I do however refer you instead to the submission we have made from Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council which covers the wider points of the consultation as it affects the parish.</p>	N	<p>The land owned by the trust is adjacent to the changes on Hargon Lane which were included as part of the targeted consultation. However, there are no direct impacts on the land parcel itself.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment regarding the response that was previously submitted to the statutory consultation and has shown regard to this within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> against Response ID reference ANON-559H-RW97-4.</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY5C-1	Land ownership	<p>I have read through the latest proposal and just wanted to update my situation</p> <p>I own the property at [redacted].</p> <p>The Property is now on the market for [redacted] but I think we will struggle to sell with this proposal still ongoing.</p> <p>This is now starting to cost money regarding the upkeep and Council Tax etc, and in normal circumstances I think we would have already sold it.</p> <p>Can you please advise the route to Blight and if you think this would be applicable.</p>	N	The Applicant can confirm that the Consultee has been contacted and blight information has been shared.
BHLF-AUZX-HY5F-4	Road drainage and the water environment; Construction; Population and human health	<p>I understand the OD levels and the theory behind choosing the site at Kelham although our physical experience associated with that land suggest that the flood water will find its way across the fields before it backs up through the Ha Ha dyke into the fields to the West.</p> <p>It was also pleasing to hear that the work that affects our members access directly, is scheduled to only take 8 weeks with an early 2025 start date. It was more concerning that the work on the Kelham fields itself will take a planned 12 weeks and involve many more vehicle movements along a very busy road, directly adjacent to a notorious bottleneck for lorries on one of the few bridges over the river in the area, Kelham Bridge.</p> <p>I would like to reiterate that I represent 980 members who will all be adversely affected by the work on or near our only access point to the fishing we pay a lot of money to rent at [redacted]. Our waters extend along the whole of the 'Old River' and so other than a couple of other fishing</p>	N	<p>The Applicant is seeking powers in the Development Consent Order to lower the ground in two locations within the fields to the north of the A617 between the villages of Averham and Kelham to create floodplain compensation areas for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment relating to floodplain compensation areas being likely to flood from water approaching over adjacent fields. The design anticipates this. Following a flood, the floodplain compensation sites would drain down through existing dykes.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised with regard to the existing A617 bridge crossing at Kelham. The need for specific interventions, such as temporary signal control, would be assessed and reviewed with the local highway authority during the development of the Traffic Management Plan for the Scheme in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR0100765/APP/3.1)</b>.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>organisations that each hold less than 300m total, we will be the main angling organisation affected and we seem to be the guardians of the river in the Averham- Kelham – South Muskham areas.</p> <p>On their behalf, I feel it is only fair and reasonable that we (NPS) are compensated for that disruption and potential loss or reduced access to the fishing we have along that stretch and on the [redacted] field opposite, which, while hopefully unaffected by increased suspended solids, will be affected by the machinery noise and vibrations, which again will adversely affect our sport in that area.</p>		<p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan provides the current details for the Temporary Traffic Management measures that are expected to be implemented during the construction of the Scheme. A Traffic Management Plan will be produced in consultation with the local highway authorities and stakeholders such as emergency services. Under the Development Consent Order, the Traffic Management Plan that will be produced must be in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>. As such, this plan will build on and comply with the commitments made in the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding the impacts on the Nottinghamshire Piscatorial Society, further information relating to 'Compensation for the effects of construction' are explained by the Applicant in the published guidance entitled: 'Your property and our road proposals' available on the Applicant's website. This guidance includes information for business, agricultural and residential property owners.</p> <p>Measures would be undertaken to avoid injury and death of fish. Any sheet piling or dewatering would be undertaken under the supervision of an Ecological Clerk of Works outside the coarse fish spawning season (avoiding between 15 March to 15 June). Further details on such mitigation measures to protect fish are detailed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b>.</p> <p>The First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/6.5)</b> will be developed into a Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Scheme. Adherence with the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 3 of the Draft Development Consent Order <b>(TR010065/APP/3.1)</b>. With these measures in place there would be no significant effects on fish as a result of the Scheme.</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY5P-E	Winthorpe Roundabout; Land ownership; Road layout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>I write to you as the tenant of [redacted] concerning the design changes at Winthorpe Roundabout as illustrated on area plan number 3.</p> <p>From my point of view the proposed land take represents a large proportion of the area in its current format, taking as it does land for sound bank, footpath and access track. This is at the risk of leaving the remaining area unviable for farming due to the size of modern farm equipment being used today in the drive to achieve ever greater efficiencies.</p> <p>I feel that the proposed access track from the A1133 to Hargon lane, for the benefit of the tenants of the [redacted] (and of no benefit to me) is unnecessary, as the current access is via Hargon lane, which will still remain. The proposed access track alongside the A46 south from Hargon lane would perfectly facilitate access to any and all of the Stuart's Trust landholding.</p> <p>It would also be an additional cost to the public purse which would be hard to justify.</p> <p>The proposed foot way/ cycle way is a good idea, but it seems very circuitous and out of the way, and I question how likely it is to be used when people would have to go out of their way.</p> <p>However I would like to make an alternative proposal which may save money;</p> <p>Rather than building a footpath to the north of Hargon lane on the western side of the A46, going all the way around the proposed Winthorpe roundabout (the signals potentially causing traffic holdups) and then returning down the eastern side of the access road to Newark, perhaps a ramped footbridge of the type we see over city ring roads, the A52 at Nottingham for example) for pedestrians and cyclists directly from Hargon lane to the footpath (and potential entrance) to Newark Showground on the eastern side of the local Newark access road would make more sense, in cost savings, reduced land take from landowners, and practicality to those locals who merely want to walk straight to the Showground?</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised by the Consultee and has carried out further engagement with them and the landowner during the targeted consultation period.</p> <p>Following feedback received to the targeted consultation, including from the Consultee and the landowner, the section of combined access track/footway/cycleway from Hargon Lane to the A1133 has been removed from the Scheme and the landscape bund would now be provided next to the A46 dual carriageway. This has reduced the permanent land required in this area within the Order Limits and the Applicant has worked to maintain a rectangle shape on this land parcel as requested by the landowner.</p> <p>The route around the Winthorpe Roundabout for walking and cycling is required for cyclists to travel safely between the A1133 and Drove Lane. The crossings would not disrupt traffic flows as the crossing signals are only green when the traffic on the carriageway that the walking and cycling route crosses is stopped on a red light as part of the traffic signal sequencing around the roundabout.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's suggestion to use a footbridge over the A46, an at-grade crossing in this location presents a lower cost and lower environmental impact solution as the installation and maintenance costs are lower in comparison to a footbridge with stairs and ramps. In addition, an at-grade crossing restricts the overlooking view into properties at the end of Hargon Lane that would be enabled by a footbridge.</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY5Q-F	Road layout; Newark Showground; Drove Lane; Traffic forecasts; Congestion; Stakeholder engagement; Walkers, cyclists and	<p>1.0 A46 Relief Road - Entrance to Showground</p> <p>1.1 The left turn "in" at this new junction point on the new two-way distributor road is very positive. However, traffic management would be markedly safer and more effective and the potential disruption caused by high volume traffic movements associated with major events at the Showground reduced if it was also a left turn "out" as well.</p> <p>1.2 This would effectively facilitate closure/diversion of the existing Bowls/Golf/Showground access road at the point where it joins Drove Lane (very close to the Winthorpe Roundabout). By doing this, the need/ability to turn right of Drove Lane, almost immediately after exiting the roundabout onto the diverted access would be removed. It would;</p>	Y	<p>With regard to the Consultee's request for a left turn out from Newark Showground onto Friendly Farmer Link Road, the Applicant has assessed additional options for turning movements onto Friendly Farmer Link Road from Newark Showground. The assessment showed that Winthorpe Roundabout could accommodate the traffic along Drove Lane and additional turning movements were not required to deal with traffic. It also presented an increased risk of queues on the link road, which could have led to rear end shunt incidents. Further information is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments relating to the access to the bowling club at Newark Showground, the access and exit arrangements from the Showground have been amended such</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	horse-riders; Overall scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• significantly improve traffic flows and reduce traffic congestion;</li> <li>• reduce static and queuing vehicles on the road (Drove Lane) with associated accident potential;</li> <li>• reduce static and queuing vehicles on the road (Drove Lane) causing traffic to back up onto the roundabout and A46;</li> <li>• move traffic obstructions away from the designated pedestrian crossing area around the Winthorpe Roundabout;</li> <li>• enhance Showground event traffic management and flows by dispersing access/egress away from Drove Lane;</li> <li>• improving the overall safety and efficiency of the network (Road, cycling and pedestrian).</li> </ul> <p>1.3 The need to widen Drove Lane and install traffic management systems to allow traffic to access the Showground without disrupting A46 traffic flows would be removed.</p> <p>1.4 By having the fully functional entrance (left turn in and left turn out) on a different road to Drove Lane, the Showground would be able to implement far more efficient traffic management at events to allow the quicker and safer access and egress of traffic at major events, improving both arrival and dispersal and minimising impact on the road network.</p> <p>1.5 It is appreciated that the left turn out would require a central "barrier/reservation" to be constructed on part of the new distributor road in order to prevent traffic turning right either in to or out of the new access point. The Showground would be entirely agreeable to making available additional land to facilitate this.</p> <p>1.6 The Showground is keen to work with National Highways regarding site operations and effective traffic management. This will include information to assist with the "smart" traffic lights managing the Winthorpe Roundabout and also wider access/egress relating to the site on busy event days. The Showground would undertake, what would be mutually beneficial and to aim to not take actions on busy event days which would unduly delay or hold traffic at the point where the new access meets the A46, rather traffic management would be encouraged to pull traffic off the highway as quickly as possible, prevent existing traffic from queuing on the highway, maintain traffic flows and minimise potential disruption.</p> <p>2.0 Informational Signage</p> <p>2.1 The Showground would be keen to work with National Highways with regard to informational/advisory (including Variable Message Signs) as well as directional signage on and around the Showground, to assist with the effective management of events and traffic flows.</p> <p>3.0 Cycle/Pedestrian Access and Road Crossings</p> <p>3.1 The Showground is generally very supportive of additional footpaths and cycleways running to and adjacent to the site.</p> <p>3.2 Concern has been expressed with regards to the requirement to use the traffic-controlled crossings around the Winthorpe Roundabout and the possible "shortcut" users may be encouraged to take across the main carriageway of the A46. Mitigation through a footbridge or other crossing controls at a more direct point may result in a safer situation.</p> <p>3.3 The existing A46 crossing point linking the footpath/cycleway from Newark over the A1 to the "Friendly Farmer" pathway on the southern side of the A46 adjacent to the Showground, would benefit considerably from a foot/cycle bridge or traffic controlled crossing. As a minimum, it should be upgraded to receive improved signage, road markings, lighting, warning signs etc for the benefit of both traffic and users of the crossing.</p> <p>3.4 The footpath/cycleway shown on the current plan should be extended down consider to the Showground entrance(s) thereby enhancing pedestrian/cycle access and egress to the site and significantly improving safety.</p> <p>3.5 The existing public footpath, crossing the Showground on its South side and leading pedestrians to cross the A46 dual carriageway at its mid-section, should be realigned along the pavement on Godfrey Drive so as to effectively lead people to and use the new pavement/cycleway proposed by</p>		<p>that the existing bowling club access from Drove Lane is changed to be left 'out' only. This would assist with traffic flows and to minimise the risk of traffic queuing back onto Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Consultee to discuss how the signals on Winthorpe Roundabout could be re-prioritised for major events and what variable message signs or directional signs could be provided to assist with traffic movement both in and out of the site, if necessary.</p> <p>The following measures could be utilised to support the event organiser and their traffic management during any events at the Showground, however, it would be the responsibility of the event organiser to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place to minimise impacts of event traffic on the road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear signage provided before and within Winthorpe Roundabout for road users</li> <li>• Electronic Variable Message Signs provided to support permanent signage used during an event</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the Consultee's concerns relating to short cut routes that users may take across the main carriageway of the widened A46, potential short cut routes across Winthorpe Roundabout would be assessed at the detailed design stage of the Scheme and pedestrian guardrails would be installed if required to deter this.</p> <p>The existing crossing point of the A46 across to the Friendly Farmer pathway would be closed. A new signalised crossing would be provided between the A1 bridge and the Friendly Farmer Roundabout to link walkers and cyclists from Winthorpe village to the existing network to the south of the A17. The existing crossing on the A17 would be used to gain access to the new walking and cycling route that has been placed alongside the new Friendly Farmer Link Road.</p> <p>Further detail is provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. The walking and cycling provisions have been reviewed following the statutory consultation. It is now intended that the walking and cycling route along Drove Lane would be extended to the first Showground entrance diagonally opposite the karting track entrance.</p> <p>The Consultee's suggestion relating to the realignment of the existing public Footpath FP3 crossing the south side of the Showground, is outside of the Scheme's Order Limits. This suggestion falls under the remit of Nottinghamshire County Council, as the local authority responsible for Public Rights of Way. Any further decision relating to this would be made by them.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments in relation to the Order Limits around the south-east side of the Showground, the area of land between the bowls centre and Drove Lane is required for temporary works. Part of this land is further required for permanent mitigation measures in the form of trees and shrubs. This is presented on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b>.</p> <p>The extent of the Order Limits at the Showground site would only be required during construction to facilitate local welfare and storage areas. This land would be required from mid-2025 to mid-2028. The Applicant will work with the Consultee to return part of the area earlier than mid-2028 and further reduce the overall time that this is required, if possible.</p> <p>During construction the existing links to the Showground and the entrances would be retained. In order to tie the new Winthorpe Roundabout into Drove Lane it would be necessary to close this road at night at the Winthorpe end. The Showground would be advised three months prior to this that a closure would be in place. The traffic entering or leaving the Showground would be diverted along the A17 to utilise Drove Lane.</p> <p>Further detail can be found within the Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010065/APP/7.7)</b> which provides the current details for the Temporary Traffic Management measures that are expected to be implemented during the construction of the Scheme.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>the scheme and to cross at the designated crossing points.</p> <p>4.0 Redline Area</p> <p>4.1 The current redline area proposed in the scheme covers a significant area on the Showground South-East side of the current Bowls/Golf/Showground access road adjacent to Drove Lane, which is necessary for regular operational requirements. This will affect event bookings contracted to use the site and so needs to be clarified and reduced if it is no longer required for the agreed design proposal.</p> <p>5.0 Timing</p> <p>5.1 Showground event bookings are often contracted a number of years prior to the event and so the proposed development period is already subject to contracted usage by organisers. Please could you provide formal site usage dates so that we can consider this with regard to planning, event bookings, contractual space requirements, mitigation, access, egress etc.</p> <p>The Showground remain supportive of the overall proposal to improve the A46 and it will certainly result in improved economic performance for ourselves commercially and the wider region through, reduced traffic disruption, enhanced employment opportunities, improved environmental considerations and significant safety enhancements. However, it is important to get the details of access and egress to this site, which is a major economic driver for the area, correct in order to maximise the benefits and realise as much of the improvement potential as possible.</p>		
BHLF-AUZX-HY59-Q	Land ownership; Stakeholder engagement	<p>As Secretary of Newark &amp; District Piscatorial Federation, the landowner of a number of fields and river banks, I have been asked to reply with concerns we have in the proposed reroute of the bridleway through our land, reference document TR010065/S42(1)(d)Cat1&amp;2/March/2023 section 5.</p> <p>We have met and had a site visit with [redacted], Design Integration Lead and [redacted], Senior Stakeholder Manager, to go over some of our concerns and these mainly but not exhaustively:</p> <p>Concerns over, access through our private car park past our equipment lock up because there is no public access through the car park. This has been the subject of local vandalism to our gate and cabin by locals demanding access. These people didn't make any official application which would have allowed us to prove that there is no right and now thankfully after a lot of bad feeling and damage, this has finally quietened down. We are very concerned that any changes, whilst temporary, will stir up this once again.</p> <p>Approach roadway access while probably just about suitable for cars would probably not be suitable for horses.</p> <p>We would not want to become liable for any injuries or damage to anyone or anything suffered whilst on this or any part of this access or our land.</p> <p>Return of the access to present standard and to not set a precedence for future access both for horses and for the public - this needs to be made exceptionally clear at every point of access for the vandalism reasons above.</p> <p>Some ideas to alleviate these problems were discussed during the meeting.</p> <p>Mainly to leave the main gate open for access but to add a secondary gate and fence off the remaining car park to prevent public access through the anglers car park and past the equipment lock up. This will be done by accessing the gate to the field on the left and following the hedge down to join the river path, subject to survey and permission from the farmer. Whilst the crop is a grass field harvested twice each year, the farmer also keeps sheep on there from time to time, so I am not sure how you might make this work for him. He pays rent to us and this is a significant income stream that we are not prepared or can afford to lose. What provisions might be put in place during harvest please? What provisions might be put in place when the field is full of sheep please?</p> <p>To provide suitable gating to allow access for horses and pedestrians but restrict motorbikes/ Quads etc - the club suffers on most of its land from damage due to illegal access of powered vehicles. This land has been fairly free from this due to the clapper gates, but as soon as it is opened up, then based on the experience in other parts of the town, the motorbikes and quads will come in and</p>	Y	<p>Following comments from the targeted consultation the temporary bridleway diversion route Newark Bridleway BW2 would be signposted for use by equestrians only. Pedestrians and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's concern relating to the suitability of the lane identified for use as a temporary bridleway diversion. The Applicant surveyed current equestrian use of the bridleway was surveyed over a one-week period, and up to three horses utilised this route daily. The Applicant is satisfied that use of this lane is appropriate for equestrian use. As the track forms part of the Applicant's temporary land take any applicable liability would remain with the Applicant during its use.</p> <p>The temporary diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 would avoid temporary severance of the existing Public Right of Way route during the construction of the new bridge over the River Trent. The diversion would only be in place for the duration of the construction works in this area. After completion of the construction works, the existing Bridleway alignment would be restored. Temporary diversions are further detailed in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on users of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes during construction and operation. There would be significant construction impacts on two walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. This includes significant adverse impacts on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 due to the length of the diversion (700m) and the duration of the diversions (24 months).</p> <p>Regarding the car park, security and gating arrangements would be agreed with the Consultee prior to the diversion being implemented, during the construction planning stage. Access to the adjacent field for harvest and any additional fencing to prevent sheep escaping would also be agreed. This would include the introduction of clapper gates or step over blocks to prevent vehicular access into the area, including by motorbikes and quad bikes, and a fenced off route along the western side of the car park next to the hedge. At the end of the works the diversion would be removed and temporary signs erected to advise users that the route is no longer available. The locked gates would be re-introduced at the end of the lane to prevent access through the fields to the river.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		vandalise the grass crops etc. Step over horse gates would prevent this whilst allowing people on bicycles to lift their bikes over.		
BHLF-AUZX-HY5R-G	Land ownership; Road layout; Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Landscape and visual effects	<p>We have considered the impact of the proposals on our land and the trustees have agreed to provide you with our response as detailed below.</p> <p>For clarity, we inform you that all of the land parcel shown on the Land Interest Plan [redacted] has, to the best of our knowledge, been owned entirely by the [redacted] for all of our lives (and indeed very much longer). So far as we are aware, it has never been owned by any other party. We mention this because we have been asked a few times by different parties whether the land had ever been gifted to the charity by our local parish council or another third party. We believe the land was part of the bequest made by the charity's founder in his will from over 400 years ago.</p> <p>The land has been considered as farmland and used for agricultural purposes for as far back as any of us can recall. Its shape makes working the land both efficient and maximises its productive use.</p> <p>Naturally, we want to see minimum permanent take of our land for the project and at the same time to maintain the rectangular shape as much as possible. Our own desktop measurement of the amount of our land affected by the Proposed Scheme Boundary (per Land Interest Plan) indicates that c. 55% of its area would be lost if all of it was permanently taken. We appreciate that not all of the 55% is likely to be permanent but we emphasise the unavoidable fact that the more that is taken, coupled with the shape of that land which remains owned by us, increasingly calls into question whether the land can continue to be effectively and efficiently farmed once the project is complete.</p> <p>Specific comments on the latest proposals are given below:</p> <p>(Reference Area Plan 2 – Winthorpe Roundabout); Trustees strongly object to the construction of the section of the proposed accommodation works access track from the A1133 to Hargon Lane. This unnecessarily takes land away from us for the convenience of another landowner. That landowner can continue to access the fields on the southern side of Hargon Lane via the same route as they have done for many years (via Hargon Lane itself). If considered necessary at the detailed design stage, additional work could be included in the (already proposed) widening of Hargon Lane to the benefit of the other landowner. There must be a cost saving to the project, in our view, by accepting our objection. We acknowledge our points being accepted and were to be given due consideration during a video conference between two trustees and your representatives on Wednesday 5th April, so we remain hopeful a solution is found.</p> <p>(Reference Area Plan 2 – Winthorpe Roundabout); We remain of the view that a footbridge provides the best solution to getting across the A46 and to the showground (whether this is from the end of Hargon Lane or from the footpath that emerges adjacent to the garage near the Friendly Farmer roundabout). However, as trustees, we have reluctantly accepted the proposed footpath to run from the end of Hargon Lane towards Winthorpe roundabout, although we remain firmly of the view given our local knowledge, that it would hardly ever get used especially as it shown being very close to the A1133 slip road (c. 6m from it for some 40m of its length and at best c. 16m for some 60m of its length). During the video conference referred to in point 1, it was suggested that if the access track was removed, there may be scope to move the bunding nearer to the new road (which would also improve noise retention) and reposition the footpath on the other side of the bunding to run through the middle of the band of trees to be placed there. We acknowledge this was purely a discussion point but we support this much more than the latest proposal documents show.</p> <p>Any bands of trees to be planted should be on land that will not be owned by the charity upon the project's completion. The [redacted] does not wish to have any ongoing tree management responsibilities. We do, however, expect that where our land borders any land that is accessible to the public (for example, the possible repositioned footpath described in point 2), "hawthorn type" hedging will be planted along its length on our land border. Such hedging is intended to be difficult for people and dogs to get through to minimize potential crop damage. The charity would accept responsibility for its ongoing management.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant notes the concerns raised by the Consultee and has carried out further engagement with them during the targeted consultation period including the video conference on 5 April 2023, as noted by the Consultee.</p> <p>Following feedback received to the targeted consultation, including from the Consultee, the section of combined access track/footway/cycleway from Hargon Lane to the A1133 has been removed from the Scheme and the landscape bund would now be provided next to the A46 dual carriageway. This has reduced the permanent land required in this area within the Order Limits and the Applicant has worked to maintain a rectangle shape on this land parcel as requested by the Consultee.</p> <p>The route around the Winthorpe Roundabout for walking and cycling is required for cyclists to travel safely between the A1133 and Drove Lane. The crossings would not disrupt traffic flows as the crossing signals are only green when the traffic on the carriageway it crosses is stopped on a red light as part of the traffic signal sequencing around the roundabout.</p> <p>A footbridge was considered at prior stages before the preferred route announcement. This was discounted due to visual impact and cost. In addition, an at-grade crossing restricts the overlooking view into properties at the end of Hargon Lane that would be enabled by a footbridge.</p> <p>Details of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Scheme are provided in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Effects) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the Environmental Statement Figures (<b>TR010065/APP/6.2</b>) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme which includes roadside planting wherever practicable in order to reduce the visual impact upon of the Scheme and aid settlement within the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Trees are not being planted on land owned by the Consultee. The exact hedgerow species type to be used as part of landscaping including the hedgerow forming the new field boundary with this land parcel, would be confirmed during the detailed design stage of the Scheme. However, the request from the Consultee would be considered and implemented wherever possible. The current indicative plant list for hedgerows includes hawthorn within the proposed species mix.</p> <p>The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which is part of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) details how mitigation and management measures would be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>As highlighted in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, Ref L4, L5 and L6 and Table 1-1 in the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>), a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will be produced as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which will outline management requirements for landscape and ecology aspects for the Scheme.</p> <p>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prepared as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan which would be developed from the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (<b>TR010065/APP/6.5</b>) for implementation during construction of the Scheme. The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan would outline maintenance requirements for landscape and ecology during the aftercare period to ensure the successful establishment of essential mitigation.</p> <p>A Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be prepared at the end of the construction phase and would cover the operational and maintenance phases of the Scheme. The Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be implemented by the Principal Contractor for the five-year aftercare period, with the relevant maintenance authorities (the Applicant and/or Newark and Sherwood District Council/Nottinghamshire County Council) responsible for long-term maintenance beyond this. Adherence to the Third Iteration Environmental Management Plan would be secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft Development Consent Order (<b>TR010065/APP/3.1</b>).</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY57-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Winthorpe Roundabout;	<p>Winthorpe Roundabout</p> <p>The footpath/cycle way is not needed to this roundabout. In 30 years, I have only ever walked to the showground down Drove Lane twice. It will not be used. A more sensible route is to use the existing footpath from Winthorpe to Coddington and put up a pedestrian bridge at the point it crosses the</p>	Y	<p>The route around the Winthorpe Roundabout for walking and cycling is required for cyclists to travel safely between the A1133 and Drove Lane. The crossings would not disrupt traffic flows as the crossing signals are only green when the traffic on the carriageway it crosses is stopped on a red light as part of the traffic signal sequencing around the roundabout. The route would provide a safe corridor for walkers and cyclists crossing the junction and is a low cost solution as the signals are required to control highway traffic movements. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
	Congestion; Road layout	<p>A46 and distributor. I understand that a pedestrian bridge is not possible however to route it on to the proposed footpath link around the back of the Esso garage and under the new A46 and link into the proposed footpath to the showground from that side would be more sensible. This could then link up with the proposed footpath at the edge of the [redacted] land and meet with the footpath on the southern side of the A46/local distributor.</p> <p>5 pedestrian crossings on the roundabout not necessary for limited use. My concerns are expense, safety and impact on traffic flow. The whole idea of the scheme is to speed up traffic around Newark and not to shift the hold up problem to this roundabout.</p> <p>Queuing to cross the roundabout will still be a problem with this design, opportunity for confusion and wrong lane for the north bound traffic from the distributor road.</p> <p>Access track for farmer access not needed. Field gate higher up the A1133 before Thoroughfare Lane would suffice.</p> <p>Farmland remaining will be untenable for farming impacting on the village charity's income stream.</p> <p>Should a cycle way be required then my suggestion would be to add a suitable cycle path to the side of the A1133 alterations and cyclists can join this from the Winthorpe Gainsborough road junction. You explained that the traffic flow sequencing around the roundabout would allow for cyclists to cross and enter Drove Lane safely.</p> <p>Hargon Lane</p> <p>Joint pedestrian / access track in my view is not necessary. Farmer already has access from Hargon Lane to fields towards Newark. The non-motorised vehicle track is not needed from Hargon Lane north or south and could be removed from the cost.</p> <p>Access to attenuation ponds and maintenance could be from the planned track behind the Esso garage accessed from the forecourt or new service road leading from the new A46 to the Esso garage ie over the site of the demolished Mint Leaf.</p> <p>Don't understand the logic for the split of the path and access track.</p> <p>Pedestrian/cycle route will increase the threat of crime and social nuisance to Hargon Lane as the path will provide quick and easy get away access.</p> <p>How will the link work to set up the pathway along Hargon Lane work? Currently there are 2 grass verges maintained by the Parish Council and myself.</p> <p>Further footfall by dog walkers will add to the problem of dog fouling already a serious issue in the village and despite intervention remains a problem.</p> <p>My thoughts:</p> <p>You need to bridge the A46 for pedestrian access to the showground nearer the planned new entrance for the top end of the site probably using the Winthorpe Coddington footpath route. I understand this is not possible however a footpath route around the Esso garage and a link to the path already planned would work for access to A17 , showground and Newark employment</p> <p>Engage with landowners to create a walking route from the top of Hargon Lane next to the bungalows and old farm buildings which would connect with a path across The Park and meet the Winthorpe Coddington footpath. This could similarly provide farm track access to the far fields.</p> <p>Forget the need for a footpath at the A1133 roundabout.</p> <p>I agree with your thoughts on the planned mitigations to stop noise, light and vibration pollution impacting residents on Hargon Lane. 2.5m high earth bund plus landscaping plus noise reduction surface and fencing to prevent visual intrusion from headlights as you explained is your intention.</p> <p>Spur from the path to access the attenuation ponds which would be a locked gated route and not a footpath.</p>		<p>provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b> and the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's suggestion to use a footbridge over the A46, an at-grade crossing in this location presents a lower cost and lower environmental impact solution as the installation and maintenance costs are lower in comparison to a footbridge with stairs and ramps. In addition, an at-grade crossing would restrict users being able to overlook properties at the end of Hargon Lane as would be the case with a footbridge.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's concern relating to queueing at the Winthorpe Roundabout, traffic modelling shows that queueing at the existing Winthorpe Roundabout increases significantly in the Do Minimum scenario. The traffic modelling for the Scheme forecasts that that the junction would operate well within capacity as a result of the Scheme in both 2028 (year the Scheme is open to traffic) and 2043 (15 years from Scheme opening). Further information is detailed in the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Signals around the roundabout would operate in three phases over a 60 second cycle, the maximum time a signal would be at red is 45 seconds. The traffic emerging from the A1133 and Drove Lane would have clear inter-green gaps between each of the three phases to safely enter the roundabout. Information relating to traffic light green times and traffic modelling is provided within the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>. Furthermore, signing would be used within the roundabout to guide traffic to minimise the risk of confusion for northbound drivers from the distribution road, there would be additional signs to clarify the lanes required and guide users to the circulatory and through section of the roundabout.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's concerns relating to the tenability of farmland, the land required by the Applicant in the Consultee's farmland has been reduced and the remaining land would be tenable. The Applicant has also removed the access track from the A1133.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> summarises the environmental impact of land take from agricultural land holdings. The land referred to by the Consultee, is identified as Farm 06 in the assessment. The realignment of Winthorpe Roundabout and creation of a new shared walking and cycling route and embankments would permanently require two hectares of land from Farm 06. It is identified that Farm 06 would have no significant adverse impacts related to land take, as this represents 3% of the landowner's 81 hectares of farmland within the local impact area. Land would also be required from Farm 06 on a temporary basis, however this is also assessed as having no significant impact on the farm as a result of land take.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee with regard to the combined access track/footway/cycleway included within the targeted consultation <i>Revised Draft Order Limits Plan</i> that is referred to by the Consultee as going both north and south from Hargon Lane, with the north section being a split walking and cycling path and vehicle access track.</p> <p>Following comments from the targeted consultation, the vehicle section of the combined access track/footway/cycleway from Hargon Lane, that goes north to the A1133, has been removed from the Scheme and the landscape bund would now be provided next to the A46 dual carriageway. This has reduced the permanent land take required in this area within the Order Limits. The walking and cycling path would still be included as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's concerns relating to the threat of crime and social nuisance, vehicle anti-access gates would be provided at the end of Hargon Lane to prevent unauthorised vehicular usage.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's comments in relation to pathway along Hargon Lane, the length of the lane within the Order Limits would remain as it is and would be a shared use track between vehicles, walkers and cyclists with the low number of motor vehicles that would use it.</p> <p>The new combined access track/footway/cycleway, which goes south from Hargon Lane, would form part of a new circular walking and cycling route, connecting Winthorpe Roundabout and Friendly Farmer Roundabout. The track is also required to provide maintenance access to the attenuation ponds included as part of the Scheme as well as access to farmers fields.</p> <p>The access track to the ponds is shared with farmers, it is considered that an access off the Esso Service Station forecourt is not suitable and would be less safe from the new A46.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
				<p>The Applicant has assessed the suggested changes for walking and cycling routes and a proposed footbridge by the Consultee. When assessing all comments received to both the statutory consultation and the targeted consultation, the layout shown as part of the targeted consultation has been retained. This route provides a link from the centre of Winthorpe utilising at-grade routes to the Showground and Newark-on-Trent as well as a circular route for users.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comment from the Consultee regarding dog fouling in the village of Winthorpe. As this issue relates to the behaviour of active travel route users, enforcement and prevention of this would need to be raised with the local authority.</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY53-H	Stakeholder engagement	Please can you remove my parents from the mailing list [redacted] [redacted] & [redacted]	N	The Applicant has updated the property records on their land management system following the information provided by the Consultee.
BHLF-AUZX-HY51-F	Land ownership; Road layout; Stakeholder engagement; Consultation - more information/publicity/time requested	<p>We write on behalf of our above-named clients in response to your targeted consultation on the proposed A46 Newark Bypass and specifically item 1 of the consultation '[redacted] access road'.</p> <p><b>1. AMENDED DRAFT ORDER LIMITS</b></p> <p>We note that the draft order limits have been amended in respect of our client's land ownership and confirm that this appears to reflect the current discussions on a new access road to [redacted] in that location – see further comments below.</p> <p><b>2. PROPOSED NEW ACCESS ROAD &amp; DRAFT ORDER LIMITS</b></p> <p>We confirm that our clients are in active discussions with the project team to revise and finalise the design of the new access road. The detailed design of the junction of the new access road where it joins the existing access drive to the [redacted] and the [redacted] is under further review and we trust that if any additional land is required to facilitate an agreed junction design, either the order limits are amended to accommodate this or in the absence of an amendment to the order limits that National Highways ('NH') enter into an separate agreement with our clients in this respect.</p> <p>We attach a copy of the current proposed general layout plan of the new access drive (prepared prior to the recent re-design of the junction) and the latest version of the junction design, which in principle would be acceptable to our client, subject to advice from our client's landscape consultants on the detailed design and formal agreement between our client and NH.</p> <p><b>3. NEW ACCESS ROAD TO [redacted] AND ADJOINING LAND/PROPERTY</b></p> <p>In respect of the discussions to date on the new access road, we submit the following comments from our discussions with NH and Skanska to date:</p> <p>(i) the design of the junction of the new access road and the existing access road should allow for 'free-flow' movement rather than a T-junction to both [redacted] and [redacted] with priority given to [redacted] approach in that design ('primary access');</p> <p>(ii) the surface of the existing access road section between the new junction and [redacted] must be made fit for purpose owing to the closure of the current A46 access;</p> <p>(iii) the surfacing of the new access road and any re-surfacing of the existing access drive at the new junction and to [redacted] should be tarmac.</p> <p>In general terms, our clients submit that the design and construction of the new access road should fulfil the following principles and to achieve this the detailed landscape plan that will underpin the schedule of works for the new access drive will require input from our client's landscape consultants and final approval by our clients;</p> <p>(iv) that the historic character of the property is preserved;</p> <p>(v) that appropriate materials are used, in keeping with the character of the property;</p> <p>(vi) that the scale, function and proportion of the design is appropriate to the property, complementing the size and style of [redacted] and the surrounding landscape;</p> <p>(vii) that the access road is safely accessible;</p> <p>(viii) that consideration is given to future maintenance obligations</p> <p><b>4. STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND</b></p> <p>As submitted in our previous consultation response (9 December 2022), we request that NH enter into a Statement of Common Ground with our clients, to record the agreement reached between the parties in respect of the new access road design and landscaping, the necessary accommodation works to mitigate the impact of the scheme and to ensure that these are addressed in further</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with the Consultee which has supported the development of Heads of Terms, temporary and permanent land take and final details of planting and access security.</p> <p>The development of Heads of Terms and ongoing engagement has also resulted in the following changes being agreed by the Consultee and updated in the Scheme design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the previously proposed property access route from the Order Limits</li> <li>• Agreement of a new location and layout for the access track (the Order Limits have been amended to account for this)</li> <li>• Agreed the location for landscape bunding planting and attenuation basins</li> <li>• Reduced the land take requirement in the Order Limits to maintain as much useable farmland as possible for the landowner</li> </ul> <p>As the Applicant and the Consultee are developing a Heads of Terms agreement, the Consultee has agreed that a Statement of Common Ground is no longer required.</p> <p>The details regarding permanent and temporary land take are included within the Book of Reference (<b>TR010065/APP/4.3</b>) and Land Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.2</b>). Copies of land plans including land acquisition types are available as part of the development consent application.</p> <p>Details of the use of the Consultee's land on a permanent and temporary basis have been provided through direct meetings that have taken place with the Consultee, in order for the Consultee to understand the impact on their property and business operations.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>modifications to the bypass design and land use proposals.</p> <p>5. PERMANENT &amp; TEMPORARY LANDTAKE</p> <p>We have also requested detailed plans showing the extent of permanent and temporary land take and to date these have not been provided.</p> <p>These plans remain imperative to assist our clients in properly considering any further impacts of the proposals and to assess the extent of land loss and disturbance during the project works. In respect of the proposed balancing pond proposed to be located on our client's land adjacent to the Winthorpe roundabout, we request that these is removed to minimise the land take requirement of our clients land.</p>		
BHLF-AUZX-HYFM-V	Road drainage and the water environment; Land ownership; Population and human health; Stakeholder engagement; Construction	<p>The below response focuses on the proposed Kelham/Averham floodplain compensation area referenced as Area Plan 4 shown below (drawing ref HE551478). I split this response into two sections, the first addressing the impact of NH works on my land West of the A617 (Section 1) , and a second section which will address my concerns about impact on my land East of the A617 (Section 2).</p> <p>Section 1:</p> <p>I am the landowner of [redacted] and my farming and associated land-based business activity is suffering considerable disruption due to National Highways intended flood compensation works. As part of my business activity, I am a joint landowner partner with [redacted], developing a solar farm and BESS on land between Kelham and Averham.</p> <p>Preapplication discussions with the LPA have been undertaken and are ongoing. A screening opinion has been issued by the LPA and a Public consultation exercise on the proposal was carried out in the summer of 2022. Currently a planning application is being prepared for submission to Newark and Sherwood District Council late spring 2023.</p> <p>As a landowner partner I am pleased to see that there is further targeted consultation on the scheme boundary for the floodplain compensation area and that the new proposed 'revised' boundary has reduced significantly since the last statutory consultation period held in Autumn 2022.</p> <p>However, significant concerns remain on the current extent of the boundary and the detrimental impact this will have on the delivery of the renewable energy generation and energy storage proposal.</p> <p>It is very important to note that A46 flood compensation has already caused significant delay in submitting planning for the solar project and this clearly has a continuing knock-on effect on income for my business due to delayed deployment.</p> <p>As you may be aware I have been working with the A46 bypass project team over the last several months to agree a way forward for both schemes.</p> <p>At the meetings [redacted] and I were accepting of your initial proposal for the flood compensation boundary to extend to north part of Red House Field (this area was not included in the original redline boundary (August 2022)) and a connecting surface water ditch (Approximately 25m wide) running parallel to the A617 (blue area shown below Fig 1).</p> <p>However, we would like to feedback on the consultation, more particularly (TR010065/S42(1)(d)Cat1&amp;2/March/2023);-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It was our understanding that the area highlighted in yellow (Fig 1: 4 below) (southern part of [redacted]) which was included in the original redline boundary consultation was to be removed (exchanged) for these blue areas</li> <li>2. The width of the connecting surface water ditch as proposed on Area Plan 4 is far wider than previously advised 25m at the project team meetings shown in fig 2 below. We need to understand why this has increased? We assume to facilitate an extra working width, however, this additional working width could significantly impact the construction of [redacted] solar project in terms of both the timing of the build and the area included for energy generation and included in the Option Agreement with the two landowners for the scheme.</li> </ol>	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee during and following the statutory and targeted consultations with regard to the issues raised in relation to land identified for use as an area of floodplain compensation in Kelham and Averham.</p> <p>The engagement that has taken place by the Applicant has included the Consultee and other interested parties, including the developer of the proposed solar panel farm.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's concerns outlined in Section 1 of their response, the Applicant has worked extensively with the Consultee to understand their concerns and explore alternatives and options for floodplain compensation that would reduce the impacts on the Consultee's business operations and land.</p> <p>In addition, as far as the Applicant understands, the collaborative engagement has resulted in a proposed solution from the Scheme which provides the full extent of generating capacity originally anticipated for the Consultee's solar farm development. The Applicant acknowledges that this outcome would not have been possible without the proactive proposal from the Consultee for an alternative floodplain compensation area. The adoption of the alternative land proposed by the Consultee required significant additional investigation including ecological impact assessments, floodplain compensation as well as a targeted consultation associated with the proposed amendments to the Order Limits.</p> <p>Following the engagement with the Consultee and subsequent targeted consultation, the Applicant has made changes to the Order Limits regarding the use of the Consultee's land for floodplain compensation purposes.</p> <p>Further detail relating to the updated Order Limits for the Scheme as a result of feedback received from the Consultee can be found in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee relating to the agreement regarding the use of the north part of the property and a connecting surface water ditch running parallel to the A617. This is included within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee under point one relating to the use of the southern part of the property, which has been identified for use by the Consultee as part of the solar panel farm development, and the request to have this removed from the Scheme Order Limits. This area of land remains within the Order Limits for the Scheme, this is shown within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. This area of land would flood infrequently and the Applicant understands that the panels and equipment can be raised such that they are not affected when the area is flooded.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on development land and businesses. This includes the land identified for the proposed solar panel farm. The land requirement for the floodplain compensation area would not have a significant impact on the land proposed for the solar panel farm. Design solutions for the floodplain compensation area have been developed in coordination and review with the Consultee, other interested parties, and developers of the solar panel farm development. The dialogue with the Consultee has included discussion on programme coordination of both the Scheme works and the solar farm development works.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee raised under point 2 relating to the width of the connecting surface water ditch. In discussion with the Consultee, a width of 25m was agreed for both the cross section of the access track and surface water ditch. The Scheme design has been</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>3. If the channel is acquired for the flood alleviation scheme, it should be on a temporary acquisition basis during the period of construction only, with a right of access granted to National Highways (or a third party (IDB)) after construction for maintenance of the channel with a repair liability for the vehicular access track appropriate to use.</p> <p>4. Timing of the works to the channel and the lowering of land at Kelham needs to be carefully considered in the context of the Option Agreement to [redacted] (Plan included at Appendix 2.</p> <p>a) It is assumed that planning for [redacted] solar scheme will be granted (following submission of the planning application in late Spring 2023), in October 2023 with a longstop date of October 2024, once granted following a six week Judicial Review period the lease for the energy scheme can be triggered, with construction commencing in November / December 2023. From our discussions with [redacted] and [redacted] we understand that flood alleviation works will commence between February 2025 and June/July 2025.</p> <p>The problems we foresee are as follows:-</p> <p>a.i) From a practical point of view, this appears to indicate the two projects will overlap.</p> <p>a.ii) From a legal point of view, [redacted] could have a lease of the land when National Highways come to do the work. Our discussions with National Highways have pointed to the temporary acquisition of land for flood alleviation works through a lease between the landowner and National Highways, however it is not possible for a landowner to lease the same parcel of land to two different parties at the same time, a legal solution needs to be found.</p> <p>5. We consider there are two more suitable locations for proposed flood alleviation that should be more carefully considered:-</p> <p>a. Land to the south of [redacted], west of the A617 [redacted] this area could be increased in size to negate the need for Area 4.</p> <p>b. Land to the south of [redacted], east of the A617 known as [redacted] alongside the River Trent, also owned by [redacted]. This was included in the original red line scheme boundary, it lies alongside the River Trent and would alleviate the need for Area 4 to be acquired. Whilst we have been informed by [redacted] that this parcel is not suitable due to the flood bank, we have not seen any evidence from the Environment Agency of this, confirming that this is a legislative or technical decision/reason for not pursuing it.</p> <p>To summarise, the inclusion of additional land into the floodplain compensation scheme from what was discussed with the project team is disappointing and will have a significant detrimental impact on the viability and deliverability of the solar and [Redacted] proposal as it will reduce the generating capacity of the scheme.</p> <p>I have worked with the A46 Bypass project team, led by [redacted], on the basis of the requirements discussed at the meetings, but the extent of the revised scheme red line boundary is not as agreed at the meetings and I ask that [redacted] (yellow area) is removed from the scheme boundary and the surface water ditch 'corridor' reduced to 25m from the edge of the A617 highway land as proposed in the drawing supplied by [redacted] in December 2022 (Fig 2).</p> <p>Section 2 :</p> <p>[Redacted] and business, comprising residential property {redacted} and some 118 acres of arable land and associated woodland/wetlands plus an airfield [redacted]. The whole property is dedicated to farming and aviation based businesses, including a runway with full planning permission for 365 days/yr operation.</p> <p>The initial red line boundary issued in 2022 encompassed virtually my entire business property as well my home, and I am pleased to see significant reduction in the area bounded in the latest revision.</p>		<p>updated to meet this agreement, as outlined in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>With regard to point 3 raised by the Consultee, while the Applicant is seeking freehold acquisition of this part of the land, continuous engagement will take place with the Consultee to resolve this by agreement.</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's comments under 4 a.i and a.ii, the Applicant would be able to undertake the majority of their works without impacting on the solar farm construction works. Items such as the new access off the A617 which crosses two 5m culverts would require a temporary access to be utilised by the solar farm contractor. The key area requiring a close working relationship would be where it is proposed that the land beneath the solar panels is reduced in level. The solar farm equipment can be placed at the currently proposed levels but with longer supports to cater for the lowered ground level subject to the necessary assessments and agreements being secured by the solar developer with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>With regards to the Consultee's suggestions of more suitable locations for proposed flood alleviation, land suggested by the Consultee under point 5a has been assessed and included within the Scheme Order Limits following the targeted consultation. Land suggested within 5b has been assessed and is not included within the Order Limits as it isn't suitable for the floodplain compensation required due to levels of this area not correlating with the specific levels and volumes of compensation necessary resulting from the Scheme.</p> <p>In relation to the Consultee's comments regarding the requested removal of the area highlighted in yellow on the Consultee's sketches, the Applicant has confirmed to the Consultee that the area identified remains necessary to achieve the required floodplain compensation volumes. However, the area to the south of the property which includes the battery storage system for the solar development has been removed from the Order Limits with the exception of the agreed 25m wide area for the flood water channel and maintenance track.</p> <p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides further justification for how the design was developed for the floodplain compensation areas.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>However, as referred to in Section 1 above, I have been in discussion with NH project team, led by [redacted], for some six months now and have great concern that the revised red line depicted east of the A617 bears no resemblance to the discussed areas put forward for the A46 scheme works by the project team over that time.</p> <p>The clearly documented intention that has been put forward at our meetings by the project team lead is that there is a requirement to create a culvert beneath the A617 at approximate position N 53d 05m 17s – W 000d 51m 11s. The access to this position to be facilitated by construction of access off A617 via position shown in NSDC planning permission ref: 14/00569/FUL.</p> <p>Link to 14/00569/FUL:  <a href="https://publicaccess.newarksherwooddc.gov.uk/onlineapplications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=N2ZX1VLBFJP00&amp;activeTab=summary">https://publicaccess.newarksherwooddc.gov.uk/onlineapplications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=N2ZX1VLBFJP00&amp;activeTab=summary</a></p> <p>There is an acknowledged need for initial deployment of machinery only via [redacted], but this has always been made clear that it will be VERY short duration and for unloading of machine/plant to initiate construction of the access point only – the remainder of the works being carried out via the new entrance to be created by NH.</p> <p>There is clearly minuted record that land north-east of that access point (depicted as area B, Drawing 4 – Fig 3 below) requires no works by NH and would be removed from the NH red line boundary at revision – this has not been done and I request the boundary be revised to reflect the minuted discussion.</p> <p>Further, is the unacceptable retention of land in my residential parcel [redacted], to south of [redacted] and east of the A617 within red line boundary (identified as area A Drawing 4, Fig 3 - further detailed in Fig 4, below). – this had not been discussed as being required by NH in any of our meetings until I raised it at a meeting on 3rd April on having seen it in consultation documents. The response was that NH are considering crossing the A617 within the area demarked on the plan as area A overleaf, and presumably taking access thereto.</p> <p>I wish it to be a matter of record that I have not been consulted on use of this piece of my residential property and if works are to be implemented by NH in that land parcel, my position is has not been by negotiation and will be by means of NH Compulsory Purchase.</p> <p>To put it clearly - I will not negotiate use of my residential property for this scheme having been asked to give up some much of my business opportunity and income already by negotiation.</p> <p>It is worth noting that 100% of my livelihood is included within the scheme already, it is too much to ask that my home is to be included also. I remain available to continue negotiations with NH team to progress this matter to an agreeable outcome for all parties.</p>		
BHLF-AUZX-HYFS-2	Stakeholder engagement; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Further to our meeting at [redacted] yesterday, please find attached a drawing prepared to indicate the large difference between the connecting channel boundary agreed during our negotiations and that now indicated on the consultation drawings that have been published.</p> <p>The consultation drawings should be amended and republished to show the agreed, much smaller, area required.</p> <p>With regard to the inclusion of [redacted] field, we reiterate that this would be very detrimental to our development.</p> <p>We ask that you use best endeavours to exclude this area from the flood alleviation scheme but in the interim, as offered, you will discuss with EA the potential for development within that area given the view that it will be flooded extremely infrequently (possibly never) and to minimal depths.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Consultee during and following the statutory and targeted consultations regarding the issues raised in relation to land identified for use as an area of floodplain compensation in Kelham and Averham.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked extensively with the Consultee to understand their concerns and explore alternatives and options for floodplain compensation that reduce the impacts on the Consultee's proposal for a solar panel farm in the area. This engagement has resulted in changes being made to the Order Limits following the targeted consultation.</p> <p>Further detail relating to the updated Order Limits for the Scheme as a result of feedback received from the Consultee can be found in the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and Works Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.3)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee relating to the Order Limits boundary of the connecting channel used for a surface water ditch and access track. In discussion with the Consultee and landowner a width of 25m was agreed for both the cross section of the access track and surface water ditch. The Scheme design has been updated to meet this agreement, as outlined in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee relating to the use of the southern part of the property, which has been identified for use by the Consultee as part of the solar panel farm development, and the request to have this removed from the Scheme Order Limits. This area of</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HYFA-G	Stakeholder engagement; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>[Redacted] is currently developing a solar farm and BESS on land to the west of Kelham and north of Averham. Pre-application discussions with the LPA have been undertaken and are ongoing. A screening opinion has been issued by the LPA and a Public consultation exercise on the proposal was carried out in the summer of 2022. Currently a planning application is being prepared for submission to Newark and Sherwood District Council late spring 2023.</p> <p>[Redacted] are please to see that the scheme boundary for the floodplain compensation area has reduced significantly since the last statutory consultation period held in Autumn 2023.</p>		

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>However, significant concerns remain on the current extent of the boundary and the detrimental impact this will have on the delivery of the renewable energy generation and energy storage proposal.</p> <p>As you may be aware representatives of [redacted] have been working with the A46 Newark Bypass project team over the last several months to agree a way forward for both schemes.</p> <p>At the meetings [redacted] were accepting of your initial proposal for the flood compensation boundary to extend to 'conservation area field' and also a connecting surface water ditch (approximately 25m wide) running parallel to the A617 (blue area shown below in Fig 1).</p> <p>However, [redacted] were not made aware of the intention to include [redacted] (yellow area location to the immediate south of the conservation area field shown below) in the scheme boundary before this consultation was published. Furthermore, the width of the connecting surface water ditch as proposed on Area Plan 4 is far wider than previously advised 25m at the project team meetings in fig 2 below.</p> <p>The inclusion of additional land into the floodplain compensation scheme from what was discussed with the project team is a surprise and will have a significant detrimental impact on the visibility and deliverability of the solar and BESS proposal as it will reduce the generating capacity of the scheme.</p> <p>[Redacted] has always maintained that is happy to work with the A46 Bypass project team on the basis of the requirements discussed at the meetings. But the extent of the proposed scheme boundary was not agreed at the meeting and [Redacted] asks that [redacted] (yellow area) is removed from the scheme boundary and the surface water ditch 'corridor' reduced to 25m from the edge of the A617 highway land.</p> <p>[Redacted] would be happy to continue the discussions with the project team and would hope to achieve a mutually agreeable outcome subject to ensuring our project capacity and delivery timeline are not adversely affected.</p>		<p>land remains within the Order Limits for the Scheme, this is shown within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency regarding the potential for the solar panel farm development to take place on the land identified for use as a floodplain compensation area, the Applicant received confirmation from the Environment Agency that the solar panel farm development could take place in the same location as the floodplain compensation area. Further information regarding this can be found within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) and Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on development land and businesses. This includes the land identified for the proposed solar panel farm. The land requirement for the floodplain compensation area would not have a significant impact on the land proposed for the solar panel farm.</p> <p>Design solutions for the floodplain compensation area undertaken by the Applicant have been developed in coordination and review with the developers and landowners of the solar panel farm development. It is the Applicant's understanding that the collaborative engagement has resulted in a proposed solution from the Scheme which provides the full extent of generating capacity originally anticipated for the Consultee's solar farm development.</p>
BHLF-AUZX-HY5J-8	Road drainage and the water environment; Land ownership	<p>I am responding to your Targeted Consultation on the A46 Newark Bypass (TR010065/S42(1)(d)Cat1&amp;2/March 2023). My comments relate to the proposed Kelham/Averham floodplain compensation area referenced as Area Plan 4 on the Targeted Consultation Changes Map.</p> <p>I have been engaged with A46 bypass project team as a stakeholder, having had numerous meetings over the last 7 months.</p> <p>I am pleased to see that the red line boundary of the Draft Order Limits (DOL) has been moved from my land to the west of the A617 at Kelham/Averham area, however I have concerns on the area that is remaining in the DOL and the impact it may have on the viability of a Solar Scheme I am a part of. The scheme I have an Option Agreement with is being proposed by [Redacted] and includes some of my land and a neighbour's land.</p> <p>At the outset of the discussions with the A46 bypass project team it was made clear that the floodplain compensation area would not effect the viability of the proposed solar scheme. However, with the inclusion of a piece of land to the south of the conservation area at Kelham and the increase in width of a connecting ditch from 25 metres to 30 metres to the west of the A617, which is contrary to what had been discussed at these meetings with the A46 bypass project team, these two areas could now impact the viability of the solar scheme.</p> <p>I would propose that the area in question be removed from the DOL boundary, and the connecting ditch be reduced to the 25 metres as discussed in our meetings.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has maintained ongoing and regular communication with the Consultee in relation to land included within the Scheme design for use as a floodplain compensation area in Kelham and Averham.</p> <p>With regard to the proposal from the Consultee to remove a field from the Order Limits (south of the conservation area at Kelham) proposed for use by a solar panel farm scheme, this area of land remains within the Order Limits of the Scheme as it is required for the floodplain compensation. The land would be lowered by up to 500mm with the solar panels set at the same level with longer leg supports to prevent them from being inundated during a flood. Further details are presented within the Land Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.2)</b> and the Statement of Reasons <b>(TR010065/APP/4.1)</b>.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> considers the impact of the Scheme on development land and businesses, including the proposed solar panel farm. The land required for the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area is currently being used for agricultural farming and would be acquired for the works.</p> <p>Two farms would be impacted by the land requirement for the Kelham and Averham floodplain compensation area, with one significantly impacted permanently.</p> <p>Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b> provides justification for how the design was developed for the floodplain compensation areas.</p> <p>The connecting surface water ditch serving the floodplain compensation area runs parallel with the A617 between Kelham and Averham. This is required to enable the conveyance of flood water through the floodplain compensation area and provide a floodplain compensation area in its own right. In discussion with the landowner, a width of 25m was agreed for both the cross-section of the access track and the surface water ditch. The Scheme design has been updated to meet this agreement, as outlined in the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>.</p> <p>Design solutions for the floodplain compensation area undertaken by the Applicant have been developed in coordination and review with the developers and landowners of the solar panel farm development. It is the Applicant's understanding that the collaborative engagement has resulted in a proposed solution from the Scheme which provides the full extent of generating capacity originally anticipated for the Consultee's solar farm development.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HYFC-J	Land ownership; Assets; Stakeholder engagement	<p>In previous discussions held with [redacted] and National Highways we raised serious concerns over the likely adverse impact that the scheme would have on our client's freehold interests at Shell Newark, A46/A17 Winthorpe Roundabout, Newark.</p> <p>As you appreciate we have now been notified in relation to specific further amendments in relation to the scheme and understand that a further targeted consultation is intended to take place with parties that are directly affected by the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Having reviewed the latest published plans, it is evident that to all intents and purposes the site is seriously adversely affected.</p> <p>In the circumstances, our client would welcome early detailed engagement to understand the detail of the scheme further. To that end, please accept this email as a formal request that the District Valuer be in attendance at these discussions.</p>	N	<p>The updates included within the targeted consultation do not directly affect the Consultee's land. Further engagement has taken place with the Consultee following the targeted consultation, including representation from the district valuer, an independent property valuer who values properties and works out compensation for property impacted by the Scheme. This engagement provided the Consultee with an update on the Scheme, current land and rights acquisition proposals, the potential impact on site services and potential mitigations. Ongoing engagement will continue to take place with the Consultee as the Scheme design develops.</p> <p>The Applicant has shown regard to the Consultee's response to statutory consultation within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (<b>TR010065/APP/5.2</b>) under Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWDH-Z.</p>

## N.9 – Targeted Non-Statutory Consultation: Section 47 and Section 48 - Community Groups

N.9.A: British Horse Society

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5Y-Q	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Thank you for the updates on the proposals for the scheme. I attach my previous feedback with highlights of queries that I do not think have been addressed in your current proposal documents.</p> <p>I am concerned that, except where you are referring to the bridleway number specifically, the language used in the document excludes equestrians as 'cycling and walking' routes are referred to rather than multi-user paths which would include all vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Annotating the existing PRow on the plans would assist with making comments of the proposed scheme. For example, in the Kelham drawing where the bridleway follows the route of the River Trent we had discussed the crossing point and access close to construction activity.</p> <p>[redacted] area – the potential for routes with public access here discussed at the meeting in December are not identified here.</p> <p>Winthorpe Roundabout – the proposal here excludes equestrians from the off-road option, presumably horses and riders are expected to use the road which would sandwich them between fast moving MPV traffic and the cycling/walking route which is unacceptable. The road crossings are limited to pedestrians – a Pegasus crossing is needed which can be a shared crossing for all vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Farndon – the alternative /diversion to the bridleway was discussed although the plan is not clear to me in terms of how the bridleway users connect with the wider network.</p> <p>I understand the Active Travel Partnership have requested a meeting which I would wish to attend. I am on leave from 28 April to 10 May but would not wish to delay the meeting.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment regarding feedback that was previously submitted to the statutory consultation, and has shown regard to this within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes <b>(TR010065/APP/5.2)</b> against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWD6-E.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comments relating to language used within the targeted consultation materials where walking and cycling routes have been referred to. The Applicant can confirm that where walking and cycling routes are mentioned, this includes mobility impaired and vulnerable road users. Reference to horse-riding or equestrian users has not been included where walking and cycling routes are specifically provided, as these routes are not designed for equestrian use.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment relating to annotation of Public Rights of Way on plans relating to the Scheme design. The location of the existing and proposed routes are now shown within detailed in Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b> considered routes that were outside of the Order Limits and not impacted by the Scheme. The area referred to in the Consultee's response was not taken forward by the Scheme as it was considered to have low demand when compared to introducing the Hargon Lane route towards the A1133.</p> <p>Regarding the Consultee's concerns relating to horse-riding provisions at Winthorpe Roundabout, a survey was conducted considering all routes currently utilised by horse-riders. The routes for walking and cycling have been developed following the survey results, which showed no evidence of sufficient equestrian demand to warrant the additional cost and land take that would be necessary to install horse-riding routes and Pegasus crossings.</p> <p>The Scheme would replace all existing walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions where impacted, and also provide additional routes for walking and cycling. If a small number of horse-riders wish to navigate Winthorpe Roundabout they would do so as they do currently, utilising the road. The survey results are detailed in Appendix 12.1 (Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider Survey Results) of the Environmental Statement Appendices <b>(TR010065/APP/6.3)</b>.</p> <p>Regarding Newark Bridleway BW2, it is temporarily diverted to the west of Crees Lane and is routed to join the end of Marsh Lane, where it would divert north along an existing footpath and into a field running parallel to Crees Lane.</p> <p>At the end of Crees Lane, walkers, cyclists and horse-riders would use the existing underpass beneath the A46 towards Newark-on-Trent adjacent to Farndon Road, where they would share an existing footpath towards the River Trent and re-join the route approximately 30m east of Windmill Viaduct, which carries the existing A46. The route is shown on the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b>. This diversion is assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010065/APP/6.1)</b>, which assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse riding routes during construction and operation. The assessment finds that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 during the construction period due to the length of the diversion (700m) and the time of the diversions (24 months).</p> <p>An Active Travel working group was held on 11 May 2023, to which the Consultee sent their apologies.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY5K-9	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Consultation - more information/ publicity/time requested; Road layout; Winthorpe Roundabout; Traffic lights/signals; Drove Lane; A1/A46 Crossing; Brownhills Junction; Speed limit; Noise and vibration; Air quality; Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Attached is the response of the Winthorpe Think Again Group to the March 2023 Targeted Consultation on the Newark ByPass re-modelling. We are pleased that we continue to be included in your consultations and also pleased to see some further commitments to pedestrian and cycle routes in our vicinity.</p> <p>As you will note in our response, there are still a number of issues that concern us, mainly on the grounds that there is insufficient detail on many proposals for us to come to conclusions on their impact. We hope that these ideas will become more concrete in the near future.</p> <p>There are also a host of other issues raised by us in our December 2022 commentary on the statutory consultation which have not been addressed yet. We hope that there will be an ongoing programme of consultations where our further questions will be answered</p> <p>Thank you for asking us for further comments on the design proposals for the road scheme. We very much appreciate being kept 'in the loop' with your deliberations. We have considered the proposals where they affect Winthorpe and have the following comments to make</p> <p>We welcome the additional facility of a pedestrian and cycle crossing route from Winthorpe to Drove Lane and the Showground which will be a benefit to local Active Travel facilities.</p> <p>Does the revised red-line boundary in the vicinity of [redacted] indicate that it is your intention to construct a new access road to the [redacted] joining the A1133 between Winthorpe village entrance and the roundabout rather than the previous suggestion of an entrance on the [redacted] side of the village entrance?</p> <p>Although the new layout for the Winthorpe roundabout is quite novel it does not appear to be operationally significantly different to the previous iteration. However there are a number of issues which will affect local users which we would like to clarify:-</p> <p>At what locations on the roundabout will there be traffic light control and will there be parts of the junction where ordinary priority rules will apply?</p> <p>Will the light controls for the pedestrian and cycle crossings be part of the traffic control programme. Will operation of the pedestrian controls cause extra disruption to traffic over and above that caused by the vehicular traffic controls?</p> <p>The left-turning lane from the A1133 on to the Lincoln bound A46 is not very clearly defined. Will there be a filter lane, a dedicated third lane at the traffic lights or just two lanes?</p> <p>In the vicinity of the Drove Lane arm there are up to five traffic lanes. There is the distinct possibility of vehicle conflict in this zone where drivers are selecting the A46 or Link Road exits. Will there be adequate road lane markings to direct drivers from as far back as the A1133 roundabout entrance where motorists need already to be in the appropriate lane?</p> <p>Is the red-line boundary extension along Hargon Lane for the purpose of constructing a new walking and cycling pathway to connect to the proposed new Drove Lane connector, or is it to allow for the re-designation of the existing carriageway as the foot and cycle path?</p> <p>We would also like to note that there are significant concerns and suggestions noted in our 'Response to National Highways' statutory consultation on the proposed Newark Bypass' submitted to you in December 2022. Amongst these, which we would especially like to be addressed are:-</p> <p>The excessive height of the road embankment, A1 bridge and Brownhills Junction roundabout in the zone between Winthorpe and Newark Winthorpe Road Estate.</p> <p>The provision and level of speed restriction on the A46 and the Link Road between Cattle Market, Friendly Farmer and Winthorpe junctions.</p> <p>The suggested pedestrian and cycle route between the Friendly Farmer/Godfrey Drive and Drove Lane as a facility separated from the new link road. We note that your latest plan positions this route</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the Consultee's comment regarding feedback previously submitted to the statutory consultation and has shown regard to this within Annex N of the Consultation Report Annexes (TR010065/APP/5.2) against Response ID reference BHLF-559H-RWXU-1.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's comment with regard to the level of detail included within the materials produced for statutory consultation and targeted consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation is compliant with the requirements of schemes seeking development consent under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Materials were produced for the statutory consultation and targeted consultation, presenting information that was available at the time of the Scheme's development. Information presented within the statutory consultation materials provided sufficient detail enabling consultees to develop an informed view of the Scheme at that particular stage.</p> <p>If the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press. The examination process removes the need for a further consultation at this stage.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment from the Consultee with regard to being consulted as part of the targeted consultation and the positive sentiment to the walking and cycling route from Winthorpe to Drove Lane.</p> <p>Following the targeted consultation, the Applicant has held a meeting with the Consultee. A microsimulation video of Winthorpe Roundabout was shared to demonstrate how the through-about layout would operate. The proposed walking and cycling routes were discussed demonstrating how the village is linked to the Coddington Public Right of Way south of the existing A46, the Showground via Hargon Lane and the A1133 and the re-routing of the existing route along Winthorpe Road to Newark-on-Trent.</p> <p>With regard to the revised red-line boundary in the vicinity of property referred to in the Consultee's response, the Order Limits have been changed to move the access further south along the A1133 approximately 50m from Winthorpe Roundabout.</p> <p>Further clarification on the points requested by the Consultee is provided by the Applicant below.</p> <p>At Winthorpe Roundabout, ordinary priority would be provided where Drove Lane and the A1133 joins the roundabout, all other arms of the roundabout would be signalised.</p> <p>The route around the Winthorpe Roundabout for walking and cycling is required for cyclists to travel safely between the A1133 and Drove Lane. The crossings would not disrupt traffic flows as the crossing signals would only show green when the traffic on the carriageway it crosses is stopped by a red light, as part of the traffic signal sequencing around the roundabout.</p> <p>There would be adequate road markings on Winthorpe Roundabout, a sign gantry would also be provided where it goes from four to five lanes to aid the driver decision process.</p> <p>From the A1133 onto Winthorpe Roundabout, the eastbound A46 and Lincoln would be clearly signposted as a left turn and the need to use the left lane.</p> <p>At Hargon Lane it is felt that the existing road can be retained as it is and shared between motor vehicles, walkers and cyclists. The Order Limits extend into the western verge of the lane in order to provide powers to add additional space should this be required at the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>The A1/A46 Crossing is set at the minimum height that is allowed for the structure. The clearance beneath the new bridge is very similar to the existing crossing, however due to the large span</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>directly alongside the new road with no separation. In our view this is not a safe proposition and would not allow for sufficient separation between vehicular, pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>There is still no indication as to how the Winthorpe to Coddington PROW will be re-routed. Your latest plan has even less detail of this route than that put forward in the previous consultation plan.</p> <p>There are also still many unanswered questions related to noise, air pollution, water management and other environmental issues that we hope will be addressed in future consultations.</p> <p>We look forward to your response and to further consultation events where we hope that the other issues raise in our Consultation Report will be addressed</p>		<p>across the A1 the depth is much greater, which raises the road alignment crossing the A1. The embankment height is directly related to the height of the A1/A46 Crossing and cannot be reduced. Since statutory consultation, the Brownhills Junction Roundabout has been lowered to a similar level as the adjacent A1 but can't be lowered further as it would be below the 1 in 1000-year flood level which would introduce safety risks for road users, walkers and cyclists using the walking and cycling route. The embankment height can't be lowered further as this needs to tie in smoothly to the A1/A46 Crossing.</p> <p>A speed limit has been allocated to each section of road modified by the Scheme. The speed limits are described in Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) and included on the Permanent Speed Limit Order Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.8</b>).</p> <p>The new dual carriageway would operate under the national speed limit between Farndon and Cattle Market and be restricted to 50mph between Cattle Market and Winthorpe for safety reasons associated with the constrained highways geometry. Speed enforcement for this section of road would be provided in the form of average speed cameras to encourage compliance with the reduced speed limit.</p> <p>The walking and cycling route between the Friendly Farmer Roundabout and Winthorpe Roundabout would be positioned alongside the Friendly Farmer Link Road to minimise the land take for the Showground. The link road has a 1m hard strip and a 0.5m separation to the walking and cycling route which provides a safety zone for users.</p> <p>Where possible all new walking and cycling routes and crossings will be designed to be <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> compliant. Where <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i> is not achievable due to existing geometry or boundary constraints robust justification will be put in place and appropriate design processes (risk assessments and a road safety audit) will be implemented to ensure crossings are safe and accessible for road users. The design of the walking and cycling routes will be further reviewed in the detailed design stage. Details of the Scheme walking and cycling routes are provided on the General Arrangement Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.5</b>) and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (<b>TR010065/APP/2.4</b>).</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (<b>TR010065/APP/6.1</b>) presents an assessment of both construction and operational phase effects of the Scheme. Specific chapters relating to air quality (Chapter 5), noise and vibration (Chapter 11) and road drainage and water environment (Chapter 13) provide information on the potential impacts and identified sensitive receptors of the Scheme.</p> <p>While there will be no further consultation events, if the Scheme's development consent application is accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate, all stakeholders will be able to review the development consent application documents, register as an 'Interested Party' and submit relevant representations to the Examining Authority prior to the examination commencing.</p> <p>Relevant representations will be considered by the Examining Authority during the examination process as well as any written representations received and there would also be hearings held during examination which Interested Parties can attend in person. These will be advertised nearer the time in the local press.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HY55-K	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Construction; Road drainage and the water environment; Land ownership; Stakeholder engagement	<p>Please find below a collective response from the Crees Lane Residents Association (CLRA) addressing key areas of the Targeted Consultation that address the updated proposals focusing on points 5 &amp; 6 in particular.</p> <p>Following the meeting held at [redacted] on Thursday, 13th April 2023, between the CLRA, [redacted] and [redacted]. A round table discussion took place where collective views were aired and highlighted points were discussed. Points that we would like to put on record as raised as a result of that meeting are as followed.</p> <p>5) Farndon Bridleway (BW2) temporary diversion</p> <p>Follow the discussions, it would seem that there is a collective agreement from both stakeholders and Consultants presents that it would better suit all concerned, in terms of safety, security and maintenance throughout the duration of the project, that the bridleway diversion start from the Western clapper-gate on plan 5, round to the proposed new temporary path running adjacent to Crees Lane. This would ensure walkers/children are kept away from the construction site and any temptations to venture into restricted areas of the project. It would also remove any potential confusion and frustration with regard to understanding access from Farndon to Newark throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>Several suggestions were made as to the proposed route concerning locking/securing the western clapper gate; however, residents require access by use of a coded padlock etc. The addition of a temporary path running alongside Crees Lane would require a secure fence so that the public using the path could not cross through the hedge line into Crees Lane, as this would be a considerable safety hazard for traffic and pedestrians using the lane.</p> <p>6) Farndon temporary construction holding area</p> <p>The proposed additional land for use as a temporary vehicle holding area was discussed at length with the attending group. A number of issues were highlighted, with suggested alternatives provided. Firstly, the holding area is suggested to be placed in an area of known flooding. The corner of the field where it is proposed is very low-lying in terms of the surrounding area, and any major downpour sees considerable surface area water. Plus, The width of Crees lane at that point narrows to a single carriageway, making passing and turning very difficult for construction and local traffic. The Holding area suggested in the land situated between the old A46 and the dual carriageway is currently a flood cell where all the run-off water from the roundabout drains to. The project team were unaware of the cell and said that they would investigate further.</p> <p>As a solution to both aspects, [redacted] (in attendance) offered the use of his land directly opposite off the roundabout where he has significant hard/secure standing (1-2 acres) that has been used by the Highways historically for previous projects and is directly accessible off the roundabout.</p> <p>[Redacted] offered the opportunity for further conversations to take place at a mutually agreeable time.</p> <p>The CLRA would like to pass their thanks to both [redacted] and [redacted] for taking the time to come and talk with the group and explain the plans in more depth. The group is in agreement that the scheme will have a significant positive impact on the immediate and wider area and are keen to work with the project team to come to mutually agreeable solutions to all aspects of the project affecting the immediate area.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments from the Consultee with regard to the points that were discussed at the meeting in April 2023.</p> <p>With regard to the points raised about Newark Bridleway BW2 temporary diversion, the route presented at targeted consultation for the diversion of Newark Bridleway BW2 was commented upon by a number of consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed that the proposed use of Marsh Lane would not be suitable for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to use alongside motor vehicles due to limited space available.</p> <p>Following targeted consultation, the Applicant has changed the temporary diversion of the Newark Bridleway BW2 so that it would be for equestrian use only.</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists would utilise the existing Farndon Footpath FP5 from the River Trent at Farndon to gain access to the route adjacent to Crees Lane. The Applicant notes the comments from the Consultee regarding the need for fencing along this diversion route to prevent the public crossing through the hedge line into Crees Lane and this would be provided where necessary.</p> <p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are included in Appendix 12.2 (Population and Human Health Supplementary Information) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3). Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (TR010065/APP/6.1) considers the impact of the Scheme on the local population and human health receptors. It assesses the impact of the Scheme on the users of walking, cycling, and horse riding routes during construction and operation. The assessment finds that there will be a significant adverse impact on users of Newark Bridleway BW2 during the construction period due to the length of the diversion (700m) and the time of the diversions (24 months).</p> <p>With regard to the Consultee's concerns relating to the temporary construction holding area, the area location adjacent to Crees Lane is within Flood Zone 3 and is likely at an existing risk from groundwater flooding.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the flood risk in the holding area and feels this can be managed adequately by implementing an appropriate drainage system, if required to allow the works to be completed.</p> <p>Details of the drainage strategy can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the Environmental Statement Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3) and the Drainage Plans within the Engineering Plans and Sections (TR010065/APP/2.6).</p> <p>Crees Lane would not be blocked at any time by construction traffic. Furthermore, the Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010065/APP/7.7) prevents construction vehicles from travelling along the private road section of Crees Lane.</p> <p>The area between the A46 and Farndon Road has been checked and there are no flood cells within the area recorded on the as-built drawings for the completed Newark to Widmerpool scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Consultee's support for the Scheme including the offer for use of land and will continue to engage with the Consultee in relation to this and aspects of the Scheme affecting the immediate Crees Lane area, if necessary, throughout the Schemes development.</p>

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
BHLF-AUZX-HYFF-N	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders; Consultation - general	<p>Response to the information provided at the meeting on the 11th May 2023</p> <p>To recap on the previous submissions in rounds 1 &amp; 2. The A46 Active Travel Partnership was formed during the first phase of consultation to draw Active Travel organisations together to make the case for significant improvements to the Active Travel network with the aim of ameliorating the problems caused by the constructions of the A1, the A17 and the dualling of the A46 to Lincoln which will be amplified by the new road. It became clear when the second set of plans were made public that no consideration of our submission had been made, nor had the required assessment of walking, cycling and horse riding needs been done.</p> <p>In December 2022 a wider Active Travel Working Group, that included members of LAF &amp; County Council Staff was formed in response to our second stage submission and a joint meeting was held at County Hall with design team to discuss the problems with the Active Travel network and opportunities to address the problems, particularly along the eastern side of Newark where the complex interchange junctions cause major difficulties for Active Travel users. A meeting was promised to report back on the design teams investigation of the options in late February but this meeting was never held. When the third phase plans were published we were sent a special invitation to comment, but the plans lacked detail so we asked for a meeting. After repeated requests a meeting was finally held on May 11th.</p> <p>What we understood from the verbal comments in the meeting.</p> <p>Assessment of walking, cycling and horse riding needs and the red line.</p> <p>From the comments made it was clear that Active Travel use surveys have been done at various points that confirmed what we had stated in our first document, that the A1, A17 &amp; A46 interchange created a major barrier to Active Travel users. Moreover, there was still no assessment of Active Travel needs up to 5km away. The schemes red line had been generated almost solely by the journey reductions times for motor vehicles and any changes were not to meet Active Travel needs.</p> <p>Winthorpe Road diversion and Winthorpe Rack</p> <p>Whilst the provision of a wider route under the new A46 bridge and the shorter diversion route proposed is an improvement, it still adds over 100m and a light controlled crossing which will significantly increasing journey time for Active Travel users. It is useful that a compensatory link across Winthorpe Rack to connect Newark BW6 to Holme Lane is being pursued, but very concerning the this relies on discretionary funding. Many months have elapsed without the basic question being answered, would the Winthorpe Rack landowner be willing to negotiate access?</p> <p>Diversion of Winthorpe Road route &amp; Drove Lane</p> <p>Much is being made of the addition of a crossing at the Winthorpe roundabout to create quote 'a circular route' either side of the A46, a bizarre label as such provision would imply amenity value. The true value of the extra crossing is in providing access to Drove Lane, which then gives access to the wider right of way network. Regrettably the opportunity to address safe access along Drove Lane following the extension of the red line area has been missed. To stress the point we remain very concerned there is nothing in the scheme to make Active Travel access along Drove Lane safer given that this is a major link to the wider right of way network and that the proposed A46 dualling will increase traffic volumes. Again we were told that improvements could be delivered using discretionary funding but the opportunity to work up a potential route with the landowners has not been taken.</p> <p>The design team's proposals to divert Winthorpe FP3 out of Newark Showground will be opposed by local user groups unless it involved compensation improvements along Drove Lane. This issue should have been tackled by three way discussions in the period since December.</p> <p>Beacon Hill route making use of the existing A1 underpass</p> <p>It is not surprising that the Newark and Sherwood District Council are very keen about the provision of this route as it is well away from roads and makes use of the existing A1 underpass that is already in use. The route would provide access to the expanding employment sites and also provide</p>	N	<p>The Applicant assessed the direct impacts caused by the Scheme and has maintained the current provisions through replication alongside the new carriageway or diversion routes. Additional routes were also present such as the eastern walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout, the link from Hargon Lane to Winthorpe Roundabout and the new walking and cycling route that would pass beneath the new A46 adjacent to the A1. These routes remove the existing severance from north to the south caused by the existing A46.</p> <p>During the meeting mentioned by the Consultee, the Applicant advised that initial discussions had been held with the landowner of the Winthorpe Rack and stated that they were receptive to the idea suggested by the Consultee. The Applicant is not able to acquire this land under the development consent application.</p> <p>The Scheme does not impact the current situation along Drove Lane and this suggestion could not be justified as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Winthorpe Footpath FP3 diversion out of the Showground and Drove Lane are outside of the Order Limits and are not required as part of the Scheme. The Scheme would improve safety and provide a walking and cycling route around Winthorpe Roundabout. This walking and cycling route has extended the route along Drove Lane to the first Showground entrance allowing this to be extended in the future, if required. The diversion of Winthorpe Footpath FP3 was discussed as the Applicant was aware that this this would form part of the planning application for a Consultee. The combined access track/footway/cycleway would remain at the same location as of that presented during the statutory consultation. Details of this can be found within the General Arrangement Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.5)</b> and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010065/APP/2.4)</b>.</p> <p>All three opportunities have been captured within Appendix C (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review) of the Transport Assessment <b>(TR010065/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>The Scheme is not able to secure the Beacon Hill route or diversion of the Winthorpe Road route and Drove Lane through the development consent application as they are not impacted or required as part of the Scheme. The Scheme would provide additional facilities and improvements above those solely required by the Scheme but located within the Order Limits.</p>



Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
		<p>a link to the routes leading to Drove Lane. Again there was no evidence provided of any attempt to pursue this option with landowners.</p> <p>We need to reiterate that at this stage we are seeking the provision of routes on the ground. Improvements using discretionary funding/ other grants can be applied for once such routes are secured.</p>		

**N.10 – Targeted Statutory Consultation: Section 42 (1)(d) - Persons with an Interest in Land**

N.10.A: Persons with an interest in land

Response ID	Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	The Applicant's response (inc. regard had to the consultation response)
HLF-AUZX-HYFW-6	Land ownership	I would like to understand why there may/might be an entitlement for me to make a relevant claim due to the effects of the construction/operation of the new road. I am not quite sure what the threats might be to residential property I own that is in the area although not directly adjacent to the works location. Maybe the concern is due to traffic flow etc during the period of works, for which any information you might have could be useful.	N	The Applicant has engaged further with this Consultee with regards to their query and provided more information as requested.