From: [redacted]
To: A46 Newark Bypass
Subject: Text of spoken submission at Kelham Hall meeting, Tuesday 8th October 2024
Date: 16 October 2024 21:13:42

Dear Sir,

Interested Party Reference number: 20049681

I was an attendee and spoke at the A46 planning meeting held at Kelham Hall on Tuesday 8th October 2024. Here is the text of my submission. I have added my further reservations not included in my spoken submission regarding the potential increased risk of serious flooding caused by the project.

Costs
It has been reported in the press that the cost of the Newark Southern Link Road is £100 million 1. This road is a straightforward 5km single carriageway. In contrast the A46 upgrade is 6km, it is a dual carriageway, and includes two rail crossings, two river crossings, a flyover, and significant modifications to existing roundabouts and slip roads. On their website Midland Connect estimate the cost of this project to be £500 million 2, i.e. only 5 times the cost of the southern link road. Considering inflation and the scale of the project, wouldn't a figure closer to £2 billion be more accurate? If so, the published cost-benefit calculations are hopelessly optimistic.

Justification
Having lived in London for my entire working life, I moved to Newark three years ago. From my perspective, the A46 is not a particularly busy road. I have travelled on it regularly and have dash cam footage of all my journeys since August of this year 3. In none of my journeys on the A46 have I been stationary in traffic for more than one minute. Even during traditional rush hours, significant delays are sporadic and relatively rare. Traffic can be slow on Friday afternoons between 3 and 5 PM, but is it prudent to spend such a substantial amount of money to alleviate congestion that only regularly occurs for two hours on one day of the week? When was the last traffic flow measurement conducted?

Noise
I live on [redacted], and the Cattle Market flyover will be very close to the end of this road. Currently, the average speed of vehicles along this section is approximately 50 MPH. Upon completion, the speed limit will increase to 70 MPH. This speed increase alone will significantly raise noise levels, and the elevated carriageway will exacerbate this further. I do not believe that the proposed noise mitigation measures of planting a few trees is sufficient to keep noise levels below the WHO recommendation of 53 dB4

Green Credentials

The existing plans reroute the Trent Valley Way along roads instead of its current path across fields. It would have been straightforward to include an underpass, allowing people to walk from Newark to Kelham across the fields without crossing major roads.

Flooding

The Kelham Road, Sandhills Park and Cullen Close area of Newark flooded three times in the winter of 2023/24. The first of these was considered a once in a generation event as the last time the area flooded was 2000. The fact that there were two more incidents suggests that climate change is already having an adverse effect on the area.

I note that the report TR010065-000267-TR010065_A46 Newark Bypass_6.3 Appendix 13.2 Flood Risk Assessment.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) does not include the Southern Link relief road. Work on this is now taking place and the village of Hawton flooded for the first time ever in winter of 23/24 too, suggesting that the work on the road had an adverse effect on the area.

The flooding in the Kelham Rd area had minimal damage to property, though several suffered from damage to out buildings due to sewage from a broken pipe and at least one property lost electricity due to water under the floorboards.

The report mentioned above was written in 2011 and though since revised, I think before giving this road the green light there needs to be a much more thorough survey of the area. It would not have taken the water to have risen much higher to write off the railway line through Newark Castle station and the District council offices as well as the houses in the area.

1 https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/newsroom/news/3million-contribution-towards-newark-southern-link-road-a-key-infrastructure-project-for-the-region

2 [redacted]

3 I can supply dash cam footage on request

4 [redacted]

Regards

Nick Roulstone

[redacted]

Nottinghamshire County Council

Newsroom

Search this website

Search keywords

£3million contribution towards Newark Southern Link Road: A key infrastructure project for the region

Wednesday, 17 July 2024

In a boost for local growth, Nottinghamshire County Council has given the green light to transfer £3m to Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) to support the development of the Newark Southern Link Road scheme which will help unlock thousands of new homes and jobs in the area.

The new 5km road will connect the A1 at Balderton to the A46 at Farndon along the southern fringe of Newark and will help alleviate traffic pressures within the town, which has been a long-standing issue for residents and businesses. The road will also support the planned improvements to the Strategic Route Network managed by National Highways, including the A46 and A1 near Newark-on-Trent and improve the cycling and walking infrastructure in the area, helping more people to choose active travel to reduce their carbon footprint.

As well as providing a new route for traffic, the Newark Southern Link Road will also pave the way for a major transformation of Newark and its surroundings with the construction of Middlebeck, a sustainable urban extension that will offer a range of benefits for the local community. This includes up to 3,150 new homes and the potential to create up to 5,000 new job opportunities for the local area. The new development will also feature a new

primary school, shops, restaurants, industry space, and 200 acres of green space for the community.

The County Council's contribution of £3m will help secure an infrastructure package of £80m for the Newark Southern Link Road scheme, which has also received £20m from the Government's Levelling Up Fund, £7m from the D2N2 LEP and £5m from Newark and Sherwood District Council.

The scheme is being delivered in phases by developer Urban&Civic. The first phase between Staple Lane and Bowbridge Lane has already been completed and the developers are currently on site at both ends of the route delivering the A46 to Bowbridge Lane element and linking the Southern Link Road from Staple Lane to the Great North Road just south of the A1 junction. The final connection at the A1 end is expected to be completed by the end of November 2024, with the remaining works scheduled to be finished by Summer 2026.

Councillor Neil Clarke MBE, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, said: "We are delighted to approve this funding contribution to the Newark Southern Link Road project, which will deliver significant benefits for the residents and businesses of Newark and Nottinghamshire. This project will help ease congestion, improve connectivity, and support economic growth and housing development in the area. It also demonstrates our commitment to the Government's Levelling Up agenda and our ambitions to improve transport infrastructure and attract investment in Nottinghamshire."

Councillor Paul Peacock, Leader of Newark and Sherwood District Council, said: “We are extremely grateful for the support from our colleagues at Nottinghamshire County Council to help deliver this significant project for Newark and surrounding communities. When finished, the road will help ease dreaded congestion and allow much-needed homes and employment opportunities to be delivered. It is a real testament to partnership working, spearheaded by the District Council, that we have reached this point.”

Once fully operational, the new road will become adopted highway and the County Council will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance.

For more information about the Newark Southern Link Road scheme, please visit [redacted]

Download images

[redacted]

Find us on

Share this article

Published: Friday 01 December 2023

Research by Midlands Connect shows that nearly three quarters (73%) of local residents support the completion of the Newark bypass.

Consumer research done for Midlands Connect by Censuswide shows that more than one in three (35%) fully support the completion of the Newark bypass and a further 38% support it to some extent. Only 9% don't support the scheme.

70% think the completion of the bypass could boost the economy and create jobs and 44% believe the scheme could be deemed as levelling up.

Last week Midlands Connect released our report proposing upgrades and finishing the Newark bypass. The £400 - £500 million scheme has been dubbed as ‘imperative’ by Midlands Connect chairman Sir John Peace. The “Last piece of the puzzle” report outlines an upgrade scheme which will:

- Improve traffic signals at Farndon roundabout to achieve smoother traffic flows in peak hours.
- Plan new dual-carriageway bridge over the A1.
- Enlarge and partial signalling of Winthorpe roundabout to reduce congestion and improve journey reliability.
- New grade separated junction at the Cattle Market roundabout.

Commenting on the research, Integrated Transport Programme Lead Swati Mittal said:

“This much-needed upgrade will bring safer and more reliable journeys both for the local communities enduring delays. The improvements will also provide an economic boost for communities across the region, supporting growth and development.

“Congestion is only going to get worse here around Newark, so we want to act now to develop this modified route and help build a better, safer road network.”

Cllr Richard Davies, Vice-Chair of Transport for the East Midlands, said:

"Improvements to the Newark Bypass are essential to unlocking the full potential of the A46 as a vital national trade corridor, driving economic growth in the region.

"Improvements to the bypass remain TfEM's top strategic road priority, and this research shows that completing this work is a local priority too."

Michael Hardy, Newark Business Club - Action Group Chair added:

"As a business club we are fully supportive of this scheme and it's long term benefits. Newark is an important gateway to and from the Midlands for ports for business and the coast for leisure, the current road configuration has not been acceptable for years.

"Improving the infrastructure will have a positive impact on local businesses in and around town as current

congestion levels put consumers off visiting. It will also open up opportunities for investment, bringing jobs to the area."

Stay up to date

Subscribe today to our newsletter to keep up to date on vital information

Sign up to newsletter

Governance

Meeting dates

Boards and groups

Other links

The Engine Room – Podcast

Social media

Compendium of WHO and other UN guidance on health and environment

2022 update

Chapter 11. Environmental noise

WHO/HEP/ECH/EHD/22.01

Suggested citation. Environmental noise. In: Compendium of WHO and other UN guidance on health and environment, 2022 update. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 (WHO/HEP/ECH/EHD/22.01). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

11. Environmental noise

This section addresses exposure of the general population to environmental noise, such as noise from various forms of traffic or industry. It includes amplified music in the framework of leisure activities as well. It does not specifically include occupational noise exposure. Occupational risks, including noise exposure, are covered in section 11.3 on workplaces.

Overview

In 2011, an estimated one million healthy life years were lost from traffic-related noise in the western part of Europe only *(1)*. Important sources for environmental noise exposure are road, railway and air traffic, or building sites. Noise exposure can also occur through other sources such as wind turbines, and leisure activities such as listening to loud music or other audio content including participation in e-sports (video and computer game competitions). Excessive noise can cause annoyance; in addition research shows it increases the risk for IHD and hypertension, sleep disturbance, hearing impairment, tinnitus and cognitive impairment, with increasing evidence for other health impacts such as adverse birth outcomes and mental health problems *(2)*.

What is the proportion of people impacted by environmental noise in my country?

The noise indicators below are taken from guidelines that were developed for the WHO European Region. In terms of their health implications, the recommended exposure levels can be considered applicable in other regions and suitable for a global audience *(2)*.

Noise indicators are based on the European Union Directive 2002/49/EC *(3)* in the European Region.

- L_{den} is an average sound pressure level over all days, evenings and nights in a year.
- L_{night} is the equivalent continuous sound pressure level when the reference time interval is the night.
- $L_{Aeq,T}$ is the A-weighted (a frequency weighting to better reflect the human ear), equivalent continuous sound pressure level during a stated time interval starting at t_1 and ending at t_2, expressed in decibels (dB), at a given point in space.

The first two indicators are used particularly for noise monitoring and exposure assessment. The third is used for measuring leisure noise exposure. For more information on these and other noise indicators consult the *Environmental noise guidelines for the European Region (2)*. These noise indicators can be converted to other indicators used in other settings *(4)*.

What is the proportion of people impacted by environmental noise in my country?

Several countries use surveys to assess the perception of noise in the general population. The last European Quality of Life survey, carried out 2016–2017, found that 32% of more than 30 000 participants across Europe reported problems with noise in the immediate neighbourhood of their home *(5)*.

What are the levels of noise exposure we want to achieve?

Based on the systematic review of evidence available at the time of the development of the environmental noise guidelines *(2)*, the following recommended levels for specific noise sources can be defined.

For average noise exposure, the following sound pressure levels are recommended *(2, 6)*:

- < 53 dB L_{den} for road traffic noise
- < 54 dB L_{den} for railway noise
- < 45 dB L_{den} for aircraft noise
- < 45 dB L_{den} for wind turbine noise
- yearly average from all leisure source noises combined to ≤ 70 dB $L_{Aeq, 24h}$
- weekly average from leisure sources (such as personal listening devices [1]) ≤ 80 dB(A) or 1.6 Pa^2h
- short-term average from occasional exposure to leisure source noise ≤ 100 dB $L_{Aeq, 15min}$.

For **night noise exposure**, the following sound pressure levels are recommended *(2)*:

- < 45 dB L_{night} for road traffic noise
- < 44 dB L_{night} for railway noise
- < 40 dB L_{night} for aircraft noise.

Different categories of noise mitigation interventions along a continuum from source reduction to behaviour change can be defined. Interventions in the guidance section below are marked with A–E as defined hereafter *(2)*.

A. Source intervention:
   - change in emission levels of sources
   - time restrictions on source operators.

B. Path intervention:
   - change in the path between source and receiver
   - path control through insulation of receiver/receiver's dwelling

C. New/closed infrastructure:
   - opening of a new infrastructure noise source
   - closure of an existing one
   - planning controls between (new) receivers and sources.

D. Other physical intervention:
   - change in other physical dimensions of dwelling/neighbourhood.

E. Behaviour change intervention:
   - change in individual behaviour to reduce exposure
   - avoidance of exposure or reduced duration of exposure
   - community education and communication.

[1] A personal listening or audio device is a portable device designed to be worn on the body or in a pocket. It is designed to allow the user to listen to various forms of media.

Guidance	Sector principally involved in planning/ implementation	Level of implementation	Instruments
Road traffic noise: policies and actions			
Recommended actions are available for specific noise sources and do not cover all potentially important noise exposures.			
1. Improve the choice of appropriate tyres and road surface (A) *(2)*.	Transport Land use planning	National; community	Regulation; infrastructure, technology and built environment
2. Reduce traffic flow and restrict truck traffic (A) *(2)*.	Transport Land use planning	National; community	Regulation; taxes and subsidies; infrastructure, technology and built environment
3. Insulate dwellings, construct barriers (B) *(2)*.	Housing Land use planning	National; community	Regulation; taxes and subsidies; infrastructure, technology and built environment
4. Construct road tunnels (C) *(2)*.	Transport Land use planning	National; community	Infrastructure, technology and built environment
5. Design/make available a "quiet side" in the dwelling; create nearby green space (D) *(2)*.	Housing Land use planning	National; community	Infrastructure, technology and built environment
Railway noise: policies and actions			
6. Apply rail grinding procedures to remove deformations and corrosions on railway tracks (A) *(2)*.	Transport	National; community	Infrastructure, technology and built environment
Railway noise: awareness raising and capacity building			
7. Inform the community about interventions being implemented to potentially reduce noise annoyance (E) *(2)*.	Health Environment Transport	Community Universal health coverage	Information, education and communication
Aircraft noise: policies and action			
8. Adapt opening and closing of runways (C) *(2)*.	Transport	National; community	Regulation; other management and control

Guidance	Sector principally involved in planning/ implementation	Level of implementation	Instruments
9. Rearrange flight paths (C) *(2)*.	Transport	National; community	Regulation; other management and control
Leisure noise: policies and actions			
10. Implement sound exposure monitoring (volume level and time spent listening) in all personal listening devices to allow for self-control with reference to a standard. In every listening device, the user should be allowed to select two different operational modes of reference exposure *(6)*, and track the percentage of exposure used vs the reference exposure for every seven days. The two operational modes include the following. • Mode 1: WHO standard level for adults • Mode 2: WHO standard level for sensitive users (e.g. children).	Health Sports and leisure	National	Regulation; infrastructure, technology and built environment
11. Implement options for volume limitation and parental volume control in every device *(6)*.	Sports and leisure	National	Regulation; infrastructure, technology and built environment
12. Enact and enforce legislation/regulations/policies for limiting sound levels and exposure in entertainment venues and events such as clubs, bars, fitness centres, concerts, etc.*(3, 7)*. Legislation should focus on: • limiting sounds to 100 dB(A) averaged over 15 minutes; • conducting regular sound monitoring to ensure and document compliance; • optimizing venue acoustics and sound system design to ascertain optimal listening conditions for all audience members in the venue/event; • create quiet zones allowing audience members to rest; • ensuring provision of hearing protection (earplugs); • ensuring provision of training on noise reduction strategies and information about noise.	Sports and leisure	National	Regulation
Leisure noise: awareness raising and capacity building			
13. Provide information on personal sound exposure to the user of personal listening devices through the device interface or other means *(6)*.	Health Sports and leisure	National	Information, education and communication
14. Provide personalized recommendations and cues for action for safe listening through personal listening devices, customized to a user's listening profile through the device interface or other means *(6)*.	Health Sports and leisure	National	Information, education and communication
15. Provide instructions on how to use safe listening features on the specific device through the device interface or other means *(6)*.	Health Sports and leisure	National	Information, education and communication

Guidance	Sector principally involved in planning/ implementation	Level of implementation	Instruments
16. Provide general information on safe listening and ways to practise it through the device interface or other means *(6)*.	Health Sports and leisure	National	Information, education and communication

Selected tools
WHO 2021: WHO is developing a global standard for safe listening entertainment venues *(7)* This guidance will promote safe listening among attendees of entertainment venues to mitigate their risk of hearing loss.
WHO Regional Office for Europe 2018: *Environmental noise guidelines for the European Region (2)* Results of the noise guidelines are also available as an executive summary in different languages.
WHO/ITU 2019: *Safe listening devices and systems – a WHO-ITU standard (6)* This document outlines the key features and requirements that personal audio systems must have in order to facilitate safe listening practices among users.
WHO 2015: *Make listening safe (8)* This webpage provides access to advocacy material around safe listening such as infographic, poster, banner and brochure.
WHO/ITU 2019: *Toolkit for safe listening devices and systems (9)* This toolkit provides practical guidance to support countries, industry partners and civil society groups in the use and implementation of the global standard on safe listening devices and systems (ITU-T H.870) *(10)*.
WHO Regional Office for Europe 2012: *Methodological guidance for estimating the burden of disease from environmental noise (11)*
WHO Regional Office for Europe 2011: *Burden of disease from environmental noise. Quantification of healthy life years lost in Europe (1)*
WHO Regional Office for Europe 2009: *Night noise guidelines for Europe (12)*

References

1. Burden of disease from environmental noise: Quantification of healthy life years lost in Europe. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2011 .
2. Environmental noise guidelines for the European Region. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2018
3. Directive 2002/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 June 2002 relating to the assessment and management of environmental noise. EUR-Lex; 2002
4. Brink M, Schäffer B, Pieren R, Wunderli JM. Conversion between noise exposure indicators $Leq_{24}h$, $L_{Evening}$, L_{Night}, L_{dn} and L_{den} principles and practical guidance. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2018;221(1):54–63. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.10.003.
5. Eurofound. European Quality of Life Survey 2016: quality of life, quality of public services, and quality of society. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union; 2017
6. Safe listening devices and systems: a WHO-ITU standard. Geneva: World Health Organization and International Telecommunication Union; 2019 accessed 2 December 2021).
7. Information session on the upcoming WHO Global standard for safe listening entertainment venues [website]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021 , accessed 10 December 2021).
8. Making listening safe [website]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021 21).
9. Toolkit for safe listening devices and systems. Geneva: World Health Organization and International Telecommunication Union; 2019 (– .
10. Guidelines for safe listening devices/systems. In: SERIES H: AUDIOVISUAL AND MULTIMEDIA SYSTEMS: E-health multimedia systems, services and applications – safe listening. Geneva: International Telecommunication Union; 2018
11. Hellmuth T, Classen T, Kim R, Kephalopoulos S, editors. Methodological guidance for estimating the burden of disease from environmental noise. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2012 — ccessed 2 December 2021).
12. Night noise guidelines for Europe. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2009 (—

World Health Organization
Department of Environment, Climate Change and Health
Division of Universal Health Coverage / Healthier Populations
20, Avenue Appia
CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland