

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:	Nottinghamshire County Council Comments
Q1.0.1	All IPs	<p>Policy – National</p> <p>Do you consider NPSNN 2024 to be Important and Relevant to the Secretary of State's decision? If yes, how much weight should the decision-maker attach to the Proposed Development's compliance with NPSNN 2024?</p>	<p>NCC accepts that the 2015 NPS has effect for any application for development consent accepted for examination prior to 24 May 2024. However, NCC consider that the terms of the NPSNN 2024 is of importance and is of relevant material consideration for the proposed development. The county has considered relevant matters in relation to the NPSNN 2024 within its Local Impact Report [REP1-038].</p>
Q6.1.3	NCC	<p>Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions</p> <p>Article 3(4) seeks the disapplication of the Nottinghamshire County Council Permit Scheme Order 2020. Is the County Council in agreement and if not please explain and justify your response, including why the usual notice provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 would not be sufficient.</p>	<p>From the Nottinghamshire County Council Permit Scheme Order 2020</p> <p>All Works Promoters must obtain a permit from the Permit Authority (4.1.1 – page 10)</p> <p>This is to comply with the TMA network management duty. (2.1 – page 6)</p> <p>The mechanism for submitting permits is through the Department of Transport (DfT) Street Manager software.</p> <p>Works for Road purposes are not chargeable (10.3 – page 26)</p> <p>The DfT require all authorities to use permits for works on the highway.</p> <p>National Highways already submit permits to Nottinghamshire for works on the Nottinghamshire network.</p> <p>Therefore, Permits are required for any works that affect Nottinghamshire County Councils network. (i.e. Diversionary works, S278 works, etc)</p>
Q6.1.7	NCC	<p>Articles 13 - 22 (Part 3 – Streets)</p> <p>As local highway authority, are the provisions set out in Articles 13-22 acceptable. If not, identify which are not and</p>	<p>Where the local authority is required to maintain highway infrastructure does this cover for commuted sums?</p>

		provide suggested alternative wording to correct/ address any concerns with reasoned justification	
Q6.2.12	The Applicant, NSDC, County Archaeologist, District Archaeologist.	<p>Requirement 9 – Archaeology and built heritage Please address the following issues:</p> <p>a) In 9(1) 'reflecting' is imprecise and adds a degree of ambiguity more appropriate to 'secure' the mitigation measures.</p> <p>b) 9(6) third line a space is missing after the (4) – Typing error.</p> <p>c) In 9(7) why is the district archaeologist not referenced as in other subsections eg (4).</p> <p>d) What is the justification for 14 days stated in 9(8) given that once 'identified' must be subject to appropriate mitigation as set out in any relevant mitigation strategy and agreed. The timescale seems unreasonably tight. Furthermore, as drafted 9(8) refers to 9(6) – surely this is referencing not- previously- identified remains which would be 9(7).</p>	<p>a) The mitigation measures set out in the REAC are too broad and the AMS is intended to provide the necessary detail, however It's certainly agreed that the word 'reflecting' is not precise enough. Alternative wording is suggested along the lines of – <i>9. –(1) Prior to the start of any pre-commencement works an archaeological mitigation strategy, securing the detailed mitigation measures as outlined in the REAC, will be prepared in consultation with the relevant planning authority and Historic England, agreed with the County Archaeologist and District Archaeologist and submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State.</i></p> <p>The word 'reflecting' is used in subsequent paragraphs and NCC thinks these should also be replaced with 'securing' as suggested in the Examiner's questions;</p> <p>b) Seems to have been corrected already in the October 2024 version.</p> <p>c) The District Archaeologist should also be included here;</p> <p>d) Certainly agree that 14 days is an arbitrary and tight deadline to agree a revised strategy for any unexpected archaeological remains encountered. NCC would recommend removing the time limit and revised wording along the lines of: No construction operations are to take place within 10 metres of the remains referred to in sub-paragraph (7) until the implementation of a revised and agreed programme of archaeological mitigation work, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State.</p>

			On point d), in practice the Council will do everything it can to address any unexpected remains as quickly as possible and avoid any construction delays as far as possible, but it does necessarily depend on what those remains are. Placing a limited time frame that we have to rush to fulfil is not really workable.
Q6.2.21	The Applicant, NSDC, NCC, EA, NE	Requirement 18 – Highway Lighting 18(1) refers to consultation with the relevant local authority, this isn't defined. Moreover, the lighting is recognised as potentially affecting landscape, visual, biodiversity etc. Wider consultation to include NSDC, NCC, EA, NE would appear to be appropriate. If not, please explain and justify why not.	Applicant to define 'Local highway authority'.
Q8.1.1	The Applicant NCC	Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs) In the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-050] the Applicant provides details of NDHAs. Can the Applicant and NCC confirm that this list is up to date?	The NDHA list is based on HER data from a 2022 when the Desk-Based Assessment was undertaken and would benefit from an up to date HER Search. Numerous NDHAs have also been identified during field work for the scheme and while many have been included on the list from the non-intrusive surveys, there should be more detail and additional sites resulting from the evaluation trenching work which have not yet been included.
Q8.1.2	NCC	Newark Flat Crossing In Section 7.3 of the Applicant's Transport Assessment Report [APP-193] there is reference to the "last remaining flat railway crossing in the UK" (paragraph 7.3.3). Does this have any heritage value, and if so, should it be considered a NDHA and assessed as such?	NCC agree that there may be merit in considering the level crossing intersection of the two railways to be of heritage interest and further research could contribute to an existing Historic Environment Record for 'Newark Crossing M3832'. The 5.1 Consultation Report indicates that the A46 Scheme "did not preclude a future grade separated rail

			scheme from being delivered at a future date” which I believe indicates that the heritage interest is unlikely to be harmed by the A46 widening scheme. The heritage significance of the level crossing would be a consideration if/when a future scheme is brought forward by Network Rail.
Q11.0.3	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Policy – Local</p> <p>Please explain the relevancy of the following policies, noted on pages 16 and 17 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-054], to the determination of this Application? Nottinghamshire and Nottingham County Council Waste Core Strategy (Adopted 2013):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCS3 Future waste management provision • WCS5 Disposal sites for hazardous, non-hazardous and inert waste • WCS8 Extensions to existing waste management facilities • WCS10 Safeguarding waste management sites <p>Emerging Nottinghamshire County Council draft Waste Local Plan (2022):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP2 Future Waste Management Provision 	The County Council note the policies referenced in Table 10-1 and Table 10-2 of ES Chapter 10. Whilst we acknowledge that the application could potentially lead to waste arisings which would impact the need for future waste management provision, including for that of disposal sites, the application itself is not for a waste facility and so we would consider Policies WCS3, WCS5, WCS8 and SP2 to have limited, if any at all, relevance to the determination of this application. In terms of WCS10, the policy seeks to ensure the safeguarding of operational and permitted waste facilities. Considering that the proposal does not appear to raise any issues in terms of safeguarding waste facilities, the County Council would consider this policy satisfied.
Q11.0.4	NCC	<p>Policy – Local</p> <p>a) Please provide a clear extract from the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021) showing the area within which the Proposed Development would be located.</p> <p>b) Subject Area Plan C on page 160 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan shows an area covered by yellow cross-hatching in a south-west to north-east direction. However, yellow cross-hatching in a south- west to north-east direction does not appear on the key. Please clarify.</p>	<p>a) Please find an extract of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan showing the proposed development area in Appendix A page 17.</p> <p>b) Unfortunately there is an error within the key for the mineral safeguarding and consultation area for sand and gravel, which should reflect the yellow cross-hatching in a south-west to north-east direction seen within Plan C. The County Council can confirm the yellow cross- hatching in Plan C is the mineral safeguarding and consultation area for sand and gravel.</p>

Q11.0.5	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Policy – Local Paragraph 10.3.58 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-054] (dated April 2024) states that: “The new waste management plan is expected to be adopted by July 2023.”</p> <p>a) Is the “new waste management plan” a replacement Waste Local Plan? If no, please provide a reference to the “new waste management plan”.</p> <p>b) When was it, or when is it expected to be, adopted?</p>	<p>This appears to be an error within paragraph 10.3.58, which mainly refers to the new Waste Local Plan other than the final sentence. In term of the new Waste Local Plan, once adopted this will replace the existing Waste Local Plan (2002) and Waste Core Strategy (2013). Following this issuing of the Inspectors post hearings note, it is expected to be adopted in late Spring/ early Summer of 2025.</p>
Q11.0.7	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Minerals Do you consider that the Proposed Development complies with:</p> <p>a) Policies SP7, DM13 and DM15 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan and the related paragraphs 3.84 and 3.87; and</p> <p>b) Paragraph 5.191 of NPSNN 2024?</p>	<p>a) In relation to Policy SP7, the County Council considers the proposed development is compliant. The applicant details the need for the development in this location, thus addressing clause 3 of Policy SP7. In terms of potential prior extraction, the applicant also details the overriding need for the development meets the criteria outlined in paragraph 3.87 and so that prior extraction is not appropriate. The County Council agree that the overriding need has been demonstrated and so the paragraph and Policy SP7 has been satisfied.</p> <p>The County Council consider that the proposed development complies with Policy DM13, with Policy DM15 bearing more relevance to the proposed scheme.</p> <p>For Policy DM15: Borrow Pits, the County Council note the scheme will make use of three borrow pits. It is noted that the borrow pits are close to the A46 project and are time limited, with two of the proposed borrow pits intending to be backfilled and the Farndon East borrow pit left to be filled by water overtime as there may not be sufficient surplus material to backfill it. Overall, the proposed development appears to</p>

			<p>comply with Policy DM15 providing it can meet the specific terms of this policy. In particular clause e) which requires proposals must provide for appropriate restoration measures which include full use of surplus spoil from the project.</p> <p>It is understood that the final form of restoration for these pits is emerging and likely to be influenced by flood alleviation requirements as well as the quantities of materials that will ultimately arise in the project that require recovery. The DCO should make provision to secure appropriate restoration schemes for the borrow pits with such schemes to be agreed by NCC as the minerals planning authority. The County Council has overseen the development and restoration of sand and gravel quarries in the local area which are now providing regionally significant scale and quality of wetland habitats in the Trent Valley. Restoration of the borrow pits should aim to build upon this and be biodiversity led if possible/subject to flood alleviation needs- as per the strategic objectives of the Minerals Local Plan. Large areas of open water (as envisaged with the Farndon East pit) are not a priority habitat and if the borrow pit or pits are not likely to be fully reclaimed then materials should be employed in a smarter way to create priority habitats such as Marsh and Swamp, Reedbed, shallows, islands, wetland margins, Floodplain Grazing Marsh, Lowland Neutral Grassland, ponds and scrapes so as to increase the overall resource and in doing so contribute to aspirations for this habitat, as per the Trent Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Project.</p>
Q11.0.9	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Site-won Material Paragraph 10.10.14 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-054] says that site-won materials, including sand</p>	<p>b) The re-use of any site-won minerals that are not used in the proposed development would be preferable as minerals are a finite resource and this would prevent the mineral being</p>

		<p>and gravel, would be re-used within the Proposed Development and, if required, further opportunities would be explored. However, paragraph 10.11.11 anticipates that not all site-won material would be re-used due to the potential poor quality of the material and its unsuitability for use as structural fill.</p> <p>a) (Applicant): What would happen to any unused site-won material, including any site-won minerals deposits?</p> <p>b) Does the dDCO need to include any provisions in relation to the use of any site-won minerals, including minerals that are not used in the Proposed Development (eg to avoid minerals going to waste)?</p>	<p>treated as waste material and so also would be preferable in terms of the waste hierarchy.</p>
Q11.0.12	NSDC, NCC	<p>Mitigation – Outline Site Waste Management Plan (OSWMP)</p> <p>Do you consider that the OSWMP at Appendix B.1 of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-184] would satisfactorily address paragraph 5.76 of NPSNN 2024? Is the Applicant's approach consistent with Nottinghamshire and Nottingham County Council Waste Core Strategy policies WCS1 and WCS2?</p>	<p>The County Council consider that the OSWMP at Appendix B.1 is consistent with Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy Policies WCS1 and WCS2, with the OSWMP outlining how waste will be managed as high up in the waste hierarchy as possible, with a focus on preventing the generation of waste in the first place. There is clear scope for a more ambitious target for utilising recycled aggregate content - the minimum target for 14% (para 1.4.2) is too low and 25% should be the minimum aim, reflecting the England average. A range of recycled and secondary materials are locally available such as PFA or IBA. There is also potential to recycle asphalt materials into cold mix surfaces and remove or reduce a need for the disposal of this material. This should be explored at the next iteration of the OSWMP. The Council supports the use of regular waste audits throughout the project which can inform improvements to the management of materials and waste with resulting reduced environmental impacts. Please note that Table 3-3 should include an asterisk like that in Table 10-12 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [App-054] that</p>

			Borrow Pits, Bole Ings and Cottam Ash Lagoons are restricted users sites, meaning they cannot accept waste externally. Additionally, it should be noted that Cromwell Quarry waste recovery site (listed in table 3-2) no longer benefits from planning permission.
Q11.0.13	Q11.0.13	Mitigation – Outline Materials Management Plan (OMMP) Do you consider that the OMMP at Appendix B.2 of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-184] to be satisfactory?	The contents of the OMMP are considered appropriate for this stage of the DCO process and will need to be further developed following DCO approval and detailed design. The final MMP will need to be submitted to CL:AIRE, administrator of the Definition of Waste: Code of Practice, a minimum of 6 weeks before site works begin.
Q11.0.14	NSDC, NCC	Mitigation – Outline Soil Management Plan (OSMP) Paragraph 10.10.7 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-054] states that the OSMP would be developed into a full Soil Management Plan (SMP) prior to construction. a) Are you satisfied with this arrangement? b) Do you consider that any amendments need to be made to the OSMP (Appendix B.3 of First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-184])?	The contents of the OSMP are considered appropriate for this stage of the DCO process and will need to be further developed following DCO approval and detailed design. It is noted that the OSMP refers to the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (2000), Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils, as the source for Figure 4.1: Topsoil stripping with bulldozer, 3600 excavator and articulated dump-truck. This has been superseded by guidance set out in The Institute of Quarrying's, Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (2021).
Q13.0.14	The Applicant, NSDC, NCC	Health Effects – Indirect Paragraph 4.80 of NPSNN 2015 and paragraph 4.71 of NPSNN 2024 state that national road networks may have indirect health impacts eg if they affect access to key public services, local transport, opportunities for walking, cycling and wheeling, or the use of open space for recreation and physical activity. Would the Proposed Development have indirect health effects and, if yes, what weight do you consider should be given to them by the decision-maker?	Whilst there would be some temporary disruption to the local transport network and walking and cycling routes during construction, once operational the scheme would generally have beneficial and/or neutral effects on walking and cycling routes. In addition, the scheme will provide a journey time reduction along the A46, which will provide a minor benefit for residents in accessing open space and community assets by private car. Therefore, any indirect effects on health are likely to be minor. The effect of the scheme on health and access to open space generally should be considered against the

			policy set out in the NPSNN (2024), specifically paragraphs 5.200 to 5.203.
Q13.0.17	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – Temporary Diversions On pages 58 and 59 of ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-056] it is stated that Newark BW2 is well-used and that users would be temporarily diverted via Newark FP3 and it is stated on page 35 of the Scheme Design Report [APP-194] the Order limits were altered to enable an alternative route to be used as a temporary bridleway diversion during construction. Is all of the diversionary route, including Newark FP3 and the A46 underpass, suitable for cyclists and horseriders in addition to walkers?</p>	The request from NCC is that the diversionary 'bridleway' route is available to all bridleway users. Not sure how other users could be physically stopped from using it?
Q13.0.18	NSDC, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – Temporary Diversions Are the arrangements in relation to WCH diversions, which are set out under reference PHH3 on page 77 of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-184], satisfactory?</p>	Ensure temp diversions are clear on site, user groups and other stakeholders are informed, information on stakeholder websites.
Q13.0.19	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – PRow Newark FP14 Paragraph 12.8.21 of ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-056] says that the existing A46 is considered to cause a severance effect on this Newark FP14 and that due to safety concerns, Newark FP14 has been proposed for closure by NCC. However, ES Appendix 12.2: Population and human health supplementary information [APP-175] states that the Newark FP14 crossing is not currently used due to safety hazards and that foot traffic is diverted along Kelham Road and Great North Road.</p> <p>a) Is Newark FP14 currently in use? If no, how long has it been out of use?</p> <p>b) Please provide details of NCC's proposed closure.</p>	Yes, Newark Public Footpath No.14 is currently open and available. However, the definitive line of the Row crosses the A46 at grade, therefore footpath users have to attempt cross the busy A46 with out any safety measures being in place. Because of this the footpath receives little use. NCC's Countryside Access Manager is not aware of any proposed formal closures aside from the proposals as part of the A46 Newark Bypass. NCC request that the proposed diversion is signposted.

		c) Is the diversion via Kelham Road and Great North Road signposted?	
Q13.0.22	The Applicant, NSDC, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – Friendly Farmer Area</p> <p>a) In respect of the 'Footway / Cycle Track' between F-5M and F-5D on Sheet 5 of Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [AS-006]:</p> <p>(i) Could this route prejudice the delivery of NSDC Local Plan allocation NUA/MU/1?</p> <p>(ii) Could the route be lost as a consequence of the development of NUA/MU/1? If yes, how would an alternative route be secured?</p> <p>(iii) Given that this section of the footway / cycle track does not run parallel with the A46, is there any risk arising from the formation and use of an 'informal' route / desire line between F-5M, FX-5E and the Shell Service Station?</p> <p>(iv) If yes, how would this be addressed?</p> <p>b) What is the purpose of retaining the part of Winthorpe FP3 that crosses the area shaded in yellow on Sheet 5?</p> <p>c) How would users of Winthorpe FP2 access the Esso Service Station and associated convenience store (noted on page 44 of Walking, Cycling & Horse-Riding Assessment and Review Report [APP-193])?</p> <p>d) Where proposed footways / cycle tracks (illustrated in pink on [AS-006]) join an existing route, eg at point F-5C on Sheet 5, would those existing routes be suitable for cycles as well as pedestrians? If no, would facilities be created to enable cyclists to safely change route / transition to the highway without dismounting?</p>	<p>a) (iii & iv) Yes. By providing a link from F-5M to the Shell Station.</p> <p>c) No link proposed but of course a desire line would be created.</p> <p>d) NCC request that they are suitable for cycles.</p> <p>Sheet 3 Rev C02</p> <p>The proposed footway/cycle track that begins/ends at F-3A does not connect to an existing cycle route on the A617.</p> <p>The proposed shared use footway on B6326 that terminates at F-3J does connect to an existing cycle route on that road which, itself, terminates at roughly H-3K.</p> <p>Sheet 5 Rev C02</p> <p>The proposed route that begins/ends at F-5A and F-5B connects at both points to the National Cycle Network. However, this is not county highway nor is it a public right of way.</p> <p>The route shown between F-5H and F-5N on sheet five does not meet one of the key design principles set out in LTN 1/20; that is, that it should be direct and convenient. It takes a highly circuitous route that will not encourage cycle or pedestrian activity. The proposals do not include for a new crossing point over the A17 at F-5D which is required to connect it to the existing shared use footway on the western</p>

			<p>side of the A17. Failure to deliver this as part of the present scheme is likely to require NCC to fund the construction of said facility at some future date.</p> <p>Sheet 6 Rev C02</p> <p>The route that begins/ends at F-6C does not connect to an existing cycle route on the A1133. There is no footway on the A1133 either.</p> <p>The route that begins/ends at F-6A does not connect to an existing cycle route on Drove Lane. There is no footway on Drove Lane either.</p> <p>Due to likely prevailing vehicle speeds and flows, ALL crossing points will need to be signalised to be LTN 1/20 compliant</p>
Q13.0.24	The Applicant, NSDC, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – Enhancements NPSNN 2015 notes at paragraph 3.22 that applicants should seek to deliver improvements that reduce community severance and improve accessibility. NPSNN 2024 notes at paragraph 4.72 that enhancement opportunities should be identified and that this includes potential impacts on vulnerable groups.</p> <p>a) Which aspects of the Proposed Development do you consider to be 'enhancements' in terms of WCH?</p> <p>b) Would the Proposed Development result in a worsening of conditions for active travel and / or vulnerable groups in any locations?</p> <p>c) Has the Applicant addressed new or existing severance issues and/ or safety concerns that act as a barrier to non-motorised users (NPSNN 2015 paragraph 5.205 and NPSNN 2024 paragraph 5.274)?</p>	<p>A) links either side of the A46 adjacent to the A46.</p> <p>B) Current proposals linking Winthorpe and Newark along the National Cycle Network route mean that users have to use the occupation slip road, another underpass and a longer route than the existing facility.</p> <p>C) Further work could be achieved by looking at the wider network feeding into the A46 Relief Road proposals such as a light controlled junction over the A17 near the Friendly Farmer and an extension of existing Newark Public Bridleway No.6 from the A1 bridge to Holme Lane.</p>

Q14.0.8	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Assessment – Transport Assessment Report – Surveys [RR-015] suggests that the traffic surveys are now out-of-date, should be repeated and should cover a period of 24 hours to evidence how many minutes per day conditions are congested and how many hours per day traffic flow is unhindered on the current system. Do you agree? If no, please explain why you consider the submitted information to be robust.</p>	<p>For the applicant to justify otherwise. The permanent counters do collect data over a 24-hour period.</p>
Q14.0.9	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Assessment – Transport Assessment Report – Junctions [RR-057] states that the submitted documents do not provide sufficient details in order to adequately appraise the impacts on junctions. It notes that further information has been requested from the Applicant around flow difference plots and individual junction modelling.</p> <p>a) Which junctions are a cause for concern? b) Please provide to the Examination details of the concerns raised with the Applicant and any information subsequently provided by the Applicant. c) The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) [APP-193] notes that it does not include a full assessment at this stage. When would a full assessment be undertaken, and could this affect the design of the junctions?</p>	<p>NCC request to see AM and PM hour peak junction modelling (ARCADY) for the following junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great North Road/Bar Gate • Great North Road/Ossington Way (Waitrose junction). • A17/Stapleton Lane/Beckingham Road and; • A17/Long Holloway/Godfrey Drive. <p>The junctions are anticipated to experience significant increases in traffic volumes with the A46 upgrade so NCC are keen to understand whether capacity will be impacted. NCC understand that the junction modelling for the four locations is currently being prepared by the applicants modelling consultant and NCC will review the findings once in receipt of the modelling files. NCC now have access to the flow difference plots for the two peak hours.</p>
Q14.0.15	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Assessment – Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report – Modelling Data Paragraph 1.1.3 of the CMAR [APP-193] states that further details of all of the areas of model development and scheme appraisal can be found in the following:</p>	<p>For the applicant to provide documents.</p> <p>NCC are in receipt of Transport Forecasting Package (HE551478-SKAG-GENCONWI_CONW-RP-TR-00022)</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Data Package (HE551478-SKAG-GEN-CONWI_CONW-RPTR-00013); • Transport Model Package (HE551478-SKAG-GEN-CONWI_CONW-RPTR-00019); • Transport Forecasting Package (HE551478-SKAG-GENCONWI_CONW-RP-TR-00022); and • Economic Appraisal Package (HE551478-SKAG-GEN-CONWI_CONWRP-TR-00032). <p>The ExA has been unable to locate these documents. Do they need to be submitted to the Examination and made available to IPs such as the local highway authority?</p>	
Q14.0.22	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Construction Phase – Walking and Cycling</p> <p>a) How would the consultation noted at paragraph 7.2.27 of the TAR [APP-193] be secured?</p> <p>b) How would the measures in Table 7-1 of the TAR be agreed (where alternatives are noted), secured and monitored?</p> <p>c) How would temporary / phased diversions of PRow and cycle routes be communicated?</p> <p>d) Should channels of communication be established with specific parties / groups?</p>	<p>NCC request (and will assist) with communication.</p> <p>C) Notices and signs on the ground, internet, social media, NCC Website - Row News.</p> <p>D) Yes, communication with user groups and NCC's 'usual' consultees on legal Orders need to be communicated with.</p>
Q14.0.27	The Applicant, NCC, LCC	<p>Construction Phase – Mitigation – Outline Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>a) Are diversionary routes at Appendix A1 of the OTMP [APP-196] acceptable? Do any other parties need to be consulted in relation to these?</p> <p>b) Would the measures in the OTMP allow for the effects of the simultaneous implementation of other schemes (such as the Southern Link Road and the North Hykeham Relief Road) to be suitably managed?</p>	<p>The applicant needs to consider Abnormal Loads in the design, especially carriageway width.</p> <p>These roads take a lot of Abnormal Loads.</p> <p>Diversion routes on pages 36 to 38 are on NHs network and are considered okay.</p> <p>The County's Highway Network Manager is concerned about additional loads on the County Network and therefore would consider the following unacceptable.</p>

		<p>c) Do any other stakeholders need to be included in the Outline Traffic Management Plan [APP-196], eg the owner / operator of the power station [RR-063]?</p> <p>d) At paragraph 2.3.20 and on page 13 reference is made to a “caravan site” at Bridge House Farm. To ensure that full regard is paid to the Public Sector Equality Duty, should this be referred to as a Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) site?</p> <p>e) Should specific reference to the GRT site at Tolney Lane also be included in the OTMP?</p> <p>f) Please explain how the matters raised in [RR-010] and [RR-078] in relation to NMUs and vehicular access would be addressed.</p> <p>g) [RR-036] refers to attendance of monthly traffic management workshops and consultation on the Traffic Management Plan which is to be approved under Schedule 2 Requirement 11 of the draft DCO. How would these arrangements be secured?</p> <p>h) Would the emergency services be consulted on the OTMP and road closures / diversions?</p> <p>i) Would the Royal Mail be consulted on the OTMP and road closures / diversions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.1.4 Fosse Road and Farndon Road (Page 39) • A.1.5 Kelham Road (Page 40) • A.1.6 A1133 (Page 41) • A.1.7 Drove Lane (Page 42) <p>b) The County's Highway Network Manager recommends that the Southern Link Road must be completed before this scheme begins.</p> <p>C) Possibly British Sugar, Newark Showground, Network Rail and Newark level crossings.</p>
Q14.0.29	NCC	<p>Scheme Design – Great North Road / Kelham Road Junction Please elaborate on your concerns in [RR-057] regarding the dedicated right turn lane from Great North Road into Kelham Road. How could these concerns be addressed?</p>	<p>The provision of a dedicated right turn lane from Great North Road into Kelham Road for southbound traffic needs to be discussed further with the Applicant. The Applicant has no safety concerns over the current design alignment but has committed to providing a dedicated right turn lane into Kelham Road. The proposed layout was submitted to Nottinghamshire County Council and comments were provided where it was agreed that these could be closed out at detailed design stage.</p>

Q14.0.32	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Operational Phase – Congestion in Newark [RR-007] notes that they are experiencing direct environmental impacts (including noise, air quality, visual detriment) from traffic diverting through the Town Centre due to capacity issues on the existing A46 around Newark. They also note severe disruption to access / egress to and from their property / the town centre and circulation around the town from displaced congestion. Would the Proposed Development result in any changes to traffic in Newark?</p>	<p>The A46 forecasting report shows a large increase on Pelham Street during the AM and PM peaks. NCC would require a commitment from the applicant that they would monitor this issue once the schemes complete and if the projected traffic increase does materialise then they would need to come up with a mitigation measure.</p>
Q14.0.37	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Operational Phase – Speed Limits Please respond to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [RR-079] which says that the speed limit from Winthorpe Roundabout along the (modified) A1133 towards Langford should be reduced. • [RR-032] which says that a 40 miles per hour (mph) zone should be introduced from the Winthorpe roundabout to the entrance to the current 40mph limit at the entrance to Langford village and that this would ensure safe and convenient access to and egress from the new private means of access that is proposed to their property. 	<p>All speeds limits should be assessed in line with DfT Circular 1/2013 (revised 2024).</p>
Q14.0.42	The Applicant, NCC	<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse riding – Cycling Facilities [RR-040] suggests that the Proposed Development would make it more difficult for cyclists to travel from Newark to Lincoln. Do you agree? If no, please explain why.</p>	<p>The route shown between F-5H and F-5N on sheet five does not meet one of the key design principles set out in LTN 1/20; that is, that it should be direct and convenient. It takes a highly circuitous route that will not encourage cycle or pedestrian activity. The proposals do not include for a new crossing point over the A17 at F-5D which is required to connect it to the existing shared use footway on the western side of the A17.</p> <p>NCC Countryside Access believe that further opportunities need to be undertaken to improve access for NMU users.</p>

			It has been suggested that the HE will assist through their 'designated funding' to look at / improve wider routes in the area.
Q15.1.2	The Applicant, NCC as LLFA	Agreement with Stakeholders Has the latest proposed drainage strategy, discussed in the Volume Impact Assessment Drainage Attenuation Standards report (Appendix D of the FRA) [APP-177] been agreed? If not, please set out any outstanding matters.	NCC agreed broad principals with the applicant at early stages however the county acknowledges concerns raised by the EA [RR-020] and would like further time to consider the matter. The council will engage with the applicant through the Statement of Common Ground process.

Appendix A

Extract of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan

