



## Hearing Transcript

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Project:</b> | A46 Newark Bypass                           |
| <b>Hearing:</b> | Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Session 1 |
| <b>Date:</b>    | 04 December 2024                            |

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

# AUDIO\_A46\_ISH2\_SESSION1\_2024-12-04

Wed, Dec 04, 2024 1:23PM • 1:20:59

Good morning. It's now 9:30am and time for this hearing to begin. First, can I confirm that everybody can hear me? Yes, thank you. And can I also confirm with the case team that live streaming has begun.

Please team. Thank you. I'd like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing on transport related matters in relation to the application made by national highways for a development consent order for the a 46 Newark bypass project. My name is Paul Burley. I'm a chartered town planner and examining inspector for nationally significant infrastructure project with the planning Inspectorate. Mr. Stone,

good morning.

My name is Kenneth stone. I'm a chartered town planner, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of the panel to examine this application. Thank you,

Mr. Love morning. My name is Good morning. My name is David love. I am a chartered town planner with postgraduate qualifications in ecology, and I'm a practitioner member of the Institute of Environmental Management and assessment. I'm an examining inspector for nationally significant infrastructure proposals with the planning Inspectorate. Thank

you. You will also hear us referred to as the examining authority on EXA. Our role is to examine the application and to report the Secretary of State for Transport with a recommendation as to whether or not development consent should be made. This application seeks consent for a scheme that comprises online widening of the a 46 to the north of the existing route for most of its length between farms and roundabout in the a one followed by a new section of offline dual carriageway proposed between the A one and wynthor Brown, about where the new dual carriageway ties into the existing a 46 to the west of the wynthor Brown about the widening works include earthwork widening along the existing embankment and new structures where The route crosses the Nottingham to Lincoln and East Coast Main Railway lines, the river Trent and the a one. The roundabouts at Fardon and Winthrop would be enlarged and partially signalized, while the cattle market roundabout would be grade separated by elevating the a 46 access to the a one to and from the a 46 will also be improved by upgrading the brown hills and friendly farmer roundabouts. The planning inspectorates case team here today is represented by Ewan Keats, case manager and Case Officer Tim hole. They are being supported remotely online by Stephen Parker. Please speak to any member of the case team, should you need

help with today's event or with the technology. Now for a few housekeeping points, everyone, please set all devices and phones to silent. The toilets closest to the Great Hall are down the ramp and to the left, and in the event of a fire, there are four fire exits out of the Great Hall. Please familiarize yourself with your nearest exit, the fire evacuation assembly points near the tennis court on the front lawn. To get there, you will need to walk through the car park and pass the Business Center. For anybody with mobility issues, there is a ramp to use. There are no scheduled fire drills. Today, I'll now deal with a few preliminary matters before I move on to the substance of today's agenda. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing, and some of you are joining us virtually, using Microsoft Teams, we will make sure, however, that however you decided to attend, you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate. If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at any point in the proceedings, please use the raised hand function, and we'll invite you to speak the appropriate time. Alternatively, please turn on your camera if you are happy to have your images seen and recorded, so that we can see that you wish to speak. The hearing is being both live streamed and recorded, and the recording will be available on the a 46 Newark bypass page of the national infrastructure website shortly after this hearing for the benefit of the recording, please, can those at present ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone, stating your name and who you are representing each time you speak, if you are not at a table with a microphone? Phone, there is a roving microphone, so please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak. Those people observing or participating remotely, in order to minimize background noise and distraction. Please, could you make sure that you stay muted and your camera remains off unless you are speaking, if anybody wishes to use social media to report on film or record during today's hearing or any subsequent hearing, they are free to do so, but please do so responsibly and with proper consideration for other parties, and it must not be disruptive and the material must not be misused in relation to GDPR, a link to the planning inspector to privacy notice was provided in the notification for this hearing, and we assume that everybody today is familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws, please speak to the case team if you have any questions about this. Anyone who speaks this hearing must do their best not to give any personal information. This should be kept private and confidential. For example, health considerations are your address if you submit information in writing or at hearings, which is considered by pins to be personal data, it will not be published or considered as part of the examination. If you have questions about personal data, you may speak to the case team. We also have guidance online entitled nationally significant infrastructure projects, advice for submitting representations or comments. In this vein, if you want to tell us something about where you live today, because it's relevant to what you have to say, please just give a general location without mentioning a specific address. If you don't wish your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. And there's also row seats at the back which will not be picked up on camera. The hearing today will follow the agenda which was published on the national infrastructure planning website on the 25th November, 2024 examination, library references, EV two, double, oh five, would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you. And could I ask the applicant to display the agenda on screen please, focusing on the points of discussion and scrolling through as we move through the agenda. Thank you. In terms of substantive matters, the agenda is split into various items to seek to examine the applicant's case. In relation to transport related matters, including air quality, we've also included some rights, sorry, some points in relation to public rights of way. The agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress, and as we discussed yesterday,

we already touched on a few points that are on today's agenda, so we may skip over those. We'll conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if discussions can't be concluded in the allotted time, it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other points to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked, if they'll require time to get the information, can you please indicate as much and then you can respond in writing. We're planning to have a mid morning break at a convenient point, and we hope to finish this session by 1pm when we take breaks, those of you are participating virtually will need to ensure that cameras and microphones are turned off during the break. Now going to move on to introductions and ask those of you participating today to introduce yourselves. Could you introduce yourself, stating your name and any title that you wish to be addressed by, for example, Mr. Or Miss, who you represent, and let us know which agenda item or items you wish to speak on. If you're not representing an organization. Please confirm your name, title, sumise your interest, and confirm the agenda item which you wish to speak upon. So I'll start with the applicant, if I may, and its advisers. We're

having microphone problems.

Good morning. Lorraine Hendry, for the applicant. I'm a partner at Womble bond Dickinson, representing national highways for this scheme. I'll let my team introduce themselves, starting to my left with Emma Harling Phillips,

thank you, sir. Emma Harling Phillips,

I'm of Council. All and a partner at Womble bond Dickinson, representing national highways. Thank you.

Julian Howes, Mark McDonald, representing the applicant highway dealing on transport matters.

Good morning. Mark Sutton, Project technical director, working for Skanska, on behalf of the applicants, I'll be addressing multiple questions across the agenda items. Morning. I'm

John Bose. I'm a chartered civil engineer specializing in transport with Mark McDonald and national highways, and we'll be looking at the which routes today.

Thank you.

Hi, Sir Simon Kirk for the applicant. I work for Mark McDonald as a technical principal specializing in traffic modeling and appraisal.

Thank you, everybody from the applicant side.

Thank you, sir. Lara Hendry for the applicant, we will have Mr. James Brooks joining us for Agenda Item four, but I'll let James introduce himself at that time. Of course, yes,

thank you. Could I now move on to the organizations and individuals who've expressed a wish to attend. And again, please introduce yourself and tell us which agenda items you intend to speak on. I'll start with representatives as the local authorities, statutory parties, then statutory undertakers, parish councils, and then any other interested parties. So may I start with the local authorities? Please? Hello, I'm

Matthew Norton. I'm the business manager for planning policy and infrastructure at Newark and Chervel District Council, and we'll be talking to matters in item three. Thank you.

Preston, senior planner for Newark and Sherwood District Council, assisting Matthew and Alistair to my right on Agenda Item three, and any of the matters that arise, i

Good morning. I'm Alistair Gregory. I'm a transport consultant from Tetra Tech. I'm here representing Newark District Council on transport matters, here to speak on anything that requires my input.

Thank you, Mr. Gregory.

I'm Sarah Hancock. I'm the principal Highway Development control officer with Nottingham, which is a county council in the Newark and Sherwood area, and I'm here to speak on matters related to item three.

Good morning. Tom Boylan from Nottingham Council. I'm a transport planner, and it's all I'm also going to speak on item number three, thank you.

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, transport infrastructure lead and between us, will cover items across the agenda. Thank you.

Good morning. DJ Howell, transport planning coordinator, also representing, on behalf of Nottingham Council.

Thank you so everybody from the local authorities, thank you. I don't have any statutory parties or statutory undertakers registered. I'll just do a quick check. Nobody in the room and anybody online, no. And similarly, nobody from any parish councils in the room, no. And online, no. Thank you. Doug, can I move to interested parties who've registered to speak? I had three individuals who've registered, but following yesterday's hearing, it may be that Mr. Thompson and Miss bereford, who were representing themselves and Lyndon respectively, will not be attending. Can I just check to see if they're online? I can't see them in the room. No. Thank you. And I think we have somebody, Mr. Park House, if you like to introduce yourself,

my name is the park house. I'm here on behalf of the a four to six active travel group that's making representations.

Thank you. Is there anybody else in the room who would like to introduce themselves? No, and anybody else online? If there is, please put your hand up. Nope. Thank you. Just to reiterate the point to all of our participants today for the purposes of the recording, each time you speak throughout the hearing, please state your name, and if you're representing someone who it is you represent, as I mentioned earlier, it's been live streamed, and this will be available to view on our website, on the a 46 new bypass page, any. One watching on the live stream today or afterwards is the opportunity to make any comments about the matters covered today in writing, the deadline for which is Friday, 13th of december 2024 we'll also be taking down action points, as we did yesterday. And the default response date for that would be again, deadline four on the 13th of December. If anybody does have any difficulties in meeting that, please let us know when you give us the response and we set a an action point. Thank you. I now briefly explain the purpose of this issue specific hearing first, I'd remind participants that applications for development consent orders are examined principally through the written process. However, hearings can be held to examine matters where it's helpful to the XA to do so. The purpose of this hearing is to consider the matters listed on our agenda published on the 25th November 2024 and we're seeking to develop an understanding of the issues so the Exo would lead on questions. This is a subject controlled matter. In other words, the matters for discussion today are those matters identified on the agenda. Parties can refer to documents that are already before the examination, but it's not appropriate to display documents that haven't previously been submitted as part of the examination. If you do propose to refer to a new document, that document would need to be submitted along with your written summary of your oral submissions today, so that it is formally entered into the examination, and then other parties would have the opportunity to view and comment on it. If, during the course of the hearing, we need to refer to a document, we'll use the pins document

reference number from the examination library. Parties with an interest in this particular subject matter known as interested parties. We may seek comment from interested parties at the appropriate time, but the applicant will always have the right of reply. For the purposes of this hearing, we are assuming that the representatives of the applicant are familiar with the background policy, legislation and guidance framework, and with the process that the examining authority and Secretary of State will go through in preparing for this hearing, we the x A have looked at all relevant material, including the environmental statement and submissions at deadlines one, two and three. All of these are available on the examination library if participants here today have not had the chance to look at deadline three submissions, and we will be discussing some of them, please let me know when you are responding. If you've already not done so, you can provide us with your comments on these documents by deadline four. Again, that's the 13th of December. 2024 as we'll be referring to a number of documents from the library during this hearing, we'll also ask the applicant to share them on the screen to help us all see what's being talked about. If you make a verbal representation today, we may request that you submit a follow up written summary of your oral submission and again by deadline four on the 13th of december 2024 written submissions should be based on your representation today, rather than adding new material, but they can include more detail and corroborative or supporting evidence. For those of you who haven't attended proceedings such as this before, there is necessary formality, and we would ask you to refrain from interruptions, because interruptions are unhelpful to us, potentially disruptive to those who are speaking, and could, in some circumstances, lead to an awarded costs against the person responsible. They can also disrupt and affect our recordings of the proceedings. So before I come to the substantive agenda items in the applicant's general case, is there anything of a more general procedural nature that anybody wishes to raise? Nothing in the room, and I don't see anybody online either. Okay, so let's move to point three on the agenda, please. The first point is a progress update. There was lots of queries in nottinghamlich County Council's local impact report in relation to the transport work and the transport modeling. And since then, we've also had submissions. There's been additional modeling, I believe there's been discussions behind the scenes as well that we haven't been a party to. And if I could go over to can. County first for an update on progress and whether there's any real sticking points that still need to be worked through

Kevin Sharman Nottinghamshire County Council. So yes, there's been quite a bit of exchange behind the scenes in terms of some of the modeling work, and I don't think that long term, there'll be any sticking points, but we've still got to go through some of the modeling and some of the inputs and such likes that feed into the modeling and some of the technical detail behind it. So whilst we haven't completed the exercise, we are underway with the process, and we're working with the applicant to try and make sure that we can get to a positive end point. Some of the difficulties regarding some of the modeling, it is quite technical, and our access to the relevant expertise is quite limited, and therefore we do have a little bit of nervousness about meeting deadline for in terms of having final decisions on some of the some of the detailed modeling, but we will endeavor to try and work towards it, and we'll come back to you if we can't meet that thank

you. And would that be NCCS final position on the modeling, if you can achieve that date,

if we can achieve that date, yes, it will be. Sorry, Kevin Nottinghamshire County Council, but as I said, it is tight, but, but we are endeavoring, and we're working towards that. We

appreciate that. Is there anything the applicant would like to add on that?

Julian Howes, representing the applicant, I note that Nottinghamshire County Council requested some input files for the modeling. These going to be shared informally, hopefully today or tomorrow, and we update the previous no be submitted as 333 nine include those files as appendix.

Thank you. Do you envisage there being any significant changes to, for example, the transport assessment report

Duncan? How should representing the applicants? No, there be.

Thank you. And changes would there be? This might be a question for the second part of the hearing today. But any consequences for the modeling exercise with the modeling of traffic change so significantly that the air modeling would have to be rerun. June

house representing the applicant, no the additional modeling Nottinghamshire County Council requested was do some junction modeling away from the scheme and those that modeling hasn't shown any any major issues it should impact on the scheme. Yeah,

thank you. Yes, I understand it. It's for it's more for comfort for the county, that there's not going to be issues that are missed, that ought to be addressed. Is that correct? Julian house, representing

the applicant, that's understanding us? Thank

you. New concert with district council, you raised a comment about the concern about the cattle market junction and the increase in traffic on that the applicant came back to the XA and explained that, albeit there would be an increase in traffic, that also be an increase in capacity. I wonder if has that response allayed that concern that councilor had,



I was to Gregory or no concerto District Council the sort of outstanding information that we're waiting for was to see the forecast year busy model videos to just provide a bit of comfort that at the forecast year, the cattle market in Great North road south of the east of cattle market will continue to operate satisfactorily. So we received those videos recently, and they were reviewed yesterday. My advice to newer consumer District Council is that the videos demonstrate adequate adequately, that the network will continue to operate satisfactorily.

Thank you. So you'll be coming back to us formally on that. Thank you. And the point we touched on yesterday again, for newer consumer District Council, it was your concern about the lorry Park and the reduction of capacity. I don't know whether that's being raised as a in your role as a local authority or as a landowner. Could you clarify that and how we might take forward that concern? I

Lindsay question from Newark and Sherwood, yeah, the lorry Park would result, sorry, the land take from the lorry Park would result in about 30% reduction in capacity. And Newark and Sherwood as a landowner is in discussion. With national highway, separate to this, on adequate compensation for that,

we heard yesterday that there's going to be a site re planning exercise undertaken at some point to hopefully mitigate at least some of the loss in LORRY PARKING. In light of that, prospect, is there still a concern? Because that was one of the concerns I picked up from your representations to us,

yeah, Lindsay Preston for the Newark and Sherwood, yeah, the whole lorry Park as a result, will have to be re evaluated in terms of the space alignment. I haven't got the number of spaces that that's going to generate as yet, because I don't think that's finalized, but that is an ongoing process as a result of the loss of the land. So

when we're recommending to the Secretary of State, should we say that there's still a concern about it, given that the NPS refers to the provision of adequate LORRY PARKING, or should we say that there's the prospect that that can be worked through?

Yeah, Lindsay Preston for Nook and Sherwood, yeah, we think there is a solution. Obviously, the lorry Park is, is well used, and obviously has substantial space. So I think it is, there is a solution that can be, can be resolved through that.

Thank you. Staying with the District Council. Could we just have an update the next point on the agenda, I think about the local plan and the progress that's being made to updating the allocations document?

Yes. Matthew Norton, new concert District Council, yes. So at the moment, the allocations document is being examined by Hayden bow Jones from the inspectorate. We have had a series of hearing sessions at the beginning of November, and those hearing sessions have been completed. However, there are a number of outstanding matters that haven't yet been addressed because there was nobody to attend the hearing sessions. So the inspector said that we would deal with those matters through written representations. So and that does include transports there, but as nobody wished to participate, he didn't want to go through the process of sitting around the table. So when we await that, but the hearing sessions have been completed. So is it

terms still the case that the examination is scheduled to close in April?

I think, I think that probably is a good guide, sir. Yeah, we sorry. Matthew not no concern. We haven't yet got to the point where we know what main modifications we'll need in total. So we are assuming, we are assuming spring for that, sir,

given that our examination closes in April as well, then we have three months to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State. Then he or she would have three months currently, or she that would take us to october 2025, so would there be any potential that the local plan document could be adopted by then?

I think insured. Yes, I think, I think I'm anticipating will be adopted by then. So, yes,

okay, any anything more precise in terms of months? I'm not going to ping you to an exact date. Yeah, I think,

I think, no concert. I think you have the advantage in this process that is quite time limited, isn't it? And set out, whereas in the examination process I am in the hands of the inspectorates. Yeah, I I've assumed that the process pretty much will be, will be finished in the spring, and that we all have adopted the the document in the summer. Okay,

thank you. Just to add, we don't speak to our colleagues about this, we can a very strict separation. Hence why we need to ask you, and what is the plan period for that document?

Matthew insured, so the so the plan period finishes in 2033 and that reflects the fact that this is a second part of the plan. So the amended Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2019 is, for what the

plan period is. And as a point of discussion at the examination hearings, there are questions about review of that plan. And we, we are committed to in to doing a new local plan as soon as possible under whichever system we can.

Yeah, thank you. And I understand that the purpose of the document is to review the currency of existing allocations, so some would be removed if the documents adopted are any allocations going to be added to that document.

Matthew Norton Nunc insured, so the Document. And does review all existing housing and employment allocations clearly, given that the plan, the original allocations documents adopted in 2013 some of those, a lot of those have been developed. The vast majority of have either got have been developed or have got a planning, planning permission and are under construction. Those sites that are no longer the approach that we took was no sites that were no longer a deliverable, would would be delete, deallocated. We have a small number of those that going through the system. Funnily enough, when you propose the allocation, people also come forward and say it's still deliverable. So we have put some back in. The second element to that is a review development management policies and affordable housing policies. And then the final element is a strategy and allocations for the Gypsy, Roman traveler community that will result in new policy areas in Newark, at Tony lane and a number of allocations in locations across the district. And that does include an allocator, allocations of Tony lane. And also, there was a proposed allocation at old stable yard just in between the A one and the a 46 but following noise assessment at the at the late stage, we recommended to the inspector that we don't allocate it. So that is irrelevant to, I suppose, to these discussions, but

So have any of those sites, such as the one that you've recommended shouldn't be allocated, been taken into account in the preparation of the transport modeling? I'd like to ask all of the parties, really whether you are happy that the list of developments is up to date, bearing in mind the prospective adoption date and that the Secretary of State would be looking at the work in that context. I'm also conscious that if sites have been deleted but taken into account, that would represent a worst case scenario. So we can look at it in that way, but perhaps first from you, we can show within county.

Pardon me, yes. Matthew Norton, new concert, yeah, so the transport modeling was at a level that and the size of the Gypsy traveler, new sites are so small that there was no additional work done, because there was felt to be capacity within, within, within the model to take that already so that would so the work that's been done to model the sites, which, alas, Gregory can go into more detail on that, that effectively has already taken that into account. So you've got no concerns over that point. County Do you have any concerns over it?

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, no, we're keeping in close liaison with with the district authority, but, but no, we don't have any great concerns at the stage.

Thank you and the applicant. Duncan,

how is representing the applicant when we based on certainty log, which lists our developments to be included in the modeling that was in consultation with you can share with the council so they're involved in the sites, and I just add that following done for transport guidance on modeling as a site. If a site is in the development plan, that doesn't mean it should be included in our course scenario there's a higher stand, higher barter across. So it's about whether the planning has planning consent, obviously in the consenting process. So just because the scheme has appeared and doesn't mean included in the modeling

or in DFT guidance, can you just come a bit close to the microphone through the recording as well? So did you hear you were just a little bit fiend, but okay, sorry, picking it up.

I was making the point about DFT, path, transport, tag guidance you intend for how there's four different categories of development likelihood and inclusion in a development plan. But not going through the consenting process isn't enough well developmentally put into modeling. So just because things may be changing the development plan this stage, they wouldn't be wouldn't expect them to be included?

Would there be a case that some sites may have been deleted from the development plan and then they appear on your uncertainty log?

I'm not aware of any. If they are in the development in our uncertainty log and in the in the core forecast, they will be through, going through the planning process, so they will, can be under construction, for example, or they be approved. So there's a high likelihood they're going to be happening. I would probably have to, yeah, I suppose it's NSDC, if there are any, just decides we

should disappear. It. And you may not need to do that, because if we open that, the question a little bit more, if they were in there and they weren't happening, but the authorities were happy with the transport modeling, in any event, would that be an issue June

house? What's in the applicant? If the local authority are happy with the with the uncertainty log, then you propose to change anything

okay in the modeling as well? I suppose, yes, follow on from that. Yes, I

do log is the basis for the modeling.

Okay, thank you. Can we just move on now to point three under B of the part three of the agenda, please. And this, this cross cuts with the part of the topic population and human health in ES chapter 12, and we'll be coming on to that later in the week. But I'm hoping this is something you can help with today. And the question is, really, is, does do any of the existing or proposed allocations depend on the implementation of the proposed development The reason I'm asking this is whether we can give weight to any wider benefits of the scheme. Because, of course, the government is is quite clear on its growth agenda and the delivery of Housing and Economic Development in your application documents. So let's first look at app 193, a P, P, 193, which is the transport assessment report. And page 206 of 471, at the PDF page number i,

that tells us that, and this is referring to your uncertainty log. None of the developments were identified as being scheme dependent.

Now, I don't know if any of these documents are going to call it, but if you just want to take my word for what that says, then if we look at your response to relevant representations, which is R, E, p1, double 09, and it's on page 10 of that document, you've told us that the scheme would help to unlock employment growth within Newark by facilitating the delivery of regional and local business developments. Now I'm going to come to the authorities on this as well the local authorities, because we've also got the council's allocations, DPD, which on page two, and this is in relation to allocation Nua slash spa slash one. It tells us that within the policy area, so this is the near the Newark Showground, any proposals must specifically address the following. And then it lists the need to address access constraints relating to the A, one, A, 46 A, 17 junctions. And then, on the same page, we've got allocation nu, a mu slash one, which is, I believe that's the Linden site we've been calling it. And that says, Until appropriate improvements have been made to the A, one, A, 46 a 17 junction, employment development will not be considered appropriate. That we've got, on the one hand, in the transport assessment report, you telling us that none of the developments identified were scheme dependent. But then some suggestions elsewhere that, in fact, some development can't go ahead without changes to parts of the a 46 so applicant, can I come to you first on that? Please?

Julian, representing the applicant, the transport assessment we have. Our basis has been that no schemes are dependent on the application. On the scheme we have, our view is that they facilitate developments. They'll help the developments. And it's increasing capacity using congestion that will help, helping, help the elements come forward. But they weren't, weren't fully dependent. And we have followed the again. Follow the advice in in in tag,

you refer to lindam site. Yep, the in the lindam for the lindam site, the allocations DPD says, And bear in mind that the Linden planning application is for employment development. It says that until appropriate improvements have been made to the A, one, A, 46 17 junction employment development will not be considered appropriate.

Is this something that you'd like to take away? And what I'd like to see is consistency through the application document, yes, and that they are tightened up. And if there is any dependency that that is clearly flagged. And we'll be coming on to this tomorrow when we discuss population human health, because the facilitation of development land is not clear to me in that topic, so I'd really like to get to the bottom of which sites may be either facilitated or rely on it. You know, bear in mind this policy, it may be useful for you to also speak to the Council on this, but I'll just come to the District Council now for their views,

yes, in terms of anyway, mix use one which you're referring to, the Linden sites. Sorry. Matthew Norton, new Contour District Council, the the current adopted document does include that line that you spoke about. But through the through the years and the application, the application, the development management process, it's become apparent that the requirement in in the plan is too onerous in the sense that it doesn't reflect the actual, the actual situation on the ground. So to that extent, as part of the proposed amendment to the the rewriting of the policy review of the policy that line has, that phrase has been moved, and it now says, Until appropriate improvement has been made to the a one, a 46 a 17 junction, friendly farmer, and any proposed development will need to demonstrate will not generate significant am and pm peak traffic as part of any planning

application. So is that on the basis that the friendly farmer hasn't been upgraded, yeah, yeah,

so there could still be an issue if they can't demonstrate that, but that's something to be taken through the development management process, rather than a prohibition in the plan, right? Okay,

so I suppose that's in a an unadopted development plan document, and we as the examining authority, currently don't have any clarity on whether that issue could be solved. Is that the correct characterization

Matthew or nurkin Should so I think I would. I suppose the issue is that through the development management process, we have granted consent for uses in that area similar to what is in the in the policy. So, so part of the overfield Park, effectively, is already developed. There's a mixture of uses on there already, and we anticipate that can be solved through that. So I suppose there is a there is a there is a difference from what the plan says and what's happening in practice, and it will, obviously, it

could. There could be a situation where what's been proposed is not acceptable, but we don't believe it. It should be prohibited. I think that's, that's okay go, sir. So,

so I suppose we can't say with a high degree of confidence right now that it would be acceptable, because we haven't got that evidence before us.

Oh, gee, what? What would you say in terms of the degree of confidence we can place in there? Well,

I suppose we are currently considering applications, so I kind of, I think I probably, before I could answer that question, I think I probably like to think about it a bit and come back.

What would you maybe if, if I may ask you to liaise with the applicant? Yeah, perhaps provide us. We'll take this as an action point, actually, for the District Council and the applicant to provide clarity on the degree of dependence, I suppose it is because there'll be different degrees of suppose of various sites on this road scheme, and it may be that you say, Well, none of them depend, or none of them, you know, are facilitated by the scheme. But again, that that affects the amount of weight we can attach to the, you know, positive weight to the release of economic development land, okay, just staying on site and with the District Council for now, can I clarify what the relevance of the sites listed in your local impact report is? Please. So this is document, re, P, 1035, and we're talking about what's on page. 14 of that, and to just turn that up quickly, you

this should be clear. It's I think I'm referring to page PDF, page 14, generally when I'm referring to so we've got a list of policy areas on that page, and we've also got reference to other sites in that document further down, if we go down onto PDF page 20, for example, you start to list individual sites rather than policy areas. Now, one of the questions I had looking at the local plan is, for example, you you mentioned the York drive policy area, where it says that there's 230 net additional dwellings. But then the mixed use site three, the NSK site, which is probably accessed from Lincoln Road by the looks of it, as is the York drive site or area that's not mentioned, and that's allocated for 150 dwellings and 4000 square meters of employment use. So why have some sites been included in the local impact report, whereas others haven't? I

So, so, yes, we've, we've provided the information, I think, in the local impact, but based on the parameters that were provided in terms of the bounds of the scheme, I think you're quite right in terms of the MSK site, so that that is served from northern road, which connects on to Lincoln Road and Brunel drive. I suppose that is a relevant policy in that sense, although it is proposed not to be allocated anymore. But of course, we talking about the current development plan. But

aren't you proposing to still keep it in the plan for a different quantum of development? It

is proposed to be in the plan as an opportunity sites, but not an allocation so something that could come forward.

My question really, is that, if both of those sites give on to Lincoln Road, what would be the difference in including them or not including them because they'd they'd both have traffic implications for that main route through the town. And I suppose the broader question, and again, this might be something you want to come back to us on, is, what's the purpose of the list that you've given in here and where, if anywhere, should it be reflected in our recommendation report?

Thank Matthew Norton, new concert, yes. Thank you. So we'll take that away and come back to Okay. So

we said that as an action point to just provide some clarity on the list of policies and allocations in the local impact report. Thank you. It may be that some of it's just in there for information, but you know, we keep in our minds that everything's must be of some type of relevance. So I just like the certainty of what we need to be discussing in our recommendation report. Thank you.

Just in a similar vein, we've we've just discussed, I suppose, highway capacity and the effect on site allocations. Is there any physical effect on any site allocations? We've, we've heard about lindam yesterday, and it's more of a pedestrian and cyclist issue, is there any physical issues for the bringing forward of any sites?

Thank you, sir. Matthew or Nook insured? Yes. So employment site three, as we would call it, is obviously the former county council highways depot, which will be the site compound, so that that will be impacted by this, by by the speed a small chunk of the north of it, sir, yeah,

and that's being used temporarily for a depot in any event, yes, same use, yeah. But does the District Council ask county the same question? Question, does the District Council consider that the works to be undertaken by national highways would prejudice the future development at that site?

Certainly not. Sir,

okay, thank you, county. I



Kevin Shaw nuncia County Council, I don't, I don't think we have any, any issues with with the being a problem here. I don't necessarily want to say anything that if I thank you

to add, okay, thank you the applicant. Do you have any points on that? And again, it's a kind of a double sided question on whether there's an impact that needs to be dealt with, but also whether the scheme would be of benefit to the delivery of any site.

Thank you. Larae Hendry, for the applicant, I'll take what the councils have both said in relation to the physical impacts, and then I think when we prepare the documents setting out the dependent developments and the developments that we facilitate, that will hopefully cover the other part of your question. Okay, well, we'll

supplement that the action point we've already taken down then with the physical dimension. Thank you. Right now, can we move on please to point b5 on point three of the agenda, which is the relationship with the Kellen bridge relief proposals. And this was a point that county you raised in your local impact report, and one of the routes, at least I saw, is safeguarded in the current local plan. But there would seem to be another potential alignment that's not safeguarded. Is that correct? I

Kevin Sharman Nottinghamshire County Council, there is a safeguarded route, which is the one that we're still looking at, but the proposal doesn't have any formal status at this stage, because it's not in any program for delivery. We're still at the feasibility stage, where we're looking at optioneering And what is the best approach, because of we've got to get a scheme that works as the cost benefit ratios and all the rest of it. So we don't have a defined corridor yet. We're just trying to safeguard interest on this corridor, because obviously the 617, as anybody coming on it this morning will have found, is a problem and will be exacerbated by the a 46 proposal, but it is a scheme very much that we're looking at in the longer term. So we just want to make sure that the two work best together however they can.

So why would it be exacerbated by the a 46 proposal?

We expect the a 46 to increase traffic on 617, and therefore the traffic numbers are predicted to go up by a couple of 1000 down a couple of 1000 ADT. And that bridge, it's got very limited capacity purely because of the alignment on the bridge, but

isn't the scheme proposed by the applicant also proposing additional capacity that would help to deal with that additional traffic? So would queuing. I'm going to come to the applicant on this point of would queuing worsen as a result,

it's purely the additional flows that's going to cause the problem at peak times. So ideally, particularly during the construction phase, there will need to look at whether there is any ways that we can help alleviate the issues around the narrowness of the bridge and HGVs passing, because what the last thing anybody wants is to have another bridge strike during construction phase, or anything else which would cause the a 617, to be closed and a diversion route to be required.

What I'm struggling to understand is why this is an issue for the applicant, because there's already seemingly an issue on this part of the network, and if the applicant wasn't using that part of the network for its construction traffic, why should it potential bridge strikes be a concern, and, you know, not wanting to be facetious, but if there is queuing, then doesn't the does not reduce the potential For fast moving traffic and strikes.

The reason we're flagging it is purely because we want to make sure that one doesn't prevent the other one from happening. Because we want wider network benefits and mitigation measures for some of the flood modeling has implications in that local area, so we just want to make sure that the two schemes are aware of each other and. We're not suggesting that the 46 can't happen because of the the improvements that we're looking to do on Callum.

So in in the county's local impact report, and this is on page 16 of the local impact report, the heading of figure 2.8 it refers to outline business case prepared by a calm in 2023 does that make any assumptions in relation to the current proposals, given that they were in the public domain in 2023 I

now I believe the SOBC that was completed at that stage was done, and some of the some of the work based on previous figures, so it just didn't take account of The the a 46 improvement, right?

Thank you. And when you said about the awareness of the sort of mutual awareness of the schemes, and you referred to flooding, is that the only issue, because, I think one of the options takes a roundabout into the Kellerman Avon floodplain, flood compensation area, rather, is that the point that county is making on this?

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, yes, that is very much the point, and we're just trying to make sure that we

are aware. Thank you. Yeah, I'm just trying to explore whether there's any wider impacts that weren't fully elaborated, but it doesn't sound as though there are. It's just that, that flooding point. Thank you. Applicant, do you want to come back on any of the that discussion now?

Julian house, the applicant, the only comment I'd make is that, if in pure traffic terms, scheme doesn't impact a 46 scheme first and traffic terms, not obviously another job being switched considered.

But it doesn't sound as though that's the issue being raised by county. It seems to be the physical layout of a potential relief option

in how's the applicant that's is correct? Yes,

thank you, right. Let's move on to the next point, and that was actually the relationship with the Linden site. And we did discuss that yesterday when lindens representatives were present. Is there anything else that anybody would like to say? I'll just ask the local to host authorities first York and Sherwood.

Lindsay question for Nook and Sherwood. It's my understanding that the phase one of the development is actually being heard by our district council members tomorrow at planning committee, and phase two is slightly behind in terms of determination that application is in but is not ready for determination as yet.

I think Linda said it would be quarter 120, 25 something like that. So if you just could keep us updated, because I know these things can move around, can't they, it would be really helpful if by the close the examination, you could just give us a final position on that county. Did you have any points on lindam Yesterday, we were talking about the the provision of a route, a pedestrian, cyclist route, whether it's through or around their site. And I'm aware that you were the authority that's interested in public rights of way, albeit it wouldn't be a public right of way. Did you have anything that you wanted to add?

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council. We haven't seen the full detail, but I know our rights of way team have been involved and are comfortable as long as there is an acceptable route, whichever route it is.

Thank you. That's helpful. And the applicant. Anything else you'd like to add?

Thank you? Levy Hendry, for the applicant. Nothing further, just noting our action points arising from yesterday.

Thank you. Let's move on to point C on the agenda then, which is matters relating to the construction phase. And first of all, let's vote. To the county's response to ex q1 which is that's our first set of written questions. The library reference is R, E, p2, 052, if we look at PDF page 13 of 17 of that document tells us that the county's highway manager network managers concerned about additional loads on the county's network and would consider as four diversions listed there, they would consider them unacceptable. Now, has there been any discussion on this with county?

Mark certain, excuse me. Mark Sutton, on behalf of the applicant, respond. We applicant responded to the relevant representation with our views on the diversion routes, particularly those related to the one on drove lane that was being proposed. And just to re clarify that, rather than being in diversion, we recently explained what was happening with local traffic utilizing that road during the closure of a certain section of the of the road. So this was the need not to divert traffic down an existing, excuse me, so down an existing route that had a seven and a half ton weight limit on it. So we, we are noted of that weight limit on drove lane and wasn't being proposed as a diversion route during during the works. Are these for the temporary blockade when you'll be lifting large this is beams and so on. Mark Sutton, for the applicant, this is correct. So the in the appendix on the outline traffic management plan, we detail out the proposed diversion routes. Many of them are required due to sectional closures of the a 46 during the lifting of the bridge beams adjacent to the judaworks others, where we go up to friendly farmer and up to win for roundabout, where we do some of the blacktop tie ins. It will be needed for that as well, so that we can do the tie in connections,

and how long, how frequently they be.

So the overnight closures, I'll get to one specific one, if I may, this detailed in the outline traffic plan. But on, the majority of all the all the other closures are during night time closures. Often, I believe that the between the hours of sort of, nine o'clock at night till five o'clock in the morning. I think on some of the a 46 is dependent on traffic count. Sometimes the a 46 can be closed at eight o'clock of the traffic counts acceptable, but it's overnight. There was one exception to that, which is detailed in both chapter and sorry, in the outline traffic management plan, and that refers to the installation of the new bridge crossing over the A one we've the applicant has developed a methodology to try to avoid putting temporary traffic management out on the A one, it's a very busy stretch of road. There's not much resilience on it, so we couldn't really narrow the lanes down. So we're going to build the bridge offline, and the bridge is going to be built offline and then driven into position. Now to do that, we're looking for an extended closure on the a one over a weekend. This has been used previously as a methodology successfully on national highways infrastructure, and it reduces the number of closures. It just has one large impact, which one can plan many, many months in advance, with local authorities and with national highways and road space teams and the communications team such that we can reduce and

well, advertise or communicate that activity and then use other parts of the strategic road network as the operations going on for that point. So that's the one area where it will be a closure running from a Friday night to the early hours of a Monday morning, where we undertake a couple

in the news recently. And have they all gone smoothly? From in Manchester, I think, and then down, there was

one down on the Network Rail. Have done I've done one recently up on the and I'm blues up on the M 62 to replace an existing bridge where they rolled one in. There was a jacking operation done on an under bridge that was not so successful. That was a Network Rail scheme, but that was to do with the ground conditions. We've successfully national highways successfully installed them on the M 42 junction six improvement scheme. Two bridges were rolled in using that methodology, and on the a 14 Huntington scheme, two bridges were installed using that methodology as well. So

presumably it's a all or nothing type of maneuver, and what happens in the event that um. So you know, something unexpected crops up, and it's, you need another 12 hours.

It's a very good point to bring out there. So the the programming and the planning that takes place for these very specific operations, we're almost like railway possession. It's, it's minute by minute, at some cases, hour by hour, and you have trigger points set into your Works program. So there'll be a program specifically for that movement over that weekend, and there are trigger points that you say you do not start operation A until this time has gone past. That's it. And the duty manager, a very senior member of the team, makes the call to stop an operation. And that has been done before if traffic, for example, if there's a road traffic collision on the A one, that means that the road closure is delayed. We have a simple date. If you don't have the closure by x, ensure that you've got adequate time. Risk at the end of it does go ahead. It's very much ties in with similar operations that have been undertaken on the network, with bridge demolitions as well, where once you start, it's you've got to finish it, but you ensure you've got that adequate time risk allowance at the end of the of the program to ensure you don't overrun. Thank

you, county. So I think the reason I'm concerned about this is because you put forward quite a strong representation saying that the routes were unacceptable, has any explanation from the applicant changed your position on that?

So we recently received the app, sorry. Kevin Shawn and Nottinghamshire County Council, we recently received the applicant's response, and we've sent that on to the network management team, but we are awaiting a detailed response from them, but I'd like to think we can come to a resolution. Thank you. That

was going to be my next question. There must be a balance somewhere along the line. Thank you. So in terms of construction traffic, this is point two, and I think we may well have addressed this through the, probably the second or the third version of the otmp, where we've added a list. It was, I think it was document, R, E, P, 201, for a list of roads where traffic couldn't travel down during the

the works periods. Mark Sutton, for the applicant, that's correct. So the outline traffic management plan currently at, sorry, Traffic Manager revision, free, R, E, p3, 026, table, 2.3 was in the plan, and following reviewing um, local highway authorities comments on restricted routes, we've since added one more in there, which was referencing to Fardon Road, which we showed we hadn't included in the original table. So that lists out the restricted routes to prevent construction traffic heading through the town or other undesirable areas. If there's a works access within an area, we'll be showing why there's certain restricted vehicles that can go down that route. So rather than a blanket prohibition, there's a we'd have to control what what vehicles are permitted to go down

County? Are you happy with the list now and the means of controlling it?

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, we're still reviewing, but I don't, I think we'll be okay. I don't I don't foresee problems as we moving forward, but we are in discussion which is the most important point to try and resolve these problems. So

I expect you'll be coming back to us in writing when you've had internal clear and clearance for these points. Yep. Thank you. A related point, we didn't get very far on this yesterday, but it's the point about the pre commencement plan, and I made the point that I didn't see these restrictions in that I was I was told that it should be mirroring what's in the otmp. But of course, we haven't had an updated pre commencement plan. Hasn't been updated since it was submitted, and we're now on our Is this our second or third otmp

Mark seven for the applicant? And yes, appreciate that, sir and realizing that we're updating the otmp with mitigation measures that are very relevant and in fact, indeed relevant to the pre commencement and proposed that an apology for not doing that is updating the pre commencement plan in line with the otmp as its updated as well, to ensure that these agreements are caught. I

think the it's a more general point as well, isn't it, that pre commencement needs to mirror the. The agreements that you reach on other control documents. Yeah, thank you. Just a more general observation on that. As you update the documents, we would like to see consolidated versions before we write our recommendation, rather than relying on errata and clarifications response to our questions,

not least because that's it's the most helpful way forward for the Secretary of State when we transfer the application to them, we wouldn't expect you to be doing it at every deadline. But could you give us some type of indication of when you will be providing us with a final consolidated set of documents? Please?

Thank you, lavender for the applicant. Apologies. Are you anticipating so we do have the errata that we've submitted twice now and where more substantive changes have been made have been required. We've updated the specific chapters. For example, the population and human health chapter was submitted. We would, we're happy to transfer the that sort of minor amendments from the Arata into the chapters and and resubmit those. But were you anticipating sort of a resubmission of all,

well, just anything that's got any substantive changes to it, you know, if it's a format issue, it's not, not as crucial as if, for example, the, you know, I think there's some issues with the transposition of modeling numbers in the transport assessment report. And what we don't want is for somebody in the Secretary of State's office to be reading all of these documents and then saying, well, the exas missed that one and then two weeks later, because it just takes several weeks to read everything, come to the errata and say, Ah, that's it. We want them to be able to have the full story in one go, really.

Lorraine Henry for the applicant, that's completely understood, if you don't mind, we'll take as an action point to review the errata list and take that view as to whether it is just a typographical, inconsequential amendment and in which I would admit it could stay in the errata log, whereas anything, as you say, if it is a typographical error in relation to say, modeling numbers, then we would put that in the document and we would resubmit that. I can't see a problem. Then,

of course, we've picked these up as we've been going along, and we're we're testing the application on that basis. So we don't need them tomorrow or even by deadline for if you could give us an indication of when you would be submitting those during the course of the examination, that would be helpful. You know, of course, we want you to work through as many of the points as you can get to your final position before you spend any great amount of time updating things. Thank

you. Lara Henry, for the applicant, I think we've had the benefit of very helpful comments from many interested parties in relation to specific elements which we have, as you've seen, picked up as we've gone along. So I think it may not be something that we do for deadline for just given the amount we have already to do. But perhaps the next deadline is something that we could aim for, just to sort of sweep that up so that we're at sort of the most up to date level with our documents. And then if anything else does come forward, we'll do that sort of as quickly as possible. We

will leave it to you. It may be that some documents can be, well, you know, sort of updated and submitted very soon, and others you may want to wait, because you've still in discussions on various points.

Excellent. Point. Yes. Thank you. Thank you.

Let's move on to public transport then, which is point D on the agenda? And Nottingham Nottinghamshire County Council, you said that this was in your local impact report, paragraph 2.46, there was potential for delays to I suppose it's bus services as a consequence of the scheme is that for the construction phase, rather than the operational phase.

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, yes, at the end of the day, once the scheme is delivered, there should be public transport user benefits. Because what we trying to do is improve the flows through the town center, which is the routes that the public transport operators use. But inevitably, during construction, there will be delays, and it's informing those delays and making sure everybody's aware of the the alternatives and such likes that will be the issue.

AI, thank you. If any operators being con. Consulted. We haven't had anything into the examination from operators. Kevin

Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, we've had informal discussions with the operators, but we, we haven't gone to the stage of formally consulting them on the on the detailed proposals, other than they they've seen the plans, and they understand what the scheme intends to do, and the concerns they were they raised were the ones that are reflected in the Impact Report.

Right? Okay, so there's nothing additional that we should be taking into account, really, apart from the potential for delays and the need to manage the situation.

Kevin Sharon Nottingham county council, that's correct.

Thank you. How would you manage the situation? Applicant,

Mark sun, on behalf of the applicant, in regard to public transport operators, particularly bus services. So in the outline traffic management plan, R, E, p3, 026, table, two, one identifies both the bus companies and Network Rail as a key customer in that table to be communicated with. The key ones



here are particularly where they are not that it's relevant here on night closures, there's no non buses running through, but particularly on the weekend of the full closure, that will be communicated out to the to the bus companies. So we provide, I think, in the in the outline traffic managed plan, states that there's a schedule, a look at schedule that communicates all traffic management proposals to key stakeholders and businesses. And we'll have basically an email mailing list that we've used previously to other schemes to keep people updated and that with the local authorities, the traffic management sorry for the traffic management workshops are then informed those upcoming events, we're not closing or temporarily suspending any bus routes or bus stops as part of the scheme.

And in terms of the there's a corridor that runs to Newark South old to Mansfield, which I guess, could be affected by congestion and created by physical work. What if the effect was to render the service is so unreliable that it started to impact on on the service and the people using it, has that been taken into account? Or would it not be the case that there would be such a magnitude of impact?

Certainly Mark sun, behalf the applicant, know that we are main sorry. We're maintaining the the single lane of traffic through there, the traffic management plan details up the phase in proposals, particularly at farm and sorry, at friendly farmer and cattle market, where there's some complex phasing to do. And the idea was to keep keeping that road operational and keeping the traffic moving during construction. We're not looking to narrow the lanes to anything that would prevent busses from being served, servicing their current routes. There'd be any

traffic management measures that might increase delays. I think when you're looking at a visit, yes, we're

going to be doing as part of the traffic management plan. They'll be doing the detail modeling to show impacts of those those works. But not yes, there be, there will be no doubt, during the construction of works, there'll be increasing in traffic. But as you would have seen this morning and on big hours, the a 46 it's already incredibly busy, as is the A 617, on that several route, not looking to cause any further impact than what's already been seen out there and used by all customer groups on this road network.

Thank you. Back to county, then will is the modeling that you're currently looking at. Would that look at the construction phase? I think it was one of the points that the applicant undertook to provide you with further information on

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes, we have some modeling that we're looking at that. So there's a model was talking about earlier that is the more difficult one for us to analyze, rather than the simpler marketing modeling. But we flagged up these public transport issues, but I would expect the network management plan, sorry, the outline plan to resolve these issues as best it can.

There is always going to be issues to the whole network, so it's just a question of flagging them up to make sure that they're in the loop and we deal with them the best way we can. But when. Not expecting that there won't be implications. So it is reasonably well accepted, and it is the right mechanism in the way that we're trying to deal with it with the applicant.

Thank you. Well, when you come back to us on that model, it would be helpful if you could specifically refer to public transport as well. And you've obviously got the concern that I'm I'm asking about whether it's going to make reliability drop significantly. Thank you. We've been going for a while now, and we're just at a convenient point in the agenda where we could take a break. So I'm going to adjourn the hearing now until 10 past 11 for us all to have a comfort break and some capacity. Thank you, everybody. Applause.