

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMEN OF THE CULTURE COMMITTEE, THE  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, THE ENVIRONMENT AND  
SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE AND THE TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS  
COMMITTEE****RESPONSES TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
COUNTY COUNCIL****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to inform Council of decisions made by the Culture, Economic Development, Environment & Sustainability, and Transport & Highways Committees concerning issues raised in petitions presented to the Chairman of the County Council on 14<sup>th</sup> January and 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

**Information and Advice****CULTURE COMMITTEE****A. Petition entitled 'Save Our Funfair – Edwinstowe' (Ref 2016/159)**

2. A petition with 969 signatures was presented to Full Council on 25 February 2016 by Councillor John Peck. The petition stated "Despite purchasing 2 fields specifically for the site of the new visitor centre the County Council has now decided that the preferred location for the visitor centre is forest corner which is the current location of the funfair. The funfair has been given notice that the Council will not renew their licence when it expires next year. The only land that the Council has offered the funfair to relocate to is the field across the road. This location is not suitable because the deterrent of the busy road for children would potentially make the funfair unsustainable. As no other suitable site has been offered this could mean that we will lose the funfair forever." The petition was compiled in December 2015.
3. The RSPB is currently part way through the design and planning stage of its work to establish the replacement visitor centre. RSPB and Council officers are in contact with the Edwinstowe Funfair operators regarding the future location and operation of the Funfair. Both the County Council and the RSPB have publically committed to support the Funfair to effectively relocate its operations. To this end, an initial meeting with the Funfair operators took place on 18 March. This meeting was constructive, and focused on how the funfair might operate sustainably from a site integrated within the replacement visitor centre's customer parking area on Naish's Field. This site offers access to a greater number of potential customers, would provide the Funfair with sufficient and appropriately designated space and access to necessary utilities. Issues

of access and road crossing will be addressed by the RSPB and the Council through the formal planning process for the replacement visitor centre.

4. Committee noted that discussions were ongoing with the Edwinstowe Funfair operators regarding the future location of the Funfair, and confirmed that the Council remains committed to supporting the effective relocation of the Funfair.

## **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

### **B. Petition regarding superfast broadband for Askham (Ref 2016/148)**

At the County Council meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 a petition of 37 signatures was presented by County Councillor John Ogle, seeking local government help to provide superfast broadband coverage to Askham.

5. Nottinghamshire County Council is the lead Authority for the programme in Nottinghamshire but improved broadband speeds are not something which the Council has a statutory responsibility for. The Council has a responsibility to ensure that the money available under the programme is used to maximum effect and that the works undertaken: (a) supply a network capable of delivering superfast broadband speeds to the optimum number of properties and (b) is of high quality.
6. All 23 premises covered by the petition do not currently have access to superfast broadband speeds, with most only receiving a maximum speed of 2Mbps. The government recognises that speeds below 2Mbps are not sufficient for ordinary web browsing, shopping and video streaming/calls (e.g. iPlayer or Skype) and has therefore instigated a 'Universal Service Commitment' pledge. Under this pledge, premises with speeds below 2Mbps can now access a satellite broadband solution through a voucher scheme, with up to £350 towards the costs of installing and maintaining a satellite broadband connection reimbursed to the consumer.
7. Economic Development Committee agreed a response to the lead petitioner should be sent setting out the following points:
8. The residents' frustration is very much appreciated. However Committee members are aware that the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire (BBfN) programme will not deliver superfast broadband speeds to 100% of premises due to the significant costs involved. The satellite broadband scheme offers a viable alternative to those premises that will not benefit directly from a fibre-based solution. Satellite services are being improved and enhanced all the time and some can now offer superfast speeds.
9. In terms of the specific premises in Askham that are covered by the petition, they are connected directly to the Gamston exchange and not to the fibre-enabled cabinet in the village. There are currently no plans to provide access to fibre broadband to these premises through the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme due to the prohibitive costs of the work required to rearrange the local telecoms network.
10. However, residents could consider applying to BT's 'Community Fibre Partnership' programme, which enables communities that are not covered by fibre broadband solutions to request a solution design from BT which could then be part-funded by the

community. Further details are available here: <http://www.bt-ngb.com/community-fibre-partnerships>. In addition, most of the 23 premises covered by the petition should be eligible for the satellite voucher scheme as referenced above. Further information on this scheme is available on the County Council's website: <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/business-employment-and-benefits/better-broadband-for-nottinghamshire-programme/basic-broadband-for-all/apply>.

11. Finally, as with other petitions relating to the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme, it is worth noting that efficiencies are accruing to the programme and that in the future these may be used to extend fibre coverage further into areas that are not currently scheduled to benefit from the programme. The County Council cannot offer guarantees that Askham will benefit from such investment but it remains a possibility, albeit not before 2018.
12. It is important to restate the position on the existing Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire (BBfN) rollout. A finite sum of money has been made available to the programme. The contracts we entered into with BT are for them to achieve maximum coverage across the County with the money available. The rollout plan BT produced and are working to is to achieve exactly that. Maximum coverage with the money available. Clearly to ensure maximum coverage their rollout plan is based on several factors including the cost of the civil engineering work required, as well as the number of properties passed.

**C. Petitions regarding broadband services in North Clifton (Ref 2016/166), Wigsley (Ref 2016/167) and Harby (2016/168)**

13. At the County Council meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016 Councillor Maureen Dobson presented three petitions regarding superfast broadband. A petition of 20 signatures organised by North Clifton residents, calling for North Clifton to be treated an urgent priority in the roll out of superfast Broadband. A petition of 59 signatures organised by Wigsley residents, calling for fibre broadband to be provided to Wigsley sooner by moving forward the roll out date and a petition of 126 signatures organised by Harby residents, calling for fibre broadband to be provided to Harby sooner by moving forward the roll out date.
14. Economic Development Committee agreed that a response to the lead petitioners should be sent setting out the following points:
15. The Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire (BBfN) programme is well on track to delivering its ambitions of 95% of premises in the county (when combined with planned commercial coverage) being enabled with access to superfast broadband (24Mbps and above) by 2016 and 98% coverage by 2018.
16. Nottinghamshire County Council is the lead Authority for the programme in Nottinghamshire but improved broadband speeds are not something which the Council has a statutory responsibility for. The Council has a responsibility to ensure that the money available under the programme is used to maximum effect and that the works undertaken: (a) supply a network capable of delivering superfast broadband speeds to the optimum number of properties and (b) is of high quality.

17. It is important to restate the position on the existing Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire (BBfN) rollout. A finite sum of money has been made available to the programme. The contracts we entered into with BT are for them to achieve maximum coverage across the County with the money available. The rollout plan BT produced and are working to is to achieve exactly that. Maximum coverage with the money available. Clearly to ensure maximum coverage their rollout plan is based on several factors including the cost and timings of the civil engineering work required, as well as the number of properties passed.
18. The residents' frustration is very much appreciated. However, the vast majority of premises within these parish areas are included in the BBfN programme, with delivery due to be achieved between October 2016 and April 2017. Some premises may be eligible for the satellite broadband voucher scheme (<http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/business-employment-and-benefits/better-broadband-for-nottinghamshire-programme/basic-broadband-for-all>). However, for premises to be eligible there needs to be longer than 12 months before a fibre broadband solution will be delivered and this will not be the case for many of the premises concerned.
19. The council has already been through an acceleration process in conjunction with BT and BDUK and as a result the delivery dates of the programme are now nine months ahead of where they were originally expected to be.
20. The rollout plan is well underway with significant ongoing work being undertaken. An accepted process of the programme is that timings of broadband rollout cannot be negotiated mid- contract as this would have the potential to incur significant extra cost.

## **ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

### **D. Petition objecting to proposed shale gas development at Misson Springs (Ref 2016/0160)**

21. At the County Council meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016 a petition was presented by County Councillor Liz Yates. The petition is entitled "*Petition against the proposed shale gas development at Misson Springs*" and has 363 signatures. The petition stated:

*"Misson is a small village located 12 miles north of Retford, in the most northern part of the county of Nottinghamshire. Misson Springs, which lies north of the village itself, is the most northern place within the county and borders on North Lincolnshire and South Yorkshire. The parish also contains the hamlet of Newington. According to the 2014-15 electoral register there are 520 residents.*

*Following the submission by IGas of the planning application ES/3379 for two exploratory wells which may lead to future hydraulic fracturing for shale gas at Springs Road, the Misson Community Action Group petitioned the parishioners of Misson. This was a door to door exercise carried out by residents in the latter part of 2015. 363 signatures were collected which represents 70% of the population.*

*This demonstrates that an overwhelming majority of the community is against an exploratory work or future shale gas extraction in the area. Residents' concerns include:*

- the large number of HGVs that will be used on a quiet rural road not suited to such large volumes of traffic;*
- dilapidation of road surface;*
- the safety of all road users;*
- the effects of noise and vibration from traffic and drilling;*
- lighting impacts on people and wildlife;*
- loss of visual amenity;*
- negative impacts on the Misson Carr SSSI;*
- increase in air emissions compromising air quality;*
- possibility of contamination of the aquifers and the water supply to hundreds of thousands of people in the East Midlands and South Yorkshire;*
- impact on heritage assets;*
- the possible contamination and loss of organic status of prime agricultural land;*
- the cumulative effect on the village bearing in mind Misson already suffers from sand and gravel quarrying, noxious emissions from Tunnel Tech North and noise from Robin Hood Airport."*

22. The planning application referred to in the petition is currently being considered and will, in due course, be brought before the Planning and Licensing Committee for determination. At such a time the petition will be reported to Members of Planning and Licensing Committee along with all other representations that have been made in relation to the application. Members will consider the petition in the determination of the application. The lead petitioner has been advised that the petition will be considered in the determination of the planning application.

## **TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**

### **E. Petition regarding Gunthorpe traffic lights (Ref 2016/0146)**

23. At the County Council meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 a petition was presented by County Councillor Roger Jackson. The petition of 427 signatures and 105 electronic signatures from residents and road users in and around Gunthorpe requested traffic lights at the junction of Main Street and the A6097. It was suggested that the lights be operational at peak times and be activated at any time by traffic leaving the village. Gunthorpe Main Street runs parallel to the A6097 with two entrances to the village, one on Main Street and one on Trentside. In addition to residential properties adjacent to the River Trent there are several Pubs and restaurants encouraging visitors all year round.
24. Comments supporting this proposal cite difficulties getting into and out of the village at peak times due to the volume and speed of traffic on the A6097

25. Any scheme, especially with the level of funding signalisation of this junction would require, needs to meet the objectives of the Local Transport Plan to be considered for funding. The main emphasis of this is supporting the economy; within that there are priorities on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs and training. There is also an on-going requirement to reduce road casualties.
26. Accident data for the A6097 / Main Street Gunthorpe (North Junction) shows that there have been no injury accidents for the last 4 years, additionally in 2014 a scheme to reduce the speed limit and improve lighting along its length has possibly further improved safety on the road.
27. Signalising the junction here would be a major investment and would need to produce significant benefits. In terms of accessibility, the bus operators haven't expressed any problems with turning out of the junction, nor would pedestrians significantly benefit from a crossing point at signals as the existing footpath to local amenities is on the village side of the road. Accident levels actually increase with the provision of signals; the average injury rate for the County is around 1.26 per year, significantly higher than the existing rate at the site. As such the Committee agreed that there were currently no plans to include a junction signalisation scheme for Main Street, Gunthorpe.

**F. Petition regarding speed limit reduction at Mill Lane, Rockley (Ref 2016/0147)**

29. At the County Council meeting of 14th January 2016 a petition was presented by County Councillor John Ogle. The petition of 18 signatures from residents of Mill Lane, Rockley requested that a speed limit of 30mph be imposed on the Road. Mill lane is a rural cul-de-sac which is currently de-restricted and fronted on part of one side by several properties including a farm and a church.
30. To consider this request an assessment will be carried out including a visual survey, an actual speed evaluation, and an investigation of the speed related injury accident data. Once this is available the request will be assessed in line with guidelines for setting speed limits.
31. If appropriate the alterations will be considered for inclusion in a future programme.

**G. Petition regarding lorry parking at Cromwell (Ref 2016/0149)**

32. At the County Council meeting of 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 Councillor Bruce Laughton presented a petition from local residents opposing Cromwell Lorry Park.
33. As Cromwell is one of four sites being considered by Newark and Sherwood District Council, this petition has been sent to Andy Statham, Director of Planning for consideration; who has liaised directly with the petitioners.

**H. Petition requesting pedestrian barrier on Sadler Street, Mansfield (Ref 2016/0152)**

34. At the County Council on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016, Councillor Diana Meale and Councillor Darren Langton presented a petition of 46 signatures requesting a pedestrian barrier on Sadler Street at the entrance of the footpath leading to Devon Drive. This was to prevent pedestrians, especially children, stepping into the road from the footpath which was felt to be a hazard.

35. The Council first received this request in October 2015. On investigating the issue it was found there is insufficient room to install a pedestrian barrier at the kerb edge adjacent to the footpath on Sadler Street. The barrier would need to be installed a minimum of 300mm from the kerb edge and this would narrow the footway to less than the recommended width for mobility scooters. Given the path is at a right angle with walls on both sides, the swept path for mobility scooters to turn in alongside a guardrail would also be made difficult if not impassable. Installation of a guardrail would also prevent access to a utility cover in the footway at this location.
36. Sadler Street and the adjoining Stafford Street form a loop off Westfield Lane and are quiet residential roads. It is reasonable to assume that traffic flows and average vehicle speeds are generally low and no complaints of speeding, through traffic or safety have been received in the last 8 years. There have also not been any accidents on either road in the last 3 years. In the past there has been contact from a mobility scooter user regarding this footpath and there are four advisory markings for the mobility impaired on these two roads.
37. In summary, the Committee agreed that it was not feasible to install a barrier at this location.

**I. Petition requesting safety barriers on footpath from Coniston Road to Belvoir Street, Hucknall (Ref 2016/0153)**

38. A 31 signature petition was presented to the 14th January 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Alice Grice. The petitioners requested that safety barriers be installed on the jitty to slow down cycles and deter motorcycles from using the jitty but are of a type to still allow access for mobility scooters.
39. The jitty is approximately 50m long with the Belvoir Street end restricted by its width and has a manhole and lamp column in the footway and parked vehicles acting as a natural restriction to slow down cycles. Provision of a barrier here is impractical and would restrict the use for mobility scooters
40. The Coniston Road end of the jitty is approximately 2.5m wide with cycles and motor bikes being unrestricted and they can exit the jitty onto the footway and carriageway at speed.
41. A staggered Pedestrian Guardrail is to be installed at the Coniston Road end of the jitty to slow down cycles and motorbikes but will allow access by mobility scooters. The work is being funded by the Community Safety Team and will be completed before the end of March 2016.

**J. Petition requesting a residents' parking scheme on Ranmoor Road, Gedling (Ref 2016/0154)**

42. At County Council on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 Councillor Nicki Brooks presented a petition of 33 signatures requesting a residents' parking scheme be introduced on Ranmoor Road, Gedling. This was due to problems caused by commuters and shoppers parking on the road.

43. Ranmoor Road is directly adjoining Main Road which is a busy shopping area with a number of businesses including a public house and a car garage. There is a car park owned by Gedling Borough Council with 30 spaces at this end of Ranmoor Rd which offers 2 hours free parking and £3 to park all day. The petitioners state that people are using Ranmoor Road to park instead of the car park due to the charges and drivers are using the road to park and ride into Nottingham. This is causing obstruction of driveways, congestion, limits on-street parking availability for residents and prevents road sweeping.
44. Requests for residents' parking are considered against the current policy for new schemes which states that there should be:
- a. Significant levels of current requests from residents
  - b. Non-resident parking which is detrimental to the vitality of the local centre or other Local Transport Plan objectives' and
  - c. A trip-attractor which causes non-resident intrusive parking
45. It is considered that this section of Ranmoor Road meets at least one of these criteria hence the County Council will carry out an investigation to determine whether a residents' parking scheme could be considered for inclusion in a future year's programme.

**K. Petition requesting the resurfacing of the carriageway on Carsic Road, Sutton (Ref 2016/0155)**

46. A 273 signature petition was presented to the 14th January 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Tom Hollis. The petitioners requested that the carriageway on Carsic Road be resurfaced.
47. In its current condition it does not justify resurfacing as a priority but has been added onto the unclassified carriageway list to be considered for resurfacing in future years. In the meantime, the condition of the carriageway will be monitored on a monthly basis and any investigatory defects noted during the inspection will be repaired. No defects were identified on the last inspection in January.

**L. Petition requesting the resurfacing of the carriageway on Huthwaite Road, Sutton (Ref 2016/0156)**

48. A 413 signature petition was presented to the 14th January 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Tom Hollis. The petitioners requested the carriageway on Huthwaite Road be resurfaced
49. The carriageway is on the provisional list for consideration for structural patching repairs to be undertaken in financial year 2016/17. It will be an ongoing phased scheme over a number of years and when complete the carriageway will be surface dressed.
50. In the meantime, the condition of the carriageway will be monitored on a monthly basis and any investigatory defects noted during the inspection will be repaired. No defects were identified on the last inspection in January.



**M. Petition requesting the resurfacing of the carriageway on Westbourne Road, Sutton (Ref 2016/0157)**

51. A 166 signature petition was presented to the 14th January 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Tom Hollis. The petitioners requested that the carriageway on Westbourne Road be resurfaced.
52. In its current condition it does not justify resurfacing as a priority but has been added onto the unclassified carriageway list to be considered for resurfacing in future years. In the meantime, the condition of the carriageway will be monitored on a monthly basis and any investigatory defects noted during the inspection will be repaired. No defects were identified on the last inspection in January.

**N. Petition requesting the resurfacing of the carriageway on Alfreton Road, Sutton (Ref 2016/0158)**

53. A 90 signature petition was presented to the 14th January 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Tom Hollis. The petitioners requested the carriageway on Alfreton Road be resurfaced
54. In its current condition it does not justify resurfacing as a priority. In the meantime, the condition of the carriageway will be monitored on a monthly basis and any investigatory defects noted during the inspection will be repaired. No defects were identified on the last inspection in January.

**O. Petition regarding condition of main road in Thrumpton (Ref 2016/0161)**

55. At the County Council on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016 Councillor Andrew Brown presented a petition of 149 signatures requesting that the central section of Barton Lane be resurfaced in Thrumpton village. It is felt that the road is in a dangerous condition due to heavy usage.
56. Barton Lane runs parallel to the A453 Trunk road and recent road layout changes in the area have resulted in each end of Barton Lane being reconstructed to a high standard. This has left a central section which is in noticeably poorer condition. The road is routinely inspected for safety on a monthly basis and the last inspection on 31 March 2016 found no actionable defects other than one currently pending repair near the Church Ln junction. Over the last 12 months, there have been 10 works orders issued for repairs. This road length has been under consideration for future resurfacing, but has not yet been approved for the Capital Maintenance Programme and is not included in the provisional Programme for 2016/17.
57. In May 2015, Thrumpton Parish Meeting also requested that the road be assessed for a weight restriction following the completion of the A453T dualling works. The traffic survey on 24/9/15 showed the numbers of heavy goods vehicles using the route to be comparatively low at only 11 on the day of the survey. It has been noted for future consideration in the Weight Restriction Programme, but it will be assessed against the scorings from other roads which are likely to be busier.
58. The road will continue to be inspected monthly and maintained in a safe condition whilst being considered for a future maintenance Programme.

**P. Petition regarding reduction in speed on the Ridgeway in Gotham (Ref 2016/0162)**

59. At the County Council on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016, Councillor Andrew Brown presented a petition of 64 signatures requesting a permanent interactive speed sign be installed to address speeding concerns in the 40mph speed limit on Leake Rd in Gotham, also known as 'The Ridgeway'.
60. Following discussions with Councillor Brown in December 2015, a speed and traffic flow survey was carried out between 25/1/16 – 31/1/16 on the straight road length within the 40mph limit northwest of the Bunny Lane junction. The peak hour's 85th percentile speeds travelling southeast were 43.9mph – 44.4mph with flows varying from 264 - 342 vehicles per hour. This meets the traffic flow, but not the speed criteria for a permanent interactive speed sign. North-west bound, the speeds in the peak hours were 48.2mph – 48.5mph with flows of 257 – 387. This meets both criteria.
61. The site will therefore be considered for a future Interactive Speed Sign Programme.

**Q. Petition requesting carriageway resurfacing on Roger Close, Sutton in Ashfield (Ref 2016/0164)**

62. A 16 signature petition was presented to the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016 meeting of the County Council by Councillor David Kirkham. The petitioners requested that the carriageway on Roger Close be resurfaced.
63. The carriageway surface is aesthetically poor with numerous areas of repairs and some fretting of the surface course and there have been several areas of carriageway repairs.
64. The carriageway is included in the 2016/17 surface dressing programme unfortunately there is no definite start date as yet however it should be completed during July – September 2016.

**R. Petition regarding flooding on public footpath off Stapleford Road, Trowell (Ref 2016/0165)**

65. A 126 signature petition was presented to County Council on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016 by Councillor Ken Rigby requesting that an investigation and remedial action be undertaken to clear a right of way of standing water.
66. The cause of the standing water is directly linked to the presence of two gullies which are failing to clear the water effectively. Two gullies had been installed at the site, it is understood, by Broxtowe Borough Council when it held the agency agreement to manage the area. Broxtowe Borough Council advises however that it has no records of these works. As the gullies in question are located off the adopted highway where Trowell footpath No 8 joins Trowell bridleway No 9, the County Council holds no responsibility for their maintenance.
67. However following a request from Councillor Rigby to assist local residents, on the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2016 the NCC Drainage Unit cleansed the gullies and removed the detritus and silt from the footpath surface at the site.

68. The gullies will also be added to the routine gully cleansing programme for the Broxtowe area which has recently been completed. The next cleansing cycle will be undertaken in approximately 12 -18 months.

### **Statutory and Policy Implications**

69. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is RECOMMENDED that the contents of the report and the actions approved be noted.

#### **Report of:-**

**Councillor John Knight**  
**Chairman of Culture Committee**

**Councillor Diana Meale**  
**Chairman of Economic Development Committee**

**Councillor Jim Creamer**  
**Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee**

**Councillor Kevin Greaves**  
**Chairman of the Transport and Highways Committee**

#### **For any enquiries about this report please contact:**

##### Culture Committee:-

Derek Higon, Service Director – Youth, Families and Cultural Services  
Tel 0115 977 3498

##### Economic Development Committee:-

Matt Lockley  
Tel 0115 9772446

##### Environment and Sustainability Committee:-

Oliver Meek, Principal Planning Officer  
Tel 0115 9932583

##### Transport and Highways Committee:-

Neil Hodgson, Service Director - Highways  
Tel 0115 977 2720

## **Background Papers and Published Documents**

- Minutes of the County Council meetings on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and 25<sup>th</sup> February 2016.
- Response to petition presented to the Chairman of the County Council, report to Culture Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> April
- Broadband petitions – North Clifton, Wigsley and Harby report to Economic Development Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2016
- Responses to petitions presented to the Chairman of the County Council, reports to Transport and Highways Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016

## **Electoral Division(s) Affected**

Carlton East, Collingham, Farnsfield and Lowdham, Hucknall, Kimberley and Trowell, Mansfield West, Misterton, Rufford, Soar Valley, Southwell and Caunton, Sutton in Ashfield Central, Sutton in Ashfield West, Tuxford