



meeting **CABINET**

date **7 JUNE 2006**

agenda item number

REPORT OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY

M1 JUNCTIONS 21 TO 30 ROAD WIDENING AND JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS

Purpose of Report

1. To consider and agree the County Council's response to the Highways Agency's proposals to improve the M1 Motorway between Leicester (J21) and Chesterfield (J30).

Background

2. The Highways Agency (HA) proposes to improve approximately 50 miles (85 km) of the M1 between Junctions 21 and 30 by road widening and junction improvement works. These works arise from a recommendation of the M1 Multi-Modal Study (M1 MMS), and subsequent Secretary of State approval, and are specifically required to ease traffic congestion, improve journey times and reliability, and improve road safety. This in turn should result in economic and local environmental benefits.
3. The highway improvements form only part of the transport solution within the M1 corridor. In order to fully capture the benefits of the trunk road investment and avoid the additional capacity simply being filled up again by induced traffic, supporting measures must be progressed in tandem with the highway capacity improvements. These would include public transport improvements, restraint measures, behaviour change and small-scale local measures.
4. This project is estimated to cost £1.9 billion and is the second highest priority scheme in the national trunk roads programme. The scheme is to be funded entirely from Central Government and is included in the HA's Targeted Programme of Improvements.
5. It is proposed to undertake the scheme in two stages, so that part of the overall project can be delivered almost immediately. The first phase will involve widening the M1 to four lanes in each direction between Junctions 25 (A52) and 28 (A38) by converting the existing hard shoulder into the fourth lane and constructing a new hard shoulder. All these works are contained within the existing highway boundary (ie no land acquisition is necessary) and this will enable early congestion relief between Junctions 25 to 28 of the motorway (see location plan A). The second contract involves improving the remaining length of the motorway between Junctions 21 and

30, improving all junctions along the route and link roads and crossings that require additional land take (see location plan B). The Contract 2 proposals are at an early stage of design and the HA is consulting on the proposals, before a decision is taken of a preferred scheme.

6. The HA plan to begin constructing the first phase of works in 2007 with completion in early 2010. The current programme for Contract 2 indicates that construction could begin in 2010/11 and be completed in 2014/15. As far as the travelling public is concerned the changeover between contracts would be indistinguishable; however this does mean that there will be on-going construction activity for over seven years.
7. The HA have carried out a detailed environmental assessment for Contract 1 to identify and describe the environmental implications of these works. A separate environmental assessment for Contract 2 will be undertaken and will be published at a later date. A public exhibition of the Environmental Statement for Contract 1 together with a public consultation on the preliminary proposal for Contract 2 was held between 30th March 2006 and 12th April 2006 at a number of venues. The Secretary of State has invited comments upon the scheme which must be lodged with the HA no later than 28th June 2006.

Scheme Details – Contract 1

8. The works to be undertaken as Contract 1 would all be between Sandiacre (Junction 25) and Pinxton (Junction 28). The works would typically involve widening the carriageway to provide a new inside lane to both the northbound and southbound carriageways, such that the existing dual 3-lane motorway would become a dual 4-lane motorway. There would be limited modifications to junctions where slip roads are affected by the works.
9. The addition of an extra lane in each direction requires the carriageway to be widened by about 3m on either side. This will be achieved by a combination of modifications to cuttings and embankments, i.e. by steepening or moving the slopes so that more land is available for carriageway, modifications at bridges, reductions in the width of the central reserve and narrowing traffic lanes.
10. There are 45 bridges within Contract 1, consisting of 23 underbridges (i.e. carrying the motorway over obstructions) and 22 overbridges. All underbridges are to be retained, although 13 would need to be widened to provide adequate room for the additional carriageway.
11. The works required to overbridges largely depends upon the available space for passing the widened M1 carriageway through the bridge aperture. Seventeen overbridges would be retained in situ, a further four would be replaced during Contract 1, two further structures would be downgraded and will be replaced only with footbridges, 1 overbridge will be demolished and not replaced.
12. The hard shoulder would be reduced in width or excluded entirely at some locations to provide sufficient room for the fourth lane to pass through the retained bridge structures. This will leave a discontinuous hard shoulder.

13. As well as widening the carriageway to provide the new fourth lane the existing carriageway will also be strengthened to increase the life of the new road before further maintenance is required. The proposed Contract 1 works would also include laying low-noise road surfacing to all the M1 carriageway between Junctions 25 and 28. The existing noise barriers would be retained unchanged where the mitigation they provide is adequate for the proposed scheme. Alterations to existing noise barriers and additional new noise barriers would be installed to upgrade noise protection, as necessary, to provide the appropriate level of mitigation.

Scheme Details – Contract 2

14. Contract 2 involves widening the remaining length of the M1 between Junctions 21 and 30 to four lanes in each direction and improving all the junctions. Although the HA has outlined its proposals for all the junctions between 21 and 30, it is Junctions 24 (A453 (Leicestershire)) up to and including Junction 28 (A38 (Derbyshire)) that are of immediate local interest.
15. At Junction 24 (A453 Leicestershire) the existing M1/A453 traffic signal controlled roundabout will be retained, although the southern slip roads to and from the M1 south will be closed. A new parallel link road between the A50 (Junction 24A) and the A42 (Junction 23A) will bypass Junction 24 and thereby provide traffic relief to this junction. Access from the A453 to M1 south and the A42 south will be catered for from the new collector road.
16. At Junction 25 (A52 Derbyshire) the existing junction is likely to remain largely unchanged, although the northern bridge over the M1 is likely to be replaced as clearances to the widened motorway will be unacceptable. A replacement of the bridge will be provided and the roundabout reshaped as a consequence.
17. At Junction 26 (A610 Nottinghamshire) the M1 MMS recommended improvements to this junction together with the construction of a new Junction 26A with direct links to the A610, as a way of resolving queuing from the A610/A6002 Nuthall roundabout which blocks back and impedes traffic leaving the M1. The HA has undertaken further detailed traffic assessment which has shown that a new Junction 26A and connecting link roads would add to the traffic demands on the A610 and peak period congestion would be extensive. As a result the HA are considering improvements to the existing Junction 26 roundabout, the provision of a dedicated free flow left turn lane from the M1 southbound slip road to the A610 and increasing the stacking capacity of the A610 between Junction 26 and Nuthall roundabout.
18. At Junction 27 (A608 Nottinghamshire) signalisation of the M1 exit lanes is proposed together with a segregated left turn lane between the A608 and the M1 south.
19. At Junction 28 (A38 Derbyshire) the capacity at the junction is to be improved by the addition of a new link for A38 traffic through the middle of the junction. This link will be at the same level as the existing roundabout and will require new sets of traffic signals where it crosses the roundabout. Further widening of the existing carriageway will be needed. The arrangement is being taken forward by the HA in preference to a 3 level interchange which was recommended by the M1MMS.

Compatibility with the Regional Transport Strategy and Joint Structure Plan.

20. Improvements to the M1 between junctions 21 and 30 have been identified as a Transport Investment Priority within the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS), which forms part of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8). This support was provided on the basis of the M1 multi-modal study which recommended widening the M1 alongside a package of other public transport and demand management measures, including heavy rail, freight, road based passenger transport, strategic park and ride and other policy interventions. It is therefore of concern that the additional capacity is being provided without any firm plans for the delivery of these complementary measures.
21. This view is reinforced by the RTS core strategy, which supports additional highway capacity “only when all other measures have been supported” – clearly not the case in this instance. The Highways Agency and the Department of Transport should ensure these other measures are also delivered.
22. The Joint Structure Plan supports the M1 improvements, and seeks safeguarding of the necessary land.

Comments on Contract 1 Proposals

Highway Issues

23. In terms of Contract 1 there are instances where construction works will have a significant adverse impact on the county road network, residents, businesses and the travelling public. It is felt that the supporting Environmental Statement (ES) underplays the levels of likely disruption which will be caused both by lane closures on the M1 during construction and by closures or other restrictions placed on roads when modifying the structures. From the details provided there appears to be potential for significant disruption to the A610 and B600 close to Junction 26.
24. There is a lack of supporting traffic information to quantify the likely traffic impacts of Contract 1 both during construction and upon completion of this phase. The County Council request the further traffic modelling details which underpin the ES so that the authority can properly assess the level of traffic displaced onto adjoining county and trunks roads. The indirect traffic consequences of the Contract 1 proposals have not been demonstrated by the HA even though there is likely to be a material and adverse traffic impact beyond the immediate confines of the M1.
25. The Contract 1 proposals will involve significant movement of materials both imported onto and removed from the site. The quantities involved are expected to amount to over one million cubic metres of material. As all of this material will need to be moved by road, further details will need to be provided to demonstrate how the impact on the local highway network can be minimised.
26. The HA require the contractor to draft a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) for their approval. The CEMP will be a strategy to manage the potential impacts arising from the construction activities. The County Council and other local authorities need to be consulted on and have direct input to the CEMP, for example specifying routes to and from landfill sites or quarries for sourcing aggregate, indicating alternative routes to be taken during temporary closure of the M1 on other

side roads, advising as to acceptable night-time working hours, scheduling the timing and duration of closures of overbridges and underpasses etc.

27. Co-ordination of the Contract 1 (and Contract 2) works must be undertaken not only within the M1 works corridor but also in respect of other works. Over the period of works envisaged the HA will inevitably have other on-going work on the M1 which may add to the redistribution of traffic onto other roads. Furthermore there needs to be close co-ordination with other committed trunk road and local authority road improvements, for example the A453 dualling scheme M1 to A52 (Nottingham), A1 grade separated junction programme and A46 Newark to Widmerpool Improvement Scheme. Strategic diversions and emergency diversion routes will need to be identified, agreed with the local highway authorities and work programmed to ensure that traffic is not directed to other routes where delays are expected. The HA is requested to ensure that the County Council is fully consulted at all stages and construction proposals developed which will provide for the needs of both local and long distance traffic.

Rights of Way Issues

28. The HA proposals under Contract 1 assume that all overbridges, which are to be replaced, will be replaced on line and, where reasonable, will meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) where they carry Public Rights of Way. It is further assumed for the purpose of assessment by the HA that the scheme will as a minimum maintain existing levels of provision for non-motorised users (NMUS) and where appropriate seek opportunities to improve the current situation for NMUS. This is however not the case. Overbridge 479 carries Greasley Bridleway (BW) 19 and a private means of vehicle access. Although the structure is currently closed to private vehicle traffic, due to its poor condition, it remains open to walkers, cyclists and horse riders. As part of Contract 1 it is proposed to demolish this structure and not replace it. Therefore necessary service diversion and issue of legal Orders to stop up the route of BW19 will be required. The County Council considers that the M1 already poses a major barrier to those people using public rights of way for east-west travel and that all existing crossings are vital and should be maintained. The County Council would therefore wish to object to removal of overbridge 479 and the severance of BW19.
29. It is noted that overbridge number 471 currently serves as a private means of vehicular access and carries Nuthall footpath No 8. Following discussion with the landowners it is proposed by the HA that the replacement structure would consist of a footbridge only. This is acceptable to the authority but replacement must have level approaches (ie no steps) to comply with the DDA. This requirement is extended to all bridge replacements on Contract 1.
30. The County Council would seek assurances that, where overbridges or underbridges are to be reconstructed, adequate footways, and where necessary cycle/and bridleway facilities, are included across the new structures. This is considered particularly important where public rights of way are linked by a road over/under bridge across the M1, and in particular Stapleford Road (OB461); Nottingham Road, Trowell (UB464); Nottingham Road Nuthall (UB474); Long Lane, Watnall (linking Greasley FP14 and BW15) OB474; Annesley Lane, Annesley linking FPs 8, 11, 12 (OB487) and Park Lane, Kirkby Park (OB489)

Conservation and Ecology Issues

31. Impacts on protected / notable species and designated sites / important habitats appear to be minimal, given that the works will be occurring within the existing highway boundary. However, the widening works will result in the loss of some areas of habitat, due to cutting back into the existing verge in order to accommodate the fourth lane. In particular, large proportions of some habitats occurring within the highway boundary, including broad-leaved semi-natural woodland, broad-leaved plantation woodland, dense and scattered scrub, and semi-improved neutral grassland, will be lost. These permanent losses have been recognised, and are assessed as being 'significant' at a local scale. The Council therefore welcomes the 'Incorporated Mitigation' proposals outlined in the ES. However, the following specific comments should be noted.

- It is noted that attenuation features will be designed during the detailed development of the drainage scheme and the potential of these for wildlife is acknowledged. Where will such features be located? It is presumed that it will not be possible to locate them within the highway boundary. If it is, they should not be located in areas of higher quality habitat.
- The authority welcomes the intention, where possible, to use ecotypes when undertaking planting. It is suggested that, if obtaining such ecotypes is likely to be a problem, stock should be grown up under contract in advance.
- The selective thinning of existing plantations to favour native species, followed by planting to give a more varied age structure, is welcomed.
- Any seeding of wildflowers (eg to introduce a ground layer in woodland areas) must only use stock of native genetic origin.
- The instigation of an appropriate management regime to benefit features of nature conservation interest is supported. At what point will such a plan be developed, and will this involve consultation with other parties? In principle, the management activities that have been identified are supported.
- The Council supports the treatment of Japanese Knotweed.

32. The intention to implement mitigation measures outside the highway boundary (with landowner agreement) to improve linkages between habitats is considered important, as the proposals currently lead to the loss of 37.15ha of vegetation. It is considered that this scale of loss cannot be wholly mitigated by works within the highway boundary. Of particular importance is the need to create larger blocks of habitat in preference to smaller blocks of narrow, linear habitat. These additional works will compensate for the overall reduction in habitat that would otherwise arise as a result of the scheme. The following specific comments should be noted

- There are inconsistencies between the habitat creation works proposed in Volume 2a of the ES and those shown in section 5.2 (Landscape Proposals) of Volume 3 of the ES. For example, section 4.4.18 mentions calcareous grassland creation at Nuthall Cutting, but this is not shown on the relevant

landscaping plan. There are concerns that this may result in opportunities being missed, and it is suggested that an integrated landscape/ecology plan should be produced as a priority.

- The proposals to buffer areas of ancient woodland, adjacent to the highway are welcomed. It is suggested that efforts should also be made to link areas of woodland through planting (or natural regeneration), eg New Farm Wood and Seller's Wood.
- The creation of grasslands within the highway boundary is supported, but it is noted that the landscape proposals show 'scattered trees' in these grassland areas. For ease of management, and to increase the longevity of these habitats (ie to reduce the time in which they scrub over), it is recommended that this tree planting is removed. Where screening is required, trees should be planted along the top of the cuttings/embankments only.
- Offsite planting should obviously only occur in areas of low nature conservation value, avoiding habitats such as rough grassland, permanent pasture or scrub.
- As with the incorporated mitigation, it is hoped that every effort will be made to source stock of local genetic origin. If necessary, stock should be grown up under contract in advance.

33. It is unclear as to whether or not the mitigation outside the highway boundary is deemed to be essential. It is stated that it is non-essential, but that it is an important part of integrating the scheme with the landscape, providing ecological links as well as important areas of habitat in their own right. The Council is concerned that all off-site works will be dependent upon landowner agreement. What action will the HA take if landowners refuse to co-operate?

34. Finally, the County Council would like to highlight the new 'biodiversity duty' that the HA has, following the passing of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Under part 3 of the Act, the Highways Agency (along with all other public authorities) now has a duty to conserve biodiversity. Section 40(1) of the Act states that:

'every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.'

In clarifying this duty, section 40(3) of the Act states that:

'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat.'

35. The County Council trusts that the HA will take all reasonable measures to conserve biodiversity and restore and enhance the nature conservation value of the area in compliance with this Act.

Heritage Issues

36. The Environmental Statement fails to note the impact of the Contract 1 proposals on individual listed buildings, with the exception of those falling within Registered Parks and Gardens. The Council considers that, as a result of the omission of detailed consideration of the impact of the proposals on individual listed buildings, the scale of the impact has not been appropriately recorded and reported in the ES. The ES goes on to suggest that the setting of individual listed buildings is purely an issue of views or landscape, which clearly it is not. Again the settings of some of the listed buildings are considered, but not all of those in the immediate vicinity of the road.
37. The County Council is particularly concerned about the likely impacts of Contract 1 upon Home Farm, Nuthall, which is immediately adjacent to the M1 at Junction 26. It is a grade II listed building and its setting will be affected to at least a 'moderate adverse' level by the proposals. Mitigation measures will not reduce the impact significantly and definitely not to a level where it would be determined as 'neutral'. Home Farm has been blighted by its proximity to the M1 since the road was built and has, as a direct result, become run-down and is now severely at risk of collapse. The listed buildings are presently on the market for sale and the M1 proposals will further devalue the site in the view of prospective investors. The ES does not take the opportunity to acknowledge the on-going detrimental impact the road has on the building, nor does it record the condition of the farmstead, which is recorded as 'at risk' by the County Council which has a duty to protect the built heritage. The proposals offer no mitigation to ensure that the future of this listed building is not further damaged, probably irreparably, by the M1 widening proposals and their construction.

Landscape Issues

38. Overall the methodology for the assessment of landscape and visual impact is not completely clear from the section in Chapter 5, "Landscape and Visual Effects", and does not demonstrate how conclusions have been derived from the base data.
39. In the Landscape Impact section greater account needs to be taken of the Mature Landscape Area designations within the vicinity of the scheme. Some of the assessments of landscape sensitivity may be scored lower than they should be as a result of not taking the MLAs into account. Specific examples have been highlighted in detailed comments provided as a supporting statement.
40. The visual impact assessment requires more work to identify precise visual impacts from individual receptors. Again, specific examples are highlighted. There is not sufficient connection between the visual impact assessment and the design proposals. Receptors have been grouped together rather than looked at individually and visual sensitivity has not been considered.
41. Given the magnitude of the scheme and the number of 'ancillary features' listed such as overhead gantries, the rigid concrete barrier to the central reservation and lighting (refer to Para 5.7.1), the statement that both residual visual impact and residual landscape impact are 'minor' requires more justification. The current assessment does not demonstrate this sufficiently or show how mitigating measures have been identified and designed.

42. The replacement of overbridges provides the opportunity in places to enhance the character of the area by, for example, the construction of visually pleasing structures rather than standard footbridges.

Comments on Contract 2 Consultation

43. The nature of the proposed improvement to M1 Junction 26 has yet to be agreed and demonstrated to the satisfaction of the County Council. The nature of the scheme displayed at the public consultation indicates that the improvements are likely to include the provision of a dedicated exit lane from the M1 southbound slip road onto the A610, together with increasing the storage capacity of the A610 between the M1 and Nuthall roundabout.
44. In finalising a solution for Junction 26, the County Council (and Nottingham City Council) require the HA to demonstrate further the likely impacts of the revised proposals by way of detailed microsimulation modelling along the A610 corridor. The solution should consider how access to the NET Park and Ride at Cinderhill and other improvements to public transport can be incorporated into the proposals. It is considered essential that the improvements at Junction 26 support and enhance Local Transport Plan policies for encouraging sustainable public transport rather than catering for increased car traffic.
45. The nature of the proposed improvements at Junction 27 have not been demonstrated by way of supporting traffic assessment and as such the form of junction improvement cannot at this stage be verified.
46. The County Council is concerned about the likely resulting significant increases of traffic on other trunk roads and local roads in Nottinghamshire arising especially from the Contract 2 proposals, particularly on the A453 (T), A52(T), A46(T), A610, A608, A611, A38, A617, and A57. It is considered essential that the traffic impacts are presented to and discussed in detail with the County Council at the earliest opportunity. Only then will it be possible to judge where the M1 scheme is likely to have a significant and detrimental impact on the wider highway network and where it may be necessary to consider selective capacity improvements.
47. The County Council is concerned that additional traffic will transfer onto the A46(T), particularly during the Contract 2 works, to the detriment of the safe and expeditious movement of traffic through Nottinghamshire. The Council considers it essential that the dualling proposals for the A46(T) are coordinated and delivered at national level so that its construction timetable can be aligned with the M1 construction to reduce the impact of any additional traffic pressures transferring from the M1. It is therefore imperative that the necessary level of funding is committed centrally to implement the A46 Newark to Widmerpool Improvement Scheme at the earliest opportunity.

Nottingham East Midlands Airport (NEMA) Fixed Rail Link

48. Nottingham East Midlands Airport has recently published its draft Masterplan, which sets out its proposals for expansion until 2030, and addresses as part of this the transport impacts of growth. The growth in freight handled by the airport will bring substantial increases in road vehicles accessing the airport via the M1, although

much of this is at night when congestion is less severe. However significant passenger growth is also predicted and this will lead to additional daytime vehicle movements, including at peak periods. This provides further justification for increasing capacity on the M1.

49. However in order to reduce the number of car movements in and out of the airport the airport is committed to increasing access by public transport. Proposals to achieve this include investment in bus services, and a shuttle bus service between the proposed East Midlands Parkway Station and the airport. In the longer term (post 2030) the Masterplan considers that a fixed link (either heavy or light rail) may be required, linking to the Parkway Station. This would need to cross the M1 and the proposed parallel link road between junctions 23a and 24. It is recommended that the Highways Agency should discuss the possible future route alignment of such a link with NEMA, so that any opportunities to “design in” a crossing point can be taken now.

Statutory and Policy Implications

50. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of Finance, Equal Opportunities, Personnel, Crime and Disorder (Community Safety), the Local Member and those using the service. Where such implications are material, they have been brought out in the text of the report. Attention is, however, drawn to specifics as follows:-

Equal Opportunities Implications

51. Appropriate consideration will need to be given in the scheme to the requirements/facilities for non-car users and those with restricted mobility.

Human Rights Act Implications

52. The Head of Legal Services advises that three rights under the Convention of Human Rights needs to be considered when taking the decision:

Article 1 of the Convention provides that every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

Article 2 of the Convention is an unqualified right to life and to positive protection of that right by public authorities.

Article 8 of the Convention provides that “everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life and his home”. The implementation of a traffic regulation order could interfere with these rights for nearby residents, but the Council may interfere with such rights in accordance with the law as contained in the transportation and highways acts and, where it is necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of, amongst other things, public safety and the general interest. The decision maker may conclude that implementation of a traffic regulation order is necessary in a democratic society to enable residents and road users to make safe journeys thereby protecting public safety and will in environmental terms also be in the general interest.

The County Council has therefore a primary duty to protect life and a secondary duty not to interfere with Article 8 or 1 rights, except in certain circumstances. The benefit of greater road safety and environmental benefits may perhaps be considered to outweigh any intrusion there may be to Article 8 or 1 rights.

Proportionality

53. The decision-maker needs to consider whether the benefits of implementing a traffic regulation order outweigh any adverse effect on the human rights of nearby residents or road users. The provision of road safety is necessary in a democratic society and statutory powers exist to make such provision. The decision-maker must weigh any competing interests and decide which are more appropriate taking all of the above into account.

RECOMMENDATIONS

54. It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet authorise officers to:
- (a) support the general principle of the proposed M1 (J21 - 30) widening improvement scheme to remove the worst of the current highway congestion and safety problems and urge the Highways Agency to implement the scheme at the earliest possible opportunity;
 - (b) remind the Secretary of State for Transport that these proposals form part of an interdependent package of measures arising out of the M1 MMS study and that appropriate levels of funding should be committed to providing the longer term public transport elements of the Strategy, ie NET and Rail network improvements.
 - (c) approve the submission of the detailed comments and objections, as outlined in the report;
 - (d) request the Highways Agency to consider the issues set out in this report and continue to consult the County Council before finalising the details of the Contract 1 scheme;
 - (e) request the Highways Agency to further consult the County Council before finalising the Contract 2 scheme to be taken through the statutory procedures.

COUNCILLOR STELLA SMEDLEY
Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability

Director of Resources' Financial Comments

All costs associated with the proposed scheme would be funded at a national level. There are no direct financial implications arising from the contents of the report. [KRP 19.5.06]

Legal Services' Comments

Cabinet has power to decide the Recommendation. [SHB 17.5.06]

Background Papers Available for Inspection

1. Highways Agency Scheme Pamphlet (Explanation of the proposals and non-technical summary of the Environmental Statement).
2. Highways Agency Environment Statement of Contract 1 Works (March 2006)
Volume 1 – Main Report
Volume 2a – Detailed assessments
Volume 2b – Annexes
Volume 3 – Figures and Plans
3. Detailed comments raised by the County Council in respect of conservation and landscape issues.

Electoral Division(s) Affected

Bramcote and Stapleford
Kimberley and Trowell
Nuthall
Beauvale
Hucknall
Kirkby in Ashfield South
Selston
Kirkby in Ashfield North

Tdps1425