

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
1	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	EIA	A list of potential environmental and socio-economic effects arising from the proposed development along with commentary of how effects are to be addressed should be included in the Non-Technical Summary.	A Non-Technical Summary has been provided which summarises of the potential significant effects and mitigation approaches.
2	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	EIA	The Environmental Statement must contain the information specified in Regulation 18(3) of the 2017 EIA Regulations and must meet the requirements of Regulation 18(4). It must also include any additional information specified in Schedule 4 to the EIA Regulations which is relevant to the particular development proposal and to the environmental features likely to be significantly affected.	Table 1-2 within Volume 1 of the ES signposts the reader to where within the ES the requirements of Schedule 4 (which encompasses the requirements of Regulations 18(3) and 18(4).
3	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	EIA	The topics at 5.15 appear to cover most of the relevant subject areas applicable in this case and consideration is also to be given to alternatives and cumulative impacts (5.16) as is required under the Regulations. The CPA concur with the view reached on heat and radiation (5.1.9) and transboundary impacts (5.1.10). A specific consideration of risks and disasters will not be required (5.1.12).	Noted - the scope included within the ES is as per that proposed in the Scoping Report.
4	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	EIA	The planning submission should incorporate an analysis of the proposed development against relevant planning policies (referenced at 8.3.1).	This analysis can be found within the Planning Statement which accompanies the application.
5	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	EIA	In terms of presenting the proposals for individual junctions there will be elements of the overarching ES that will be relevant and have related impacts, particularly with regard to transport, emissions and ecology (9.6.8) (unless it is proposed to provide ecological mitigation at each junction), climate and cumulative impacts. Whilst the format in the Scoping document deals with each topic with a commentary on each junction, where site specific issues at other junctions have no relevance or environmental impact on the junction [assessment] they can be omitted from the junction-specific submission. This will help with the focus of the applications while providing all relevant information and context.	The ES is structured to provide an assessment of each junction in isolation - focussing on topics where significant effects were considered likely within the Scoping Report. This has meant that no detailed assessment has been undertaken for White Post Roundabout and Warren Hill Junction. An overview of the scoping assessments for White Post Roundabout and Warren Hill Junction is provided in Appendices 4-6 and 4-7 respectively. Volume 1 of the ES provides the assessment of environmental effects Project-wide (all four assessed Schemes combined), In-combination effects and Cumulative Effects.
6	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	All Schemes	Transport Assessment	Highways - A Transport Assessment will need to consider in particular: any adverse effects of the redistribution of vehicles, which may have otherwise avoided the junction in question, due to it being currently over capacity; the highway safety implications of the proposals, to include consideration of the roads and junctions where vehicles have redistributed; and consideration of the impact on vulnerable road users.	A Transport Assessment has been prepared and provided within the planning application. This notes the limited redistribution of vehicles anticipated as a result of the Project, including to/from the A614. The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 and will be subject to audits at stage 2 (detailed design) and Stage 3 (substantial completion). Throughout scheme design development, input has been sought on various design proposals within each Scheme from Via Safer Highways. NCC Police have also been consulted on all proposals related to speed limit changes.
7	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout, Kirk Hill	Biodiversity	Attention is drawn to NWT comment on Bio-diversity Net Gain, funding and management which should be addressed in the submission.	The Project has been developed with consideration for BNG requirements, and is predicted to achieve a net gain in all three metrics (see Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3). All net gain requirements will be within the revised highway boundary. Funding and management will be the responsibility for NCC.
8	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout, Kirk Hill	Biodiversity	Noise - Noise change impacts on sensitive species (roosting and foraging bats and nesting birds) will need to be assessed depending on the outcome of surveys.	The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D.
9	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout, Kirk Hill	Climate	Emissions - As part of the greenhouse gas impact assessment consideration should be given to the impact of emissions arising from increased traffic growth and potential to ease congestion (15.1). The need for accurate modelling of greenhouse gas emissions identified by NWT should be noted.	As noted within the Scoping Report, traffic composition (% heavy goods vehicles) and traffic flows are expected to remain largely comparable with the Project. This is also noted within the Transport Assessment which accompanies the planning application. Traffic speeds do increase around some of the junctions, however, this has not triggered the criteria within DMRB LA 114 Climate of an increase greater than 20 km/hr. Therefore operational greenhouse gases have remained scoped out of the assessment. An assessment of construction greenhouse gases has been undertaken for Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout and Kirk Hill Junction as can be found summarised within Chapter 12: Climate in Volume 1 of the ES. The detail of the methodology used can be found within ES Volumes 1A to 1D.
10	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout, Kirk Hill	Heritage	Historic Environment - The setting of heritage assets, impacts and mitigation will need careful consideration. Particular regard should be given to the recommendations of Historic England. Section 7.7.6 identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section.	Changes to the setting of heritage assets have been considered in the likely significant effects section of the Cultural Heritage assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D of the ES.
11	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction	Biodiversity	Natural England has provided advice on the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and without wishing to repeat it at length in this letter is included as Annex A to the attached consultation response.	Noted. A response to the Natural England advice is provided within this table.
12	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction	Biodiversity	Appropriate species surveys will need to be undertaken (Table 9-3).	Protected species surveys have been undertaken as reported within Section 8.4 Assessment Methodology in Volumes 1A to 1D.
13	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	EIA	The ES should include a detailed description (2.3.5-2.3.8 and 8.3.3- 8.3.33) of the site to provide context to the Ollerton roundabout project.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1A Chapter 2: The Scheme.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
14	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	Ollerton roundabout has had a low level of accidents for many years, and making it more complex with greater capacity for more and faster motor vehicles will be detrimental to that good record. The proposal introduces potential conflicts by marking some of the exits as twin lanes which will further promote drivers to negotiate the roundabout in pairs. This layout is also likely to increase downstream speeds and overtaking as a result of having those twin lanes demarked at the exits.	<p>The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer. This issue was raised in the RSA with a recommendation to increase the size of the roundabout. The size of the roundabout cannot be increased due to the physical constraints (existing built environment) and the proposals include the maximum ICD that can be achieved at this location.</p> <p>The Scheme includes a reduction in the current speed limit and will be subject to 40 mph posted speed limit to encourage lower vehicular speeds and influence driver behaviour enabling them to negotiate the junction safely.</p>
15	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	Via Road Safety advise that the proposal will lead to an increase in collisions and injuries compared with the current layout because of the additional conflicts introduced by the extra lanes. Roundabouts with more than four entries have been problematic at almost all locations in Nottinghamshire (Ollerton having been safer because the compact layout restricts the number of vehicles that can negotiate it at the same time). The new layout may also lead to additional problems with two-wheeled vehicles (powered and non-powered) which can become "lost" amongst larger vehicles, as well as being more vulnerable in the event of collisions.	<p>The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer. This issue was raised in the RSA with a recommendation to increase the size of the roundabout. The size of the roundabout cannot be increased due to the physical constraints (existing built environment) and the proposals include the maximum ICD that can be achieved at this location.</p> <p>The Scheme includes a reduction in the current speed limit and will be subject to 40 mph posted speed limit to encourage lower vehicular speeds and influence driver behaviour enabling them to negotiate the junction safely.</p>
16	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	The proposed scheme will increase the throughput of the junction in terms of motor vehicle capacity. This is likely to increase the number of journeys made using motor vehicles, in the immediate local area as well as in the wider region, increasing risk of collisions, not only at this junction but at all points on those additional journeys.	A Transport Assessment has been prepared and provided within the planning application. This notes the limited redistribution of vehicles anticipated as a result of the Project.
17	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	The signal-controlled crossings will need to be made attractive to users with joined-up high-quality infrastructure (walking and cycling routes) and should be given attention during the detailed design. Additional footways are proposed around this junction where pedestrians will be required to cross three of the roads at the splitter islands without the aid of formal control which is likely to be very difficult at certain times and will create new conflicts. Via Road Safety question why these new footway links are being proposed and, if they are necessary, further consideration of control crossing facilities is recommended.	NCC's Principal Officer for LTP and Travel Planning was consulted early in the design process to comment on existing issues relating to Non-Motorised Users at all junctions, with a subsequent meeting (held September 2020) to discuss some of the design principles relating specifically to NMUs and the proposed provision within each scheme. This has not been raised as a specific issue at these discussions, nor has it been raised during the Stage 1 RSA undertaken at this junction. The need for the provision of these uncontrolled crossings will be considered in detailed design; there is a layby to the north of the junction on the A614 that will remain, albeit relocated away from its current location which could generate foot traffic, which is one of the reasons for the provision of this footway. This is used by Royal Mail and other delivery drivers. The speed limit for the junction will be reduced to 40 mph which will aid safe passage of NMUs.
18	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	Assessment of the risk of an increase in collisions, including non-car road users and those crossing the junction, and the need for mitigation will need to be considered. British Horse Society has noted that the controlled crossing proposed across the A6075 aligns with the entrance to the pub/diner rather than with the end of the bridleway. Users of the bridleway are more likely to use the crossing than pub visitors as the pub has its own carpark. There also appears to be another controlled crossing across the A614 south which provides connectivity to. This allows access to Newark Road (Bus-only Lane) into Old Ollerton. Consideration needs to be given to the provision of safe crossing of the A6075 and A614 (south) by horse riders in addition to cyclists and pedestrians.	The existing land and environmental constraints mean that there is no opportunity to include specific facilities for equestrian users at this location. These physical restrictions also impact on (limit) the width of other NMU provisions such as footways. While it is acknowledged that Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway 26 (BW26) intersects the roundabout from the west at the A6075, NMU survey returns did not identify any equestrian usage at the junction. The constraints of the built environment around this junction mean that incorporation of Pegasus crossings into the proposed junction improvements could not be achieved due to the design requirements associated with constructing such a facility (corral).
19	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	Having regard to the proximity of the Ollerton Roundabout to high-quality bat foraging habitat, NCC Ecology advises that bat activity surveys need to be undertaken, and that the impact of artificial lighting and noise should be considered with the use of lux diagrams and noise contour plans, unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no significant changes to the noise and lighting environment as a result of the roundabout improvements. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust has highlighted the need for a methodology for how impacts of changes to noise, light and disturbance are to be assessed. The need for bat surveys is identified in order to be able to assess the predicted noise changes on bat foraging activity.	<p>The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Lux plans did indicate a potential adverse effect for bats for one property at Forest Side. An additional Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021) has been undertaken to determine whether suitable roosting features were present to support bats. (see Appendix 8-2 in Volume 3A). Further detail on the mitigation and the assessment is reported in Section 8.6 and 8.7 in Volume 1A.</p>
20	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	Given the diverse bird assemblage supported by the wider SSSI/SAC adjacent to the Ollerton Roundabout (including heathland/woodland and nocturnal species), as well as the comments in Table 9-3 that Suitable nesting and foraging habitat is present for nightjar and woodlark within the Scheme boundary. Therefore, effects to both species due to the removal of suitable habitat as part of the works and therefore potential impacts to the ppSPA, cannot be discounted, targeted bird surveys should be undertaken unless sufficient data is available from other sources, such as Birklands Ringing Group/NBGRC (noting that the latter do hold bird data so it is unclear why none was returned as part of the desktop study) and/or that it can again be demonstrated that there will be no significant changes to the noise and lighting environment as a result of the roundabout improvements.	Additional data has been obtained from the NBGRC. The impacts to nightjar and woodlark have been assessed within Volume 1A Chapter 8: Biodiversity and within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Report (Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3).

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
21	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	In relation to bats and potential roost sites, it is noted that in some cases buildings adjacent to the proposed works areas have not been surveyed as they lie outside the scheme boundary. It will need to be demonstrated through the assessment process that there will not be significant indirect impacts on potential roost locations as a result of noise, lighting or general disturbance.	The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux plans did indicate a potential adverse effect for bats for one property at Forest Side. An additional Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021) has been undertaken to determine whether suitable roosting features were present to support bats. (see Appendix 8-2 in Volume 3A). Further detail on the mitigation and the assessment is reported in Section 8.6 and 8.7 in Volume 1A.
22	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	With reference to the Sherwood ppSPA (Paragraph 9.6.5) in-line with the 'risk-based approach' set out in Natural England's Advice Note (March 2014), a consideration of potential impacts on the ppSPA should be undertaken as part of the HRA assessment (required due to proximity to the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC). Although it will be referenced in the Scoping Opinions to be adopted for the White Post and Warren Hill junctions, it should be noted that given that both junctions lie within the 5km buffer zone for the ppSPA they should be scoped in for the purposes of the HRA. The Lowdham Roundabout and Kirk Hill Junctions do not need to be considered except as part of an in-combination assessment.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken, considering the Schemes at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and White Post Roundabout. See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3. This includes consideration for the ppSPA.
23	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	With reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, the creation of habitat should be delivered as far as possible at each of the individual junctions comprising the overall combined scheme through the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes. The proposed Ollerton Roundabout improvements should be landscaped to reflect characteristic Sherwood habitats, e.g. acid grassland or heathland, with Silver Birch or Oak trees (if trees are considered appropriate), given the location as a gateway to some of Sherwood's most ecologically-important sites.	The design has sought to maximise habitat creation at each Scheme location as noted in the BNG Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021a) located in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3. The proposed landscape designs are specific to the character of the location, including for example, acid grassland and oak trees at Ollerton Roundabout.
24	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Heritage	The scheme extends into the designated conservation area of Ollerton Village and impacts on this designated heritage asset may potentially cause unacceptable levels of harm. The conservation area contains a cluster of designated listed buildings which are also shown on the designations plan. However, they are not identified on the key of this plan, although a correct list appears in the EIA scoping report text. It is important to recognise that these designated heritage assets each have a 'setting' that contributes to their significance and that could be impacted upon and potentially harmed by the proposals. Ollerton Hall is a grade II* listed building within view of the roundabout and as such this designated heritage asset will require careful consideration and response within the scheme submission. Ollerton Hall and other heritage assets should be set as receptors in the LVIA to ensure that suitable evidence is provided in the EIA. Noise receptors should be treated similarly.	The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1A of the ES. Heritage assets are shown on Figure 6-1 within Volume 2A. Ollerton Hall has been considered within the LVIA reported in Chapter 7 in Volume 1A of the ES. Noise sensitive receptors are considered in Chapter 10 of Volume 1A. The operational noise changes are predicted to be negligible and not significant. The noise contour plans (Figures 10-2 and 10-3 show negligible changes to operational noise. Light spill during operation has also been considered within the assessment.
25	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Heritage	Harm to designated heritage assets (in this case the conservation area and individual listed buildings) is in some cases avoidable (or can be significantly reduced) through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Detailed consultation prior to the submission of the planning application, to ensure collaborative input into the designs, is encouraged. Early consultation with NCC Historic Buildings and conservation officers at the Newark & Sherwood District Council should take place before designs are fully developed to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these.	Likely significant effects have been considered to heritage assets within the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1A of the ES. The assessment has considered noise and lighting in operation. Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.
26	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Ollerton Roundabout	Water	Flood Risk and Risk to Groundwater - The Environment Agency draws attention to matters to be considered in the Flood Risk Assessment and also identifies potential risk to groundwater, including the need for a controlled waters risk assessment.	Risks to the SPZ and groundwater have been considered in Volume 1a Chapter 9: Geology and Soils. A preliminary risk assessment for controlled waters has been undertaken based on the preliminary conceptual model within Appendix 9-1 in Volume 3A. A controlled waters risk assessment would be undertaken in advance of construction work.
27	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	EIA	The ES should include a detailed description (2.3.9-2.3.12 and Option 1 - 8.3.34-8.3.62 and Option 2 - 8.3.63-8.3.92) of the site to provide context to the Mickledale Lane junction project.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1B Chapter 2: The Scheme.
28	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	British Horse Society has identified the closure of a route providing connectivity between the bridleway (Rufford BW19) on Inkersall Lane and the multi-user route crossing the A614 on the former mineral line to the north. The provision of connectivity and safe crossing of the A614 by all non-motorised user groups should be considered.	Mickledale Lane will be closed off to vehicles and will become a cul-de-sac accessed from the east at the mini-roundabout junction with the new link road. This means that an NMU link for equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians travelling east-west towards the BW5, PRoW at Inkersall Lane and beyond, can be maintained as a preferred route encouraging NMUs to cross the A614 at a location with the least amount of potential conflict using existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing provision which incorporates central refuges. It is anticipated that the new roundabout will generate gaps in platoons of traffic and reduced vehicular speeds which will aid east-west crossing movements. As mentioned previously, NCN 645 lies 210 m to the north of the junction and is a traffic free route. The route is signed, accessed from Bilsthorpe village and promoted as a multi-access route using the disused railway bridge enable safe passage of NMUs over the A614. While it is acknowledged that Rufford BW5 runs east of the A614 along Inkersall Lane and Rufford BW19 joins Mickledale Lane approximately 500 m to the east of the proposed mini-roundabout, NMU survey returns identified some albeit low levels of equestrian usage at the junction. Therefore, it is not proposed to provide specific facilities for equestrian users at this location. The PRoW team are aware of the blocked passage from BW5.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
29	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	Via Rights of Way has identified latent and growing equestrian use in the area with Inkersall Lane (Rufford BW 5) and Rufford BW 19 linking Bilsthorpe to Sherwood.	See above (response to 28)
30	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	Links to the National Cycle Network (NCN) 645 are used informally by equestrians. Whilst this is not an equestrian route it is advised that Sustrans are looking to formally include equestrians in the future. The closure of the link referred to by the British Horse Society is currently part of a claim for a footpath and may be upgraded to bridleway if there is evidence of equestrian use. However, this will take several years to be processed and there is no guarantee of success, and therefore must be discounted as a possible solution to the safe crossing of the A614. Horse riders can access NCN 645 from BW19 once they have crossed the A614. This will increase the likelihood of equestrians having to cross the A614 at grade.	See above (response to 28)
31	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	A new bridleway dedication at the eastern end of Mickledale Lane linking Bilsthorpe to the Southwell Trail (also a bridleway) is a result of development in the area, and will provide a crucial link through new development increasing the potential equestrian traffic from further afield.	See above (response to 28)
32	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Road Safety	A Road Safety Audit will be required for Option 2 and Via Road Safety Team have identified the need to consider the following matters: - Improvements to access the private dwellings close to Mickledale Lane (perhaps these can be served from the side road rather than the A614) - The small roundabout will need provision for pedestrians where there is an existing footway - The existing safety camera installation will need to be revised to suit this new layout. This may force a full upgrade of the local equipment to the currently available products, as it forms part of the average speed enforcement system on the route. - Mickledale Lane should be clearly and fully closed to motor traffic at the A614, but please ensure that provision for non-motorised road users is retained (pedestrians, cycles, possibly horses, too, to access the onward route to the west).	The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer. In relation to: Point 1 - a change to the access given to the four properties was consulted upon during the development of Option 1 (traffic signals). The residents were completely against this option and wanted to maintain access to the front of their properties at the A614. Point 2 - NMU provision will be maintained on the north side of Mickledale Lane and will continue towards the A614 within the section which will be closed to traffic. Point 3 – conversations are on-going with Jenoptik about relocation of this asset. Point 4 – see Point 2. In addition, vehicular access will be prevented through the installation of a gate. Some vehicular access may be required due to the presence of stats in the Mickledale Lane carriageway.
33	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	Via Rights of Way identify the following matters that need to be considered: - The safe crossing of the A614 taking account of the expected increase in use due to the informal link between BW19 and NCN 645 having been closed. - As the existing Mickledale Lane junction with the A614 would be closed appropriate access/gaps(1.5m)/corral would need to be provided for equestrian users. The provision of a Pegasus crossing should be considered. - How equestrian users would navigate the new smaller roundabout on Mickledale Lane. Moving the footway/cycle way to the north side of Mickledale Lane would avoid the need to cross the new link road. - The provision of good visibility for equestrians so as to be able to make sound decisions to cross the highway.	The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer. In relation to: Point 1 - a change to the access given to the four properties was consulted upon during the development of Option 1 (traffic signals). The residents were completely against this option and wanted to maintain access to the front of their properties at the A614. Point 2 - NMU provision will be maintained on the north side of Mickledale Lane and will continue towards the A614 within the section which will be closed to traffic. Point 3 – conversations are on-going with Jenoptik about relocation of this asset. Point 4 – see Point 2. In addition, vehicular access will be prevented through the installation of a gate. Some vehicular access may be required due to the presence of stats in the Mickledale Lane carriageway. See above (response to 28). The central refuge on the A614 will remain and is wide enough to safely accommodate cyclists but not equestrians. Mickledale Lane will be closed off to vehicles and will become a cul-de-sac accessed from the east at the mini-roundabout junction with the new link road. This means that an NMU link for equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians travelling east-west towards the BW5, PRoW at Inkersall Lane and beyond, can be maintained as a preferred route encouraging NMUs to cross the A614 at a location with the least amount of potential conflict using existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing provision which incorporates central refuges. It is anticipated that the new roundabout will generate gaps in platoons of traffic and reduced vehicular speeds which will aid east-west crossing movements. NMU provision will be maintained on the north side of Mickledale Lane and will continue towards the A614 within the section which will be closed to traffic. Visibility at the existing A614 junction with Mickledale Lane will be unaltered.
34	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Biodiversity	With reference to the Sherwood ppSPA (Paragraph 9.6.5) in-line with the 'risk-based approach' set out in Natural England's Advice Note (March 2014), a consideration of potential impacts on the ppSPA should be undertaken as part of the HRA assessment (required due to proximity to the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC).	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken (see Appendix 4-4 in Volume 3) which includes consideration for the Sherwood Area ppSPA and the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC. .
35	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Biodiversity	With reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, the creation of habitat should be delivered as far as possible at each of the individual junctions comprising the overall combined scheme through the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes. Reference should be made to the species in the relevant Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment.	The design has sought to maximise habitat creation at each Scheme location as noted in the BNG Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021a) located in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3. The proposed landscape designs are specific to the character of the location, including for example, meadow grassland and species rich hedgerows at Mickledale Lane Junction.
36	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Heritage	NCC Historic Buildings comments that the conservation area is not directly affected and where historic buildings fall within the influence of the scheme it is their setting that requires examination. Harm to designated heritage assets (including their settings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at the local district council should take place before designs are fully developed, providing an opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these.	The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volumes 1B of the ES. Consultation has been undertaken with the NCC County Archaeologist and NCC's Senior Practitioner for Historic Buildings prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
37	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Water	The Environment Agency draws attention to matters to be considered in the Flood Risk Assessment. A surface water drainage strategy will also need to be submitted.	A response to the Environment Agency's comments is provided within this table. A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy.
38	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Mickledale Lane Junction	Water	Risks to Source Protection Zone 1 and associated groundwater abstraction need to be fully considered. Particular attention is drawn to the need for the drainage design to take account of the highly sensitive nature of groundwater beneath the site. A controlled waters risk assessment will be required.	Risks to the SPZ and groundwater have been considered in Volume 1B Chapter 9: Geology and Soils. A preliminary risk assessment for controlled waters has been undertaken based on the preliminary conceptual model within Appendix 9-1 in Volume 3B. A controlled waters risk assessment would be undertaken in advance of construction work.
39	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Lowdham Roundabout	EIA	The ES should include a detailed description (2.3.21-2.3.23 and 8.3.92-8.3.123) of the site to provide context to the Lowdham roundabout project.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1C Chapter 2: The Scheme.
40	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Lowdham Roundabout	Road Safety	Assessment of the risk of an increase in collisions, including non-car road users and those crossing the junction, and the need for mitigation should be considered. The identified issue of conflict between vehicles and cyclists should be studied.	The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer. It should be noted that a controlled crossing facility will be provided at the north arm of the roundabout, to maintain the link between the existing off-carriageway facilities. Footway and uncontrolled crossing points will be provided around the south side of the junction to maintain the link between the four properties on Nottingham Road and village amenities.
41	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Lowdham Roundabout	Rights of Way	The opportunity to provide connectivity for non-motorised user routes to a multi-user crossing and provision of a suitable footpath network should be considered.	See above (response to 40)
42	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	Ecology - The response received from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust has highlighted the need for a methodology for how impacts of changes to noise, light and disturbance are to be assessed. The need for bat surveys is identified in order to be able to assess the predicted noise changes on bat foraging activity. I have forwarded the response from NWT to NCC Ecology and will forward any response received. Appropriate species surveys will need to be undertaken (Table 9-10).	The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volume 1C. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volume 2C). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volume 1C.
43	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Lowdham Roundabout	Water	Flood Risk - The Environment Agency draws attention to matters to be considered in the Flood Risk Assessment.	A response to the Environment Agency's comments is provided within this table. A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy.
44	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	EIA	The ES should include a detailed description (2.3.24-2.3.27 and 8.3.124-8.3.154) of the site to provide context to the Kirk Hill junction project. A brideway (East Bridgford BW28) runs parallel on the northern side of the A6097 crossing Kirk Hill with public footpath East Bridgford FP27 joining at the Kirk Hill junction and public footpath Shefford FP9 joining the southern side of the A6097 to the north-west of the junction.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1D Chapter 2: The Scheme.
45	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Road Safety	Highways - Although a consultation response has not been received from the NCC Highways Officer dealing with development proposals in Rushcliffe Borough, with regard to consistency across the county and relationship between the various schemes along the A614/A6097 corridor I would expect there to be a common approach.	Noted.
46	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Road Safety	Via Road Safety Team has previously carried out a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the proposal which makes recommendations to reduce the chance of identified collision scenarios.	A second RSA 1 was undertaken on the scheme which included the Pegasus crossing. I am not sure whether the recommendations made have been responded to formally. The RSA raised issues relating to the location of the stop line on Kirk Hill which cannot be moved due to swept path analysis showing potential conflicts between waiting and turning vehicles; conspicuity of traffic signals which will be addressed with additional signal heads as opposed to the recommended double height poles (these are a maintenance issue and are avoided where possible); overtaking through the junction, which should be eliminated through the implementation of additional splitter islands (to accommodate the additional signal heads); request to include a controlled crossing at Kirk Hill which cannot be included but the provision of the brideway along Kirk Hill could encourage an increase of NMUs using the new facility and linking in to the BW crossing further north west on Kirk Hill itself.
47	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Road Safety	The proposed scheme will increase the throughput of the junction in terms of motor vehicle capacity. This is likely to increase the number of journeys made using motor vehicles, in the immediate local area as well as in the wider region. This will cause a consequent increased risk of collisions, not only at this junction but at all points on those additional journeys.	The route is largely subject to a 50 mph speed limit, with 40 mph through Gunthorpe west of Kirk Hill Junction and is enforced through the use of a time over distance speed camera system. The Kirk Hill Junction is currently on a derestricted section of the A6097; the Scheme proposals include a reduction in the posted speed limit through the junction. Traffic modelling work has showed that level of redistribution is expected to be small. See above (response to 46). NMUs (equestrians) are catered for. And the brideway can of course be used by any type of NMU. The provision of the brideway along Kirk Hill closes what was previously a gap in provision. The brideway may not be on the most direct route but the route it takes provides segregation from live traffic for all NMUs, it is significantly wider than the current provision for pedestrians along Kirk Hill (it will be 5m wide) and the point at which the brideway crosses Kirk Hill is away from the junction, at what is considered to be the most appropriate location (visibility splays will be provided in line with standards). It is acknowledged that the design does not include any improvements for cyclists or pedestrians to aid their negotiation of the junction; however it is noteworthy that there were none in the original design. There are no footpath routes to link into on the south side of the junction therefore provision of a facility could mean that pedestrians find themselves stranded walking on uneven ground or in the live carriageway. There is a footpath that crosses the A6097 to the northwest of the junction. This is at a point where the carriageway remains at its current width therefore the situation has not worsened at all.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
48	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Road Safety	The provision of additional traffic lanes is likely to increase conflicts between vehicles by promoting overtaking (which requires merging of the traffic streams downstream of the junction) and resulting in increased speeds. This increases the risk of collisions and injury through and beyond the junction. The proposal as it stands offers no improvement that might benefit non-motorized road users; it is therefore recommended that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders are considered, noting the rights of way that are present locally.	East Bridgford Bridleway No. 28 will be diverted around the north side of Kirk Hill, crossing at the bend and linking through to the cut-through path which is currently used as an unofficial diversion route. A new 5m-wide bridleway will be constructed adjacent to Kirk Hill (road) with an uncontrolled Bridleway crossing point to link existing bridlepath running between the A6097 and Kirk Hill. It is anticipated that the improved facility will encourage greater NMU use, as it will be more attractive option and crosses Kirk Hill at a point that is safer i.e. away from the junction. Currently, FP 27 does not appear to link into any other registered PRow (from definitive mapping). The provision of the diversion for of BW 28 along Kirk Hill will provide an enhanced facility crossing Kirk Hill at a point that affords good intervisibility between those crossing and vehicles on Kirk Hill, and links, via a cut-through back into the existing BW 28. This cut-through is neither recorded as a public right of way nor adopted highway but is accepted by the public as an alternative route to the obstructed definitive line of East BW28. NMUs can use this route to continue across the A6097 to Shelford FP9 on the south side of the road. A new Pegasus crossing will be provided 100 m east of the junction to facilitate the safe movement of equestrians across the A6097. This crossing will link into the public bridleway on the northern side and a new path with fencing will be created on the southern verge of the A6097 to link the route to East Bridgford Road.
49	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Rights of Way	Via Rights of Way identify that East Bridgford Bridleway 28 crosses Kirk Hill and will be impacted by the proposed junction improvement. East Bridgford Footpath 27 (corner of Kirk Hill and A6097 junction) would be impacted by any junction widening at this point. Neither right of way has been recognised in the proposal and they are both well used and important links in the minor highway network. There is also local interest in the improvement of the bridleway, especially a safe equestrian crossing to East Bridgford Road and on to Newton which needs to be considered in the application. Currently there are informal equestrian crossings utilising knowledge of the phasing of the traffic lights.	East Bridgford Bridleway No. 28 will be diverted around the north side of Kirk Hill, crossing at the bend and linking through to the cut-through path which is currently used as an unofficial diversion route. A new 5m Bridleway will be constructed adjacent to Kirk Hill (road) with an uncontrolled Bridleway crossing point to link existing bridlepath running between the A6097 and Kirk Hill. It is anticipated that the improved facility will encourage greater NMU use, as it will be more attractive option and crosses Kirk Hill at a point that is safer i.e. away from the junction. Currently, FP 27 does not appear to link into any other registered PRow (from definitive mapping). The provision of the diversion for of BW 28 along Kirk Hill will provide an enhanced facility crossing Kirk Hill at a point that affords good intervisibility between those crossing and vehicles on Kirk Hill, and links, via a cut-through back into the existing BW 28. This cut-through is neither recorded as a public right of way nor adopted highway but is accepted by the public as an alternative route to the obstructed definitive line of East BW28. NMUs can use this route to continue across the A6097 to Shelford FP9 on the south side of the road.
50	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Rights of Way	The time and frequency of equestrian crossings should be recorded and consideration given to whether these can be safely accommodated through a system of rider alert and the phasing of light changes or the need for a more formalised crossing of the A6097 in the highway design.	NMU surveys taken showed a low number of equestrian users at the junction (one equestrian user was noted as crossing from Kirk Hill to East Bridgford Rd) during the survey period. However, feedback from local users highlighted a local toll ride arrangement is in place for equestrians in the area. Riders can pay an annual fee to access a network of routes over private land. One of the entrances to this network is located on the north-west side of East Bridgford Road, very close to its junction with Kirk Hill. Users of this toll ride network account for many of the equestrian movements around the Kirk Hill junction.
51	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Rights of Way	British Horse Society seeks assurances in relation to the protection and safety of bridleways in the vicinity of the junction and the opportunity to improve the connectivity of the off-road network should be considered.	See above (response to 49, 50)
52	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Biodiversity	Ecology - The creation of habitat should be delivered at each location, as far as possible, with consideration given, for example, to the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes.	The design has sought to maximise habitat creation at each Scheme location as noted in the BNG Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021a) located in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3. The proposed landscape designs are specific to the character of the location, including for example, meadow grassland and species rich hedgerows with trees at Kirk Hill Junction.
53	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Biodiversity	The Kirk Hill Junction lies outside the 5km buffer zone for the ppSPA for woodlark and nightjar and as such does not need to be considered except as part of an in-combination assessment.	Noted. Impacts of the Project on the ppSPA have been considered within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3). An in-combination assessment has been undertaken, no combined impacts to nightjar and woodlark are anticipated.
54	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Cumulative Effects	There are several residential properties in close proximity to the proposed junction improvement works and the submission should clearly consider the potential impact on amenity at both the construction and operational stage. The proposed consideration of impact on properties is proposed to be considered within the relevant technical assessments rather than as a stand-alone chapter and is considered to be an appropriate approach in this instance.	The assessments reported within Volume 1D Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects and Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration, consider both the construction and operational phase of the Scheme. An in-combination assessment is provided within Volume 1 Chapter 13.
55	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Heritage	The scheme extends into the designated conservation area of East Bridgford village. The impacts on this designated heritage asset will be considerable and have potential to cause unacceptable levels of harm. The NPPF is clear in setting out that opportunities to enhance, preserve and conserve designated heritage assets with a number of policies set out in Section 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.	The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volumes 1D of the ES.
56	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Heritage	The conservation area contains a cluster of designated listed buildings which are also shown on the designations plan, but are not identified on the key. It is important to recognise that these designated heritage assets each have a 'setting' that contributes to their significance, and could be impacted and potentially harmed by the proposals. There are several listed buildings within view of the junction and as such these will require careful consideration and response within the scheme submission. These heritage assets should be set as receptors in the LVIA to ensure that the evidence is suitable. Noise receptors should be treated similarly. Rushcliffe Borough Council identify the importance of mature landscaping including trees and landscaping of the entrance to the village of East Bridgford and its Conservation Area which should be clearly acknowledged and considered in the preparation of the application submission.	The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage and Landscape and Visual assessments within Volume 1D of the ES.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
57	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Heritage	Harm to designated heritage assets (including their settings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution should be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at Rushcliffe Borough Council should take place before designs are fully developed to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these.	The impact to designated assets, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1D of the ES, during both construction and operation of the scheme. This includes from light and noise changes. Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.
58	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Kirk Hill Junction	Flood Risk	Flood Risk - A Flood Risk Assessment and surface water drainage strategy will be required.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.
59	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	EIA	The Environmental Statement should include a detailed description (2.3.17-2.3.20) of the site to provide context to the Warren Hill gyratory project. 2.3.20 acknowledges the presence of a Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) to the north of the junction and the statement should include consideration of potential impacts and safety of users entering and leaving public right of way.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Project. Consideration for the rights of way was included in the Scoping Report. Appendix 4-7 in Volume 3 confirms that no rights of way will be affected outside of the highway boundary.
60	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	The number/frequency of northbound vehicles on the A614 turning to return southbound at the northern end of the gyratory should be quantified along with details of how that manoeuvre is to be undertaken following the closure of the link by bollards, and any safety implication arising.	The banned movement at this junction has been assessed and is based on traffic data which showed that the demand for the right turn from the A614 north to the A6097 south is extremely limited. In all of the modelled periods there are no vehicles making this turn. This data is available for review at request. The proposed design is considered to achieve the right balance when considering the lack of demand for the turn versus the proposed merge arrangement which is considered to simplify and normalise the merge movement, reducing confusion and uncertainty, which in turn reduces the safety risk. To enhance this, and support the banned right turn, a comprehensive review has been undertaken of the existing signing which ensures that appropriate alternative routes are well signposted, at the right locations, well in advance of the junction, on all approaches. The banned movement will be supported by a TRO which will be signed in accordance with design standards (regulatory signing). The proposals will be developed in detail and will be subject to a Stage 2 RSA.
61	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	Via Road Safety has undertaken a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and recommendations to reduce the chance of collision scenarios should be considered and incorporated, along with assessment of any changes arising.	We will of course follow up on the response to the RSA 1 and the subsequent conversation the design team has had with Safer Highways during detailed design. The Scheme will be subject to a Stage 2 RSA during the detailed design stage.
62	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Rights of Way	Via Rights of Way draw attention to Oxtou BOAT 11 along Rob Lane immediately to the north of the proposed works. Continued safe access and visibility for users as a consequence of the proposed works should be considered.	It is unlikely that any diversions or suspension of this route would be required for this Scheme. No works are proposed to this route. Consideration for safety during the works would be considered during the planning of any construction traffic management.
63	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Rights of Way	British Horse Society has identified an opportunity to extend the public right of way network west from Oxtou BOAT 11 which should be considered and would need to include safe crossing of the A614.	This is currently outside the scope of this Scheme, but the comments are noted should the opportunity to provide betterment become available at a later date.
64	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Biodiversity	Natural England has provided advice on the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and without wishing to repeat it at length in this letter is included as Annex A to the attached consultation response.	Table 1-2 within Volume 1 of the ES signposts the reader to where within the ES these items can be found.
65	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Biodiversity	NCC Ecology has advised that given that the site lies within the 5km buffer zone of the ppSPA the potential impact of the Warren Hill gyratory works should be scoped in for the purpose of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Although the proposed works at his junction are minimal, this approach will demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been applied.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken, considering the Schemes at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and White Post Roundabout. See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3. This includes consideration for the ppSPA.
66	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Ecology	With reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, the creation of habitat should be delivered as far as possible at each of the individual junctions comprising the overall combined scheme through the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes. Reference should be made to the species in the relevant Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment.	There are no landscape proposals for the Warren Hill Junction Scheme. The biodiversity net gain approach is proposed to be delivered at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Kirk Hill Junction and Lowdham Roundabout.
67	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Ecology	Attention is drawn to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) comment on Bio-diversity Net Gain, funding and management which should be addressed in the overall submission.	There are no landscape proposals for the Warren Hill Junction Scheme. The biodiversity net gain approach is proposed to be delivered at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Kirk Hill Junction and Lowdham Roundabout.
68	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Biodiversity	Noise change impacts on sensitive species (roosting and foraging bats and nesting birds) will need to be assessed depending on the outcome of surveys.	There are not expected to be any changes to the operational noise environment at this location. Temporary minor changes in construction noise would be possible, however due to the very minor extent of works required, this is unlikely to be significant.
69	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Climate	As part of the greenhouse gas impact assessment consideration should be given to the impact of emissions arising from increased traffic growth and potential to ease congestion (15.1). The need for accurate modelling of greenhouse gas emissions identified by NWT should be noted.	As noted within the Scoping Report, traffic composition (% heavy goods vehicles) and traffic flows are expected to remain largely comparable with the Project. This is also noted within the Transport Assessment which accompanies the planning application. Traffic speeds do increase around some of the junctions, however, this has not triggered the criteria within DMRB LA 114 Climate of an increase greater than 20 km/hr. Therefore operational greenhouse gases have remained scoped out of the assessment. An assessment of construction greenhouse gases has been undertaken for Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout and Kirk Hill Junction as can be found summarised within Chapter 12: Climate in Volume 1 of the ES. The detail of the methodology used can be found within ES Volumes 1A to 1D.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
70	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Heritage	The setting of heritage assets, impacts and mitigation will need careful consideration. Particular regard should be given to the recommendations of Historic England. NCC Historic Buildings comments that The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies two non-designated heritage assets affected as they fall within the influence of the scheme. Impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage assets will need to be considered.	The scope of work required at Warren Hill Junction is largely maintenance and is unlikely to detract from the character of the setting of any heritage assets.
71	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	Warren Hill Junction	Flood Risk	A Flood Risk Assessment and surface water drainage strategy will be required. The Environment Agency has identified that the site overlies the Chester Sandstone Formation which is classified as a Principal aquifer, and is within Source Protection Zone 3. Potential impacts on groundwater from the proposed site drainage will need to be considered.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3. There is no proposed amendment to the site drainage, and no overall increase in impermeable area; therefore a separate assessment of the risk to groundwater has not been included in the ES.
72	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	EIA	The Environmental Statement should include a detailed description (2.3.13-2.3.16) of the site to provide context to the White Post roundabout project. 2.3.16 acknowledges the presence of public footpath Farnsfield FP19 to the south of the junction and the statement should include consideration of potential impacts and safety of users as a consequence of the proposed improvement works.	A detailed description is provided within Volume 1 Chapter 2: The Project. Consideration for the rights of way was included in the Scoping Report. Appendix 4-6 in Volume 3 confirms that no rights of way will be affected outside of the highway boundary.
73	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Road Safety	Via Road Safety has commented that the proposed high friction surfacing should be of benefit to the safety of motor traffic since it will afford increased resistance to skidding, especially in wet or icy conditions. A colour differential on the immediate approaches to the roundabout (switch from grey to buff, perhaps) would provide drivers with a visual alert of the roundabout hazard ahead.	Noted. The colour will be defined during detailed design.
74	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Rights of Way	British Horse Society has commented that the bridleway network is not significantly impacted by the proposed works.	Noted.
75	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Biodiversity	NCC Ecology has advised that given that the site lies within the 5km buffer zone of the ppSPA the potential impact of the White Post roundabout works should be scoped in for the purpose of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Although the proposed works at his junction are minimal, this approach will demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been applied.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken, considering the Schemes at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and White Post Roundabout. See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3. This includes consideration for the ppSPA.
76	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Ecology	Although the NCC Ecology response makes reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, the proposed works at this junction would be within existing highway limits. Attention is drawn to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) comment on Biodiversity Net Gain, funding and management which should be addressed in the overall submission. While the creation of habitat should be delivered as far as possible at each of the individual junctions comprising the overall combined scheme, should mitigation for the wider scheme be proposed at this junction consideration should be given to the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes. Reference should be made to the species in the relevant Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment.	There are no landscape proposals for the White Post Roundabout Scheme. The biodiversity net gain approach is proposed to be delivered at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Kirk Hill Junction and Lowdham Roundabout.
77	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Biodiversity	In terms of wider impacts of the combined schemes noise change impacts on sensitive species (roosting and foraging bats and nesting birds) will need to be assessed depending on the outcome of surveys. It is not expected that works at the White Post roundabout will give rise to ecological impact but should be at least considered in the submission.	There are not expected to be any changes to the operational noise environment at this location. Temporary minor changes in construction noise would be possible, however due to the very minor extent of works required, this is unlikely to be significant.
78	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Climate	As part of the greenhouse gas impact assessment consideration should be given to the impact of emissions arising from increased traffic growth and potential to ease congestion (15.1). The need for accurate modelling of greenhouse gas emissions identified by NWT should be noted.	As noted within the Scoping Report, traffic composition (% heavy goods vehicles) and traffic flows are expected to remain largely comparable with the Project. This is also noted within the Transport Assessment which accompanies the planning application. Traffic speeds do increase around some of the junctions, however, this has not triggered the criteria within DMRB LA 114 Climate of an increase greater than 20 km/hr. Therefore operational greenhouse gases have remained scoped out of the assessment. An assessment of construction greenhouse gases has been undertaken for Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Lowdham Roundabout and Kirk Hill Junction as can be found summarised within Chapter 12: Climate in Volume 1 of the ES. The detail of the methodology used can be found within ES Volumes 1A to 1D.
79	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Heritage	The setting of heritage assets, impacts and mitigation will need careful consideration. Particular regard should be given to the recommendations of Historic England. NCC Historic Buildings comments that The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies two non-designated heritage assets affected by the scheme. The immediate setting of White Post Farm will be impacted and careful consideration will need to be given to ensure that an unacceptable level of harm does not arise.	The scope of work required at White Post Roundabout is largely maintenance and is unlikely to detract from the character of the setting of any heritage assets. The repositioning of the existing lighting (required for safety reasons) will be considered at detailed design and will maintain sensitivity around these assets.
80	Nottinghamshire County Council - Scoping Opinion	White Post Roundabout	Flood Risk	A Flood Risk Assessment and surface water drainage strategy will be required. The Environment Agency has identified that the site overlies the Chester Sandstone Formation which is classified as a Principal aquifer, and is within Source Protection Zone 3. Potential impacts on groundwater from the proposed site drainage will need to be considered.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3. There is no proposed amendment to the site drainage, and no overall increase in impermeable area; therefore a separate assessment of the risk to groundwater has not been included in the ES.
81	VIA Safer Highways	All Schemes	Road Safety	Previously I produced the attached commentary on road accidents which I updated in 2020; that might be useful to you, but presumably has already been considered by the project team. Fundamentally, all of the current proposals are aimed at increasing capacity for motor vehicle traffic, which will have an adverse effect on road casualties in the County (simply because more vehicle movements means more risk of crashing, not only at those locations but over their entire journeys).	The safe operation of the route is a key objective of the Project. The Transport Assessment includes an assessment of the history of collisions at each junction. Also, see above (response to 6)
82	VIA Safer Highways	All Schemes	Road Safety	With the exception of the Lowdham Roundabout, which should be including measures to address an accident problem involving pedal cycles, there isn't much in the proposals that will have a positive effect on road safety.	See above (response to 6)

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
83	VIA Safer Highways	All Schemes	Road Safety	NCC policy requires that further Road Safety Audits are carried out prior to and after construction, and Via East Midlands should be best-placed to undertake these at the appropriate times.	The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process. Preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer.
84	VIA Safer Highways	All Schemes	Road Safety	This scheme will increase the throughput of the junction in terms of motor vehicle capacity. This is likely to increase the number of journeys made using motor vehicles, in the immediate local area as well as in the wider region. This will cause a consequent increased risk of collisions, not only at this junction but at all points on those additional journeys.	A Transport Assessment has been prepared and provided within the planning application. This notes the limited redistribution of vehicles anticipated as a result of the Project.
85	VIA Safer Highways	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	Ollerton roundabout is perhaps the most concerning for us; this is a junction which has had a low level of accidents for many years, and making it more complex with greater capacity for more and faster motor vehicles will be detrimental to that good record.	See above (response to 15)
86	VIA Safer Highways	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	The latest design introduces further conflicts by marking some of the exits as twin lanes which will further promote drivers to negotiate the roundabout in pairs. This layout is also likely to increase downstream speeds and overtaking as a result of having those twin lanes demarked at the exits.	<p>This is a capacity driven improvement scheme and the need for two lanes at the roundabout exits is as a result of modelling analysis using forecast traffic growth. The inclusion of two exit lanes (merge in turn) not an unusual situation and this arrangement has been designed in line with current relevant design standards. The Scheme includes a reduction in the current speed limit and will be subject to 40 mph posted speed limit to encourage lower vehicular speeds and influence driver behaviour enabling them to negotiate the junction safely.</p> <p>The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 and will be subject to audits at stage 2 (detailed design) and Stage 3 (substantial completion). Throughout scheme design development, input has been sought on various design proposals within each Scheme from Via Safer Highways. NCC Police have also been consulted on all proposals related to speed limit changes.</p>
87	VIA Safer Highways	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	From the broader Road Safety point of view, this scheme will undoubtedly lead to an increase in collisions and injuries compared with the current layout because of all the additional conflicts introduced with the extra lanes. Roundabouts will more than 4 entries have been problematic at almost all locations in Nottinghamshire; Ollerton has always been a lot safer because the compact layout restricts the number of vehicles that can negotiate it at the same time. The new layout could also lead to additional problems with 2-wheeled vehicles (powered and non-powered) which can often become "lost" amongst larger vehicles, as well as being more vulnerable in the event of collisions.	See above (response to 15, 86)
88	VIA Safer Highways	Ollerton Roundabout	Road Safety	<p>The signal-controlled crossings, where proposed, will be very valuable to non-motorized road users; these need to be made attractive to users with joined-up high-quality infrastructure (walking and cycling routes). It is recommended that this supporting infrastructure is given attention during detailed design. Obviously these measures could be introduced regardless of the proposed improvements for motor traffic capacity at the junction.</p> <p>However, there are additional footways proposed all around this junction where pedestrians will be required to cross three of the roads at the splitter islands without the aid of formal control which is likely to be very difficult at certain times and will create new conflicts. It is therefore questionable as to why these new footway links are being proposed. If they are necessary, then further consideration of control crossing facilities is recommended.</p>	See above (response to 15 and 17)
89	VIA Safer Highways	Mickledale Lane Junction	Road Safety	<p>Option 1</p> <p>The drawing in the consultation pack for Option 1 is a very similar design as that which has already been presented for Road Safety Audit Stage 1. I've attached our report for that which makes some recommendations to reduce the chance of the collision scenarios that were identified. NCC policy requires that further Road Safety Audits are carried out prior to and after construction, and Via East Midlands should be best-placed to undertake these at the appropriate times. From the broader Road Safety point of view, this scheme has the potential to attract additional motor traffic to use Mickledale Lane and the wider routes available through Bilsthorpe. An increase in motor traffic in Bilsthorpe in particular is likely to increase the risk of collisions and injuries, not just at the junction but at all points on those additional journeys. Whilst included in our RSA report, I'll reiterate that the draft design doesn't indicate any provision for non-motorized road users. It is strongly recommended that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and horse-riders are considered. It would seem sensible to incorporate formal crossing points, or at least to construct a layout that could accommodate them in the future. There are rights of way accessed at the side of the café, as well as the café itself, which are very likely to attract local people to cross the A614 here.</p>	Option 1 has been discounted as noted in Volume 1 Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
90	VIA Safer Highways	Mickledale Lane Junction	Road Safety	<p>Option 2</p> <p>We have not undertaken Road Safety Audit on this proposal to date. NCC policy requires that Road Safety Audits are carried out prior to and after construction, and Via East Midlands should be best-placed to undertake these at the appropriate times. From an initial study of the documents presented now, we would recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements to access the private dwellings close to Mickledale Lane (perhaps these can be served from the side road rather than the A614) - The small roundabout will need provision for pedestrians where there is an existing footway - The existing safety camera installation will need to be revised to suit this new layout. This may force a full upgrade of the local equipment to the currently available products, as it forms part of the average speed enforcement system on the route. - Mickledale Lane should be clearly and fully closed to motor traffic at the A614, but please ensure that provision for non-motorised road users is retained (pedestrians, cycles, possibly horses, too, to access the onward route to west) 	See above (response to 32)
91	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>The drawing in the consultation pack is the same design as has already been presented for Road Safety Audit Stage 1. I've attached our report for that which makes some recommendations to reduce the chance of the collision scenarios that were identified. Since then, I've had a discussion with the design team about how to resolve Problem 3.3 with road markings, but note that these haven't yet been amended in the design (we are still waiting for notification regarding the resolutions to this and the other issues raised in our report).</p> <p>From the broader Road Safety point of view, I note that this proposal has the potential to make a positive contribution to road safety by reducing conflicts, overtaking, and speeds in the northbound direction through the junction. The issues raised in the attached will still need attention, though.</p>	<p>We will of course follow up on the response to the RSA 1 and the subsequent conversation the design team has had with Safer Highways during detailed design. The Scheme will be subject to a Stage 2 RSA during the detailed design stage.</p>
92	VIA Safer Highways	White Post Roundabout	Road Safety	<p>The proposed high friction surfacing should be of benefit to road safety of motor traffic since it will afford increased resistance to skidding, especially in wet or icy conditions because of the increased and positive texture. This helps during emergency braking and reduces the potential for nose-to-tail shunt collisions. These types of surface are proprietary, though, and do not have the long lifespan of traditional aggregates, and future maintenance will need to be allowed for to preserve the benefits over the medium and long-terms.</p> <p>It is recommended that an opportunity is taken to provide a colour differential on the immediate approaches to the roundabout (switch from grey to buff, perhaps) which could be done at minimal additional cost. This will provide drivers with a visual alert of the hazard ahead.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The colour of the surfacing will be determined in detailed design.</p>
93	VIA Safer Highways	Lowdham Roundabout	Road Safety	<p>Providing two marked lanes of traffic circulating all around the roundabout will increase conflicts between vehicles, with the resultant increased risk of collisions and injury at the junction. This could be particularly difficult for powered and non-powered 2-wheeled vehicles.</p>	<p>This is a capacity driven improvement scheme and the need for two lanes at the roundabout exits is as a result of modelling analysis using forecast traffic growth. The inclusion of two exit lanes (merge in turn) is not an unusual situation and this arrangement has been designed in line with current relevant design standards. The Scheme includes a reduction in the current speed limit and will be subject to 30 mph posted speed limit to encourage lower vehicular speeds and influence driver behaviour enabling them to negotiate the junction safely.</p> <p>The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 and will be subject to audits at stage 2 (detailed design) and Stage 3 (substantial completion). Throughout scheme design development, input has been sought on various design proposals within each Scheme from Via Safer Highways.</p>
94	VIA Safer Highways	Lowdham Roundabout	Road Safety	<p>The Toucan pedestrian crossing over the A6097 northern arm will be valuable to non-motorized road users, if it can be made attractive to users with some joined-up high-quality infrastructure. It is recommended that this supporting infrastructure is given attention during detailed design.</p> <p>However, there are currently also footways present all-around this junction, and this proposal offers little or no improvement for pedestrians on three of the arms. This is a residential area with private dwellings all around the junction, so further consideration could be given to improving the facilities for pedestrians all around the junction. It is very difficult to cross the A6097 on the south side, and even the A612 is a busy road to try to cross, which will be worse once widened to three lanes at the entry.</p>	<p>Improvements to the supporting infrastructure will be considered further during detailed design and where possible within the scheme extents improvement will be incorporated.</p> <p>The Schemes will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process; preliminary designs have been subject to RSA at Stage 1 with feedback provided to the RSA team by the designer.</p> <p>It should be noted that a controlled crossing facility will be provided at the north arm of the roundabout, to maintain the link between the existing off-carriageway facilities.</p> <p>Footway and uncontrolled crossing points will be provided around the south side of the junction to maintain the link between the four properties on Nottingham Rd and village amenities.</p> <p>In general, Local Transport Notes (LTN) 1/12 and 2/08, Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists and Cycle Infrastructure Design respectively, have been applied to design of facilities for NMUs across the Project as a whole. It is acknowledged that these two documents have been superseded by the recent publication of guidance for designing for cyclists, LTN 1/20. The principles within LTN 1/20 have not been applied for two key reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The existing character and constraints of the junctions within the Project, Ollerton and Lowdham in particular, limit the extents to which LTN 1/20 can be applied; and o Due to the large amount of advance design work which was carried out prior to its publication.
95	VIA Safer Highways	Kirk Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>Providing additional traffic lanes is likely to increase conflicts between vehicles by promoting overtaking (which requires merging of the traffic streams downstream of the junction) and resulting in increased speeds. This increases the risk of collisions and injury through and beyond the junction.</p> <p>This proposal as it stands offers no improvement that might benefit non-motorized road users; it is therefore recommended that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders are considered, noting the rights of way that are present locally.</p>	<p>Overtaking through the junction should be eliminated through the implementation of additional splitter islands (to accommodate the additional signal heads); in addition the speed limit through the junction will be reduced to 50pmh, to make it consistent with the majority of the rest of the route.</p> <p>See above (response to 46, 47)</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
96	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>Currently northbound driver on the A614 can access the A6097 (and the A46) via the signed route to the north of the gyratory. In this proposal this movement is not allowed. Consequently, drivers may choose to use the caravan car park to the north of the gyratory or Baulker Lane crossroads to U turn and access the A6097. Neither of the junctions could accommodate an HGV making such a manoeuvre easily. This could lead to shunt type accidents on a relatively high-speed road and subsequent driver/rider injury.</p> <p>Recommendation; assess the demand for this movement and provide a suitable alternative route for drivers which is appropriately signed well in advance of the gyratory.</p>	<p>The banned movement at this junction has been assessed and is based on traffic data which showed that the demand for the right turn from the A614 north to the A6097 south is extremely limited. In all of the modelled periods there are no vehicles making this turn. This data is available for review at request.</p> <p>The proposed design is considered to achieve the right balance when considering the lack of demand for the turn versus the proposed merge arrangement which is considered to simplify and normalise the merge movement, reducing confusion and uncertainty, which in turn reduces the safety risk. To enhance this, and support the banned right turn, a comprehensive review has been undertaken of the existing signing which ensures that appropriate alternative routes are well signposted, at the right locations, well in advance of the junction, on all approaches. The banned movement will be supported by a TRO which will be signed in accordance with design standards (regulatory signing).</p> <p>The proposals will be developed in detail and will be subject to a Stage 2 RSA.</p>
97	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>Now northbound drivers from the A6097 have to give way and gap seek before joining the A614 northbound stream. In this proposal the A6097 northbound stream have to merge with a faster A614 northbound stream over a relatively short distance. This is an unusual manoeuvre, as offside lane traffic is usually travelling faster and seeks to merge over a specifically designed length for the speed of road. More hesitant drivers will find this a difficult manoeuvre. Failure to merge could result in side swipe accidents, head on collisions or shunt type accidents with subsequent driver/rider injury.</p> <p>Recommendation; provide the merge length required for this speed of road and ensures all road markings are laid in a MMA material to ensure road markings are highly visible and do not suffer from early wear and become a maintenance liability. Reduce the vegetation on the gyratory so that following vehicles from the A6097 can see across the gyratory to merging vehicles ahead.</p>	<p>The merge is considered to be a more usual manoeuvre, similar to those used in other high speed, high flow situations, such as motorways, where vehicles travelling at elevated speeds merge in turn.</p> <p>Specification of materials will be developed and confirmed throughout the detailed design process and can include input from the Safer Highways team. Ultimately, in developing the proposals, Via will be designing for maintenance and will specify material that reflect this.</p> <p>There is a balance to be achieved between adequate forward visibility and too much visibility, the latter of which could result in higher vehicle speeds for those negotiating the junction thus increasing risk of collisions associated with inappropriate speed. The desired visibility splays will be achieved in line with design standards to ensure that adequate forward visibility is achieved through appropriate vegetation maintenance which can be agreed on site with input from relevant specialists including the Safer Highways Team.</p>
98	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>Presently, A614 northbound drivers can travel in two lanes until the DWL system north of the gyratory. Drivers may still use the hatched lane to overtake slower moving vehicles in the nearside lane. The slight crest on the A614 may mask a vehicle joining the A614 stream at the merge as this will now be over the crest. This could result in overtaking/side swipe accidents at high speed resulting in driver/rider injury.</p> <p>Recommendation; physically reduce the A614 northbound approach to one lane with hard kerbing to prevent overtaking.</p>	<p>The use of physical means of narrowing is a concern in regard to potential kerb strikes and associated collisions resulting. The balance here is considered to be the provision of hatched markings, with a view to monitoring the situation over a period post construction whereby any issues can be identified and mitigated as required should the concerns raised become reality. This will be discussed in partnership with the Safer Highways team throughout the development of detailed design.</p>
99	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>In order for northbound drivers from the A6097 to match the merge speeds on the A614, drivers may accelerate around the gyratory radius. In these proposals the radius of the bend has been tightened by the hatch markings. This could result in bend loss of control accidents and driver/rider injury.</p> <p>Assess the texture of the road surface on the bend, check SCRIM readings and improve surface texture if necessary.</p>	<p>Pavement design is undertaken during the detailed design stage and the appropriate Polished Stone Value (PSV) will be specified in accordance with the calculations, while also considering existing surfacing and future maintenance. The scheme will be subject to RSA and details of the proposed pavement construction will be included in the submitted package for consideration.</p>
100	VIA Safer Highways	Warren Hill Junction	Road Safety	<p>Northbound drivers from the A6097 do not need to Give Way to northbound vehicles on the A614 in these proposals. They now merge with a faster moving stream of vehicles. During the hours of darkness or in poor weather conditions this increases the risk of side swipe/shunt type accidents if lighting levels are not appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation; undertake a full lighting assessment to assess if lighting levels need improvement. Implement any recommendations made.</p>	<p>The design team will ensure that a review of existing lux levels will be undertaken in detailed design, to identify the need for any improvements. There is an opportunity to upgrade existing lanterns, which will be taken should that be identified as a planned future maintenance activity.</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
101	Cadent Gas	Ollerton Roundabout, Lowdham Roundabout	Utilities	<p>Due to the presence of Cadent and/or National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works.</p> <p>The apparatus that has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low or Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity). - Above ground gas sites and equipment <p>BEFORE carrying out any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note the presence of an Above Ground Installation (AGI) in proximity to your site. You must ensure that you have been contacted by Cadent and/or National Grid prior to undertaking any works within 10 m of this site. - Carefully read these requirements including the attached guidance documents and maps showing the location of apparatus. - Contact the landowner and ensure any proposed works in private land do not infringe Cadent and/or National Grid's legal rights (i.e. easements or wayleaves). If the works are in the road or footpath the relevant local authority should be contacted. - Ensure that all persons, including direct labour and contractors, working for you on or near Cadent and/or National Grid's apparatus follow the requirements of the HSE Guidance Notes HSG47 - 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services' and GS6 - 'Avoidance of danger from overhead electric power lines'. This guidance can be downloaded free of charge at http://www.hse.gov.uk - In line with the above guidance, verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, cables, services and other apparatus on site before any activities are undertaken. 	Noted.
102	Cadent Gas	White Post Roundabout	Utilities	<p>Due to the presence of Cadent and/or National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works.</p> <p>The apparatus that has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low or Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity). <p>BEFORE carrying out any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note the presence of an Above Ground Installation (AGI) in proximity to your site. You must ensure that you have been contacted by Cadent and/or National Grid prior to undertaking any works within 10 m of this site. - Carefully read these requirements including the attached guidance documents and maps showing the location of apparatus. - Contact the landowner and ensure any proposed works in private land do not infringe Cadent and/or National Grid's legal rights (i.e. easements or wayleaves). If the works are in the road or footpath the relevant local authority should be contacted. - Ensure that all persons, including direct labour and contractors, working for you on or near Cadent and/or National Grid's apparatus follow the requirements of the HSE Guidance Notes HSG47 - 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services' and GS6 - 'Avoidance of danger from overhead electric power lines'. This guidance can be downloaded free of charge at http://www.hse.gov.uk - In line with the above guidance, verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, cables, services and other apparatus on site before any activities are undertaken. 	Noted.
103	Newark and Sherwood District Council - Planning Development	All Schemes	EIA	I can advise that Newark & Sherwood District Council have no information they would wish to raise within the ES over and above that required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.	Noted.
104	Nottinghamshire County Council - Lead Local Flood Authority	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, White Post Roundabout, Kirk Hill Roundabout	Flood Risk	We advise that a Flood Risk Assessment and surface water drainage strategy are required as part of any Environmental Impact Assessment for this project.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.
105	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	In line with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we would expect the ES to contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets.	This is included in the Cultural Heritage assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D of the ES.
106	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	We are content that the proposed scoping in / out of historic environment affects across the junctions reflects their likelihood of significant impacts, i.e. that those where works are only proposed in carriageway are scoped out unless there are significant additional lighting / drainage measures likely to be associated.	Noted.
107	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	In addition to impacts upon designated heritage assets we would expect the ES to proportionately consider the potential impacts on non designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, since these can also be of national importance and make an important contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of an area and its sense of place. This information is available via the local authority Historic Environment Record (www.heritagegateway.org.uk) and relevant local authority staff.	Non-designated assets have been included within the assessment, and effects on these are reported within the Cultural Heritage assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D of the ES.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
108	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	We refer you to the detailed advice of the County Archaeologist as regards the archaeological impacts of the schemes scoped-in, noting the importance of attention to ancillary features such as balancing ponds / compounds / drainage works as well as carriageway construction itself.	Noted.
109	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	The assessment should also take account of the potential impact which associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. The assessment should also consider, where appropriate, the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits, and can also lead to subsidence of buildings and monuments.	Impacts from associated activities have been considered in the likely significant effects section of the Cultural Heritage assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D of the ES.
110	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	Where junctions interact with Conservation Areas and listed buildings you should have early conversations with District Conservation Officer to establish what aspects of the works and associated lighting schemes etc may affect the character of those assets. The setting effects of the detailing of lighting schemes upon the significance of designated heritage assets should also be considered. District Conservation Officers are best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities; how the proposal can be tailored to avoid and minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of heritage assets.	Likely significant effects have been considered to heritage assets within the Cultural Heritage assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D of the ES.
111	Historic England	All Schemes	Heritage	We refer you to Planning Good Practice Advice Note 3 Setting of Heritage Assets for a structured approach to the consideration of setting issues. It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this.	Noted.
112	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	Ollerton Roundabout	Heritage	<p>The scheme extends into the designated conservation area of Ollerton Village, this is correctly shown on the designations plan and referred to in the EIA scoping report. The impacts on this designated heritage asset will be considerable and have potential to cause unacceptable levels of harm. The NPPF is clear in setting out that opportunities to enhance, preserve and conserve designated heritage assets with a number of policies set out in section 16.</p> <p>The conservation area contains a cluster of designated listed buildings which are also shown on the designations plan, however, they are not identified on the key of this plan, although a correct list appears in the EIA scoping report text. It is important to recognise that these designated heritage assets each have a 'setting' that contributes to their significance and that could be impacted upon and potentially harmed by the proposals. Ollerton Hall is a grade II* listed building within view of the roundabout and as such this designated heritage asset will require careful consideration and response within the scheme submission. If this is not clearly demonstrated the EIA will not be adequate, this and other heritage assets should be set as receptors in the LVIA to ensure evidence is suitable. Noise receptors should be treated similarly.</p> <p>Harm to designated heritage assets (in this case the conservation area and individual listed buildings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at the local district council should take place before designs are fully developed. This is to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these.</p> <p>Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the EIA.</p>	<p>The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1A of the ES.</p> <p>Heritage assets are shown on Figure 6-1 within Volume 2A.</p> <p>Ollerton Hall has been considered within the LVIA reported in Chapter 7 in Volume 1A of the ES. Noise sensitive receptors are considered in Chapter 10 of Volume 1A. The operational noise changes are predicted to be negligible and not significant. The noise contour plans (Figures 10-2 and 10-3 show negligible changes to operational noise. Light spill during operation has also been considered within the assessment.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.</p>
113	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	Mickledale Lane Junction	Heritage	<p>The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies the listed buildings and conservation area within the study area and several non-designated heritage assets. The conservation area is not directly affected and in all cases where historic buildings fall within the influence of the scheme it is their setting that requires examination and I am content that the EIA scoping report identifies this correctly. Harm to designated heritage assets (including their settings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at the local district council should take place before designs are fully developed. This is to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these.</p> <p>Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the HIA.</p>	<p>The impact to the conservation area and listed buildings, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1B of the ES.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.</p>
114	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	Warren Hill Junction	Heritage	The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies two non-designated heritage assets affected as they fall within the influence of the scheme. It is their setting that requires examination and I am content that the EIA scoping report identifies this correctly. Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the HIA. I look forward to detailed consultation prior to the submission of the planning application.	Noted

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
115	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	White Post Roundabout	Heritage	<p>The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies two non-designated heritage assets affected as they fall within the influence of the scheme, one of which is White Post Farm. The scheme impacts on the immediate setting and requires careful consideration to ensure that unacceptable levels of harm is not caused.</p> <p>Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the HIA. I look forward to detailed consultation prior to the submission of the planning application.</p>	Noted
116	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	Lowdham Roundabout	Heritage	<p>The EIA Scoping report accurately identifies the listed buildings and conservation area within the study area and 'numerous' non-designated heritage assets. The conservation area is not directly affected and in all cases where historic buildings fall within the influence of the scheme it is their setting that requires examination and I am content that the EIA scoping report identifies this correctly.</p> <p>Lowdham War Memorial is the closest of all the assets and the backdrop and setting of this public monument includes the area of the junction. It will be imperative that the setting of this and the other HAs in the vicinity are carefully considered. Harm to designated heritage assets (including their settings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets.</p> <p>Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at the local district council should take place before designs are fully developed. This is to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these. Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the HIA. I look forward to detailed consultation prior to the submission of the planning application.</p>	<p>Noted. Impacts have been assessed in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1C of the ES.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.</p>
117	Nottinghamshire County Council - Archaeological and Building Conservation	Kirk Hill Junction	Heritage	<p>The scheme extends into the designated conservation area of East Bridgford village, this is correctly shown on the designations plan, and referred to in the text of the EIA Scoping Report. The impacts on this designated heritage asset will be considerable and have potential to cause unacceptable levels of harm. The NPPF is clear in setting out that opportunities to enhance, preserve and conserve designated heritage assets with a number of policies set out in section 16.</p> <p>The conservation area contains a cluster of designated listed buildings which are also shown on the designations plan, however, they are not identified on the key of this plan. It is important to recognise that these designated heritage assets each have a 'setting' that contributes to their significance and that could be impacted upon and potentially harmed by the proposals. There are several listed buildings within view of the junction and as such these will require careful consideration and response within the scheme submission. If this is not clearly demonstrated, then the EIA will not be adequate, these heritage assets should be set as receptors in the LVIA to ensure evidence is suitable. Noise receptors should be treated similarly.</p> <p>Harm to designated heritage assets (including their settings) is in some cases avoidable through carefully considered design. For instance, noise and light pollution can be considered at the design stage to ensure that they do not impact adversely on these heritage assets. Early consultation with the NCC building conservation section and conservation officers at the local district council should take place before designs are fully developed. This is to ensure that there is opportunity to avoid adverse impacts and, where possible, introduce suitable enhancements to the scheme that can demonstrably mitigate these. Section 7.7.6 of the EIA scoping report, identifies the correct Historic England Good Practice Advice notes and these must be reflected in the Cultural Heritage section of the HIA. I look forward to detailed consultation prior to the submission of the planning application.</p>	<p>The impact to designated assets, including their setting, is considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment within Volume 1D of the ES, during both construction and operation of the scheme. This includes from light and noise changes.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with NCC archaeology and historic buildings teams prior to submission of the application. This dialogue will continue during the detailed design stage.</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
118	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	EIA	<p>1. General Principles</p> <p>Schedule 4 of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, sets out the necessary information to assess impacts on the natural environment to be included in an ES, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A description of the development – including physical characteristics and the full land use requirements of the site during construction and operational phases. - Expected residues and emissions (water, air and soil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation, etc.) resulting from the operation of the proposed development. - An assessment of alternatives and clear reasoning as to why the preferred option has been chosen. - A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development, including, in particular, population, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. - A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment – this should cover direct effects but also any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects. Effects should relate to the existence of the development, the use of natural resources and the emissions from pollutants. This should also include a description of the forecasting methods to predict the likely effects on the environment. - A description of the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment. - A non-technical summary of the information. - An indication of any difficulties (technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered by the applicant in compiling the required information. It will be important for any assessment to consider the potential cumulative effects of this proposal, including all supporting infrastructure, with other similar proposals and a thorough assessment of the 'in combination' effects of the proposed development with any existing developments and current applications. A full consideration of the implications of the whole scheme should be included in the ES. All supporting infrastructure should be included within the assessment. 	Table 1-2 within Volume 1 of the ES signposts the reader to where within the ES these items can be found.
119	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2. Biodiversity and Geology</p> <p>2.1 Ecological Aspects of an ES</p> <p>Natural England advises that the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters. Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) have been developed by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and are available on their website. EclA is the process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating the potential impacts of defined actions on ecosystems or their components. EclA may be carried out as part of the EIA process or to support other forms of environmental assessment or appraisal. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out guidance in S.174-177 on how to take account of biodiversity interests in planning decisions and the framework that local authorities should provide to assist developers.</p>	The methodology aligns with both the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and the CIEEM guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA).
120	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.2 Internationally and Nationally Designated Sites</p> <p>The ES should thoroughly assess the potential for the proposal to affect designated sites. European sites (e.g. designated Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) fall within the scope of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In addition paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, listed or proposed Ramsar sites, and any site identified as being necessary to compensate for adverse impacts on classified, potential or possible SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites be treated in the same way as classified sites. Under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) an appropriate assessment needs to be undertaken in respect of any plan or project which is (a) likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) and (b) not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site. Should a Likely Significant Effect on a European/Internationally designated site be identified or be uncertain, the competent authority (in this case the Local Planning Authority) may need to prepare an Appropriate Assessment, in addition to consideration of impacts through the EIA process.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and sites of European or international importance (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites).</p> <p>The development site is in close proximity to the following designated nature conservation sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Birklands and Bilhaugh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Birklands West and Ollerton Corner SSSI - Further information on the SSSI and its special interest features can be found at www.magic.gov. The ES should include a full assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the development on the features of special interest within Click here to enter text. and should identify such mitigation measures as may be required in order to avoid, minimise or reduce any adverse significant effects. - European site conservation objectives are available on our internet site http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/649006889408921 	<p>The Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (see Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3) has considered the impact of European designated sites.</p> <p>The EIA has considered the impacts upon SSSIs within the study areas.</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
121	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.3 Regionally and Locally Important Sites</p> <p>The EIA will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. Local Sites are identified by the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or a local forum established for the purposes of identifying and selecting local sites. They are of county importance for wildlife or geodiversity. The ES should therefore include an assessment of the likely impacts on the wildlife and geodiversity interests of such sites. The assessment should include proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures. Contact the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or local sites body in this area for further information.</p>	<p>The assessment has considered impacts upon locally designated sites, including those designated for geodiversity. The Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre was contacted to obtain data to inform the assessment.</p>
122	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.4 Protected Species - Species protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information regarding the locations of species protected by law, but advises on the procedures and legislation relevant to such species. Records of protected species should be sought from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations, groups and individuals; and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area, to assist in the impact assessment.</p> <p>The conservation of species protected by law is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Government Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System. The area likely to be affected by the proposal should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year for relevant species and the survey results, impact assessments and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the ES.</p> <p>In order to provide this information there may be a requirement for a survey at a particular time of year. Surveys should always be carried out in optimal survey time periods and to current guidance by suitably qualified and where necessary, licensed, consultants. Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species which includes links to guidance on survey and mitigation.</p>	<p>The assessment has considered both the construction and operational phases of the Project on protected species.</p> <p>Records were sought from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre and local relevant groups as noted within Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist. The survey results, impact assessments and mitigation strategies are included within the ES. Surveys were carried out at optimal survey time periods as far as possible. Where this is a limitation, this is noted within the ES.</p>
123	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.5 Habitats and Species of Principal Importance</p> <p>The ES should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance' within the England Biodiversity List, published under the requirements of S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a general duty on all public authorities, including local planning authorities, to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Further information on this duty is available here https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-duty-public-authority-duty-to-have-regard-to-conserving-biodiversity. Government Circular 06/2005 states that Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species and habitats, 'are capable of being a material consideration...in the making of planning decisions'. Natural England therefore advises that survey, impact assessment and mitigation proposals for Habitats and Species of Principal Importance should be included in the ES. Consideration should also be given to those species and habitats included in the relevant Local BAP.</p> <p>Natural England advises that a habitat survey (equivalent to Phase 2) is carried out on the site, in order to identify any important habitats present. In addition, ornithological, botanical and invertebrate surveys should be carried out at appropriate times in the year, to establish whether any scarce or priority species are present. The ES should include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g. from previous surveys); - Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal; - The habitats and species present; - The status of these habitats and species (e.g. whether priority species or habitat); - The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species; - Full details of any mitigation or compensation that might be required. <p>The development should seek if possible to avoid adverse impact on sensitive areas for wildlife within the site, and if possible provide opportunities for overall wildlife gain. The record centre for the relevant Local Authorities should be able to provide the relevant information on the location and type of priority habitat for the area under consideration.</p>	<p>Species and habitats listed under that Habitats and Species of Principal Importance and those listed within the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan have been indicated and assessed as part of the ES.</p> <p>Records were sought from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist. The survey results, impact assessments and mitigation strategies are included within the ES.</p> <p>The development has avoided impacts on sensitive areas for wildlife, where possible. Where this has not been possible, opportunities for an overall improvement in habitat quality to support local species has been provided within the landscape design.</p>
124	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.6 Contacts for Local Records</p> <p>Natural England does not hold local information on local sites, local landscape character and local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species. We recommend that you seek further information from the appropriate bodies (which may include the local records centre, the local wildlife trust, local geoconservation group or other recording society and a local landscape characterisation document).</p>	<p>To inform the baseline assessment, data was obtained from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre.</p>
125	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Landscape	<p>3. Landscape and visual impacts</p> <p>Natural England would wish to see details of local landscape character areas mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography.</p>	<p>Local landscape character has been mapped to support the Landscape and Visual assessment within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects in Volume 1A. The Landscape and Visual impact assessment has considered visual effects and changes as a result of the Scheme.</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
126	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Heritage	Heritage Landscapes - You should consider whether there is land in the area affected by the development which qualifies for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest. An up-to-date list may be obtained at www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm .	Noted.
127	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	4. Access and Recreation Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.	The existing land and environmental constraints mean that there is no opportunity to include specific facilities for equestrian users at this location. These physical restrictions also impact on (limit) the width of other NMU provisions such as footways. While it is acknowledged that Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway 26 (BW26) intersects the roundabout from the west at the A6075, NMU survey returns did not identify any equestrian usage at the junction. The constraints of the built environment around this junction mean that incorporation of Pegasus crossings into the proposed junction improvements could not be achieved due to the design requirements associated with constructing such a facility (corral). Toucan crossings are proposed to be provided.
128	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails The EIA should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the adjacent/nearby Click here to enter text. National Trail. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.	The assessment reported in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects in Volume 1A considers rights of way as identified in Section 7.5. There are no National Trails, areas of Access land or Coastal access within the study area.
129	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Geology and Soils	5. Soil and Agricultural Land Quality Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society, for example as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. The applicant should consider the following issues as part of the ES: 1. The degree to which soils are going to be disturbed/harmed as part of this development and whether 'best and most versatile' agricultural land is involved. This may require a detailed survey if one is not already available. For further information on the availability of existing agricultural land classification (ALC) information see www.magic.gov.uk . Natural England Technical Information Note 049 - Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land also contains useful background information. 2. If required, an agricultural land classification and soil survey of the land should be undertaken. This should normally be at a detailed level, e.g. one auger boring per hectare, (or more detailed for a small site) supported by pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics of the full depth of the soil resource, i.e. 1.2 metres. 3. The ES should provided details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be minimised. Further guidance is contained in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites.	A soil and agricultural land classification survey and assessment has been undertaken as noted within ES Volume 1A Chapter 9: Geology and Soils, however at this time only preliminary results were available and not the full survey report. Mitigation to reduce impacts on soil are noted within Section 9.8 of Volume 1A.
130	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and Lowdham Roundabout	Air Quality	6. Air Quality Air quality in the UK has improved over recent decades but air pollution remains a significant issue; for example over 97% of sensitive habitat area in England is predicted to exceed the critical loads for ecosystem protection from atmospheric nitrogen deposition (England Biodiversity Strategy, Defra 2011). A priority action in the England Biodiversity Strategy is to reduce air pollution impacts on biodiversity. The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of developments which may give rise to pollution, either directly or from traffic generation, and hence planning decisions can have a significant impact on the quality of air, water and land. The assessment should take account of the risks of air pollution and how these can be managed or reduced. Further information on air pollution impacts and the sensitivity of different habitats/designated sites can be found on the Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk). Further information on air pollution modelling and assessment can be found on the Environment Agency website.	The EIA considers the impact of air pollution on biodiversity as reported in Volumes 1A and 1C for Ollerton Roundabout and Lowdham Roundabout. No sensitive designated sites were identified within the air quality study area for either the Mickledale Lane Junction or the Kirk Hill Junction Schemes.
131	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Cumulative Effects	8. Cumulative and in-combination effects A full consideration of the implications of the whole scheme should be included in the ES. All supporting infrastructure should be included within the assessment. The ES should include an impact assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included in such an assessment, (subject to available information): a. existing completed projects; b. approved but uncompleted projects; c. ongoing activities; d. plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and e. plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, i.e. projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development and for which sufficient information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects.	Volume 1 provides a Project-wide assessment for the four individual Schemes. Completed projects are taken into account within the existing baseline scenario. Where projects were identified that would be expected to be complete and operational prior to the start of construction for the Project, these are considered as part of the future baseline. A cumulative assessment has been carried out as noted in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Cumulative Effects Assessment.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
132	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	EIA	<p>The scoping request is for a proposal that does not appear, from the information provided, to affect any nationally designated geological or ecological sites (Ramsar, SPA, SAC, SSSI, NNR) or landscapes (National Parks, AONBs, Heritage Coasts, National Trails), or have significant impacts on the protection of soils (particularly of sites over 20ha of best or most versatile land), nor is the development for a mineral or waste site of over 5ha.</p> <p>At present therefore it is not a priority for Natural England to advise on the detail of this EIA. We would, however, like to draw your attention to some key points of advice, presented in annex to this letter, and we would expect the final ES (ES) to include all necessary information as outlined in Part 4 of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. If you believe that the development does affect one of the features listed in paragraph 3 above, please contact Natural England at, and we may be able to provide further information.</p>	Table 1-2 within Volume 1 of the ES signposts the reader to where within the ES these items can be found.
133	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.2. Internationally and Nationally Designated Sites</p> <p>Natural England undertakes an initial assessment of all development consultations, by determining whether the location to which they relate falls within geographical 'buffer' areas within which development is likely to affect designated sites. The proposal is located outside these buffer areas and therefore appears unlikely to affect an Internationally or Nationally designated site. However, it should be recognised that the specific nature of a proposal may have the potential to lead to significant impacts arising at a greater distance than is encompassed by Natural England's buffers for designated sites. The ES should therefore thoroughly assess the potential for the proposal to affect designated sites, including Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Ramsar sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Should the proposal result in an emission to air or discharge to the ground or surface water catchment of a designated site then the potential effects and impact of this would need to be considered in the ES Local Planning Authorities, as competent authorities under the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), should have regard to the Habitats Regulations Assessment process set out in Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations in their determination of a planning application. Should a Likely Significant Effect on a European/Internationally designated site be identified or be uncertain, the competent authority (in this case the Local Planning Authority) may need to prepare an Appropriate Assessment, in addition to consideration of impacts through the EIA process.</p> <p>Statutory site locations can be found at www.magic.gov.uk. Further information concerning particular statutory sites can be found on the Natural England website.</p>	<p>The Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (see Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3) has considered the impact of European designated sites.</p> <p>The EIA has considered the impacts upon SSSIs within the study areas.</p>
134	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.3. Protected Species</p> <p>The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species. Records of protected species should be sought from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations, groups and individuals; and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area, to assist in the impact assessment.</p> <p>The conservation of species protected by law is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Government Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System. The area likely to be affected by the proposal should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year for relevant species and the survey results, impact assessments and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the ES.</p> <p>Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species. It provides a consistent level of basic advice which can be applied to any planning application that could affect protected species. It also includes links to guidance on survey and mitigation. Natural England does not hold comprehensive information regarding the locations of species protected by law, but advises on the procedures and legislation relevant to such species.</p>	<p>The assessment has considered both the construction and operational phases of the Project on protected species.</p> <p>Records were sought from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre and local relevant groups as noted within Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist. The survey results, impact assessments and mitigation strategies are included within the ES. Surveys were carried out at optimal survey time periods as far as possible. Where this is a limitation, this is noted within the ES.</p> <p>Further assessment was scoped out of the EIA for Warren Hill Junction. A summary of the scoping assessment can be found in Appendix 4-7 of Volume 3.</p>
135	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.4. Regionally and Locally Important Sites</p> <p>The ES should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on non-statutory sites, for example Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS), Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information on these sites. We therefore advise that the appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations, Local Planning Authority and local RIGS group should be contacted with respect to this matter.</p>	The assessment has considered impacts upon locally designated sites, including those designated for geodiversity. The Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre was contacted to obtain data to inform the assessment.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
136	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>2.5. Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats and Species</p> <p>The ES should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). These Priority Habitats and Species are listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance' within the England Biodiversity List, recently published under the requirements of S14 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a general duty on all public authorities, including local planning authorities, to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Further information on this duty is available in the Defra publication 'Guidance for Local Authorities on Implementing the Biodiversity Duty'. Government Circular 06/2005 states that BAP species and habitats, 'are capable of being a material consideration...in the making of planning decisions'. Natural England therefore advises that survey, impact assessment and mitigation proposals for Habitats and Species of Principal Importance should be included in the ES. Consideration should also be given to those species and habitats included in the relevant Local BAP. The record centre for the relevant Local Authorities should be able to provide the relevant information on the location and type of BAP habitat for the area under consideration.</p>	Species and habitats listed under that Habitats and Species of Principal Importance and those listed within the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan have been indicated within the baseline sections (8.5) of Volumes 1A to 1D. This is a factor in considering the importance of habitats and species.
137	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Landscape	<p>3. Landscape, Access and Recreation 3.1. Landscape and Visual Impacts The consideration of landscape impacts should reflect the approach set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management, 2013, 3rd edition), the Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland (Scottish Natural Heritage and The Countryside Agency, 2002) and good practice.</p>	The LVIA methodology within Section 7.4 in Volume 1A uses the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (Landscape Institute, 2013).
138	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Landscape	<p>3.2. Access and Recreation</p> <p>The ES should include a thorough assessment of the development's effects upon public rights of way and access to the countryside and its enjoyment through recreation. With this in mind and in addition to consideration of public rights of way, the landscape and visual effects on Open Access land, whether direct or indirect, should be included in the ES. Natural England would also expect to see consideration of opportunities for improved or new public access provision on the site, to include linking existing public rights of way and/or providing new circular routes and interpretation. We also recommend reference to relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.</p>	There is limited land affected, none of which is access or public open land. No National Trails have been noted as being present near to any of the Schemes being considered. As such, no significant effects were anticipated and therefore the EIA has not assessed the impacts on accessibility. However, the design has still taken these into account as noted within the descriptions of each Scheme (see Chapter 2: The Scheme in Volumes 1A to 1D). Visual effects are considered within this assessment.
139	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Geology and Soils	<p>4. Land use and soils</p> <p>Impacts from the development should be considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 170 and 171 of the NPPF. We also recommend that soils should be considered under a more general heading of sustainable use of land and the valuing of the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource, also in line with paragraph 170 of the NPPF. Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society; for instance as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. The Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) 'The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature' (Defra, June 2011), emphasises the importance of natural resource protection, including the conservation and sustainable management of soils and the protection of BMV agricultural land.</p> <p>Development of buildings and infrastructure prevents alternative uses for those soils that are permanently covered, and also often results in degradation of soils around the development as result of construction activities. This affects their functionality as wildlife habitat, and reduces their ability to support landscape works and green infrastructure. Sealing and compaction can also contribute to increased surface run-off, ponding of water and localised erosion, flooding and pollution. Defra published a Construction Code of Practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites(2009). The purpose of the Code of Practice is to provide a practical guide to assist anyone involved in the construction industry to protect the soil resources with which they work.</p> <p>As identified in the NPPF new sites or extensions to new sites for Peat extraction should not be granted permission by Local Planning Authorities or proposed in development plans. General advice on the agricultural aspects of site working and reclamation can be found in the Defra Guidance for successful reclamation of mineral and waste sites.</p>	<p>A soil and agricultural land classification survey and assessment has been undertaken as noted within ES Volumes 1A to 1D Chapter 9: Geology and Soils, however at this time only preliminary results were available and not the full survey report.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce impacts on soil are noted within Section 9.8 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p>
140	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>6. Climate Change Adaptation</p> <p>The England Biodiversity Strategy published by Defra establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The ES should reflect these principles and identify how the development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained. The NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment "by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures" (NPPF Paras 170 and 174), which should be demonstrated through the ES.</p>	The landscape design shown in Appendix 2-2 in Volumes 3A to 3D shows how habitat types and species will be incorporated which are tolerant to the extremes of climate change e.g. drought. Further consideration of climate change vulnerability is included in the Climate assessments within Volumes 1A to 1D.
141	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Landscape	<p>The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. We encourage the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.</p>	Local landscape character has been mapped to support the Landscape and Visual assessment within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects in Volume 1A. The Landscape and Visual impact assessment has considered visual effects and changes as a result of the Scheme.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
142	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Landscape	Natural England supports the publication Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, produced by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management in 2013 (3rd edition). The methodology set out is almost universally used for landscape and visual impact assessment. In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, Natural England encourages all new development to consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics and, wherever possible, using local materials. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.	The LVIA methodology within Section 7.4 in Volume 1A uses the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (Landscape Institute, 2013). The landscape design in Appendix 2-2 of Volume 3A is based on the local character of the Sherwood area.
143	Natural England	Ollerton Roundabout	Cumulative Effects	The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. In this context Natural England advises that the cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application. The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas which can be found on our website. Links for Landscape Character Assessment at a local level are also available on the same page.	A cumulative assessment has been carried out as noted in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Cumulative Effects Assessment. This includes consideration for applications at the Scoping stage where relevant to do so. The long list of developments was consulted upon with the relevant local authorities.
144	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Cumulative Effects	The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. In this context Natural England would expect the cumulative impact assessment to include those proposals currently at Scoping stage. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.	A cumulative assessment has been carried out as noted in ES Volume 1 Chapter 14: Cumulative Effects Assessment. This includes consideration for applications at the Scoping stage where relevant to do so. The long list of developments was consulted upon with the relevant local authorities.
145	Natural England	Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction, Lowdham Roundabout	Landscape	The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas which can be found on our website. Links for Landscape Character Assessment at a local level are also available on the same page.	The landscape assessment has referred to National Character Areas.
146	British Horse Society	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	Bridleway Ollerton and Boughton BW26 from Edwinstowe meets the Edwinstowe Road (A6075) just short of the roundabout. The response from Via re Safer Highways highlights the increase in traffic and perceived risk of incidents, although vulnerable road users are not highlighted. The controlled crossing proposed across the A6075 aligns with the entrance to the pub/diner rather than with the end of the bridleway. Users of the bridleway are far more likely to use the crossing than pub visitors because the pub has its own carpark. There also appears to be another controlled crossing across the A614 south. This allows access to Newark Road (Bus Lane only) into Old Ollerton. The route marked in yellow into Old Ollerton south along Bescar Lane and north to Ollerton and Boughton BW7 (across the A616 Ollerton Rd) needs to be accessible for horse riders to share with other vulnerable road users, rather than limited to cyclists and pedestrians.	The existing land and environmental constraints mean that there is no opportunity to include specific facilities for equestrian users at this location. These physical restrictions also impact on (limit) the width of other NMU provisions such as footways. While it is acknowledged that Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway 26 (BW26) intersects the roundabout from the west at the A6075, NMU survey returns did not identify any equestrian usage at the junction. The constraints of the built environment around this junction mean that incorporation of Pegasus crossings into the proposed junction improvements could not be achieved due to the design requirements associated with constructing such a facility (corral).
147	British Horse Society	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	Rufford bridleway 5 is a connecting route to Rufford bridleway 19 and provides access to Sherwood Pines and surrounding area. To the north of the route NCN route 645 runs to Bilsthorpe. Sustrans have a Paths for Everyone commitment however the link to the NMU route from BW5 has been blocked (see illustration below). This would provide safe passage for horse riders over the A614 provided there were access to Micklegate Road as an alternative option to continuing west along the bridleway to navigate the proposed roundabout junction.	While it is acknowledged that Rufford BW5 runs east of the A614 along Inkersall Lane and Rufford BW19 joins Mickledale Lane approximately 500 m to the east of the proposed mini-roundabout, NMU survey returns identified some albeit low levels of equestrian usage at the junction. Therefore, it is not proposed to provide specific facilities for equestrian users at this location.
148	British Horse Society	White Post Roundabout	Rights of Way	Bridleway Farnsfield 34 ends at footpath 35 which is unsatisfactory in terms of the bridleway network although not significantly impacted by the infrastructure development.	Noted.
149	British Horse Society	Warren Hill Junction	Rights of Way	Oxton BOAT 11 ends/begins at the site of the proposed roundabout. Opportunity to extend the PRoW network as some historic evidence suggesting route continued to the west to Haywood Oaks road. Project 2026 researchers may pursue further.	This is currently outside the scope of this Scheme, but the comments are noted should the opportunity to provide betterment become available at a later date.
150	British Horse Society	Lowdham Roundabout	Rights of Way	Lowdham Bridleway 10 ends/begins just north of the site of the proposed roundabout. Again an opportunity to connect the network for more NMU's to access off road routes by providing a multi-user crossing and upgrading footpath 13 to reach UCR Church Lane. Again historic research may support a claim.	This is currently outside the scope of this Scheme, but the comments are noted should the opportunity to provide betterment become available at a later date.
151	British Horse Society	Kirk Hill Junction	Rights of Way	In the vicinity of Newton BW 7, East Bridgford BW28, East Bridgford BW42 and East Bridgford RB34. BW 28 and BW42 are close to the road therefore assurances in relation to the protection and safety of the routes would be needed. There are opportunities to improve connectivity of the off-road network for example with Sustrans route 48	This is currently outside the scope of this Scheme, but the comments are noted should the opportunity to provide betterment become available at a later date.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
152	Environment Agency	Ollerton Roundabout	Flood Risk	<p>We welcome the acknowledgement in the Scoping Report that the site lies in an area, which is at risk of flooding and therefore the planning application needs to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The detailed FRA will need to contain the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - plans identifying rivers and any water body including existing culverts/drains on site - topographical survey of the existing site levels and the proposed site levels post development - historical flood risk - flood risk from all sources (fluvial, pluvial, tidal, ground water, sewers, reservoirs etc.) and considering climate change scenarios <p>Furthermore, the FRA should also assess, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential impacts of both temporary and permanent works. For example, due to the nature of the construction works, the storage of any excavated material should be addressed within the FRA. Should any excavated heaps be stored within FZ2 or FZ3 then careful consideration to their placement so as not to impeded flood water - potential impacts of climate change - potential impact related to ground level raising - whether floodplain compensation storage is required - any potential impacts/alterations to existing flood flow routes - any potential impacts related to watercourse crossings (if applicable) - the requirements for flood mitigation measures - surface water runoff rates before and post development and how surface water runoff will be discharged off. 	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.
153	Environment Agency	Ollerton Roundabout, Lowdham Roundabout	Flood Risk	The Environment Agency recently updated the allowances for peak river flow and Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances following research completed in 2020. This research sought to better understand how different river catchments respond to changes in rainfall due to climate change within river basin districts. It uses the latest rainfall projections in UKCP18. The climate change allowances, which were published on 20th July 2021 and which will need to be used in the assessment, can be found here: Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).	The Flood Risk Assessment has used the latest climate change allowances.
154	Environment Agency	Ollerton Roundabout, Lowdham Roundabout	Water	The construction of any outfall for discharging surface water run off to a main river or any works within 8m of a main river operated by the Environment Agency may require flood risk activity permits. The applicant should assess if they will require a flood risk activity permit from the Environment Agency. Further information is available from our website by following this link: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activitiesenvironmental-permits . Please contact for any queries related to Flood Risk Activity Permit requirements.	Noted.
155	Environment Agency	Ollerton Roundabout	Water	<p>The site overlies alluvium over the Chester Sandstone Formation. These are classified as Secondary A and Principal aquifers respectively. The site also lies within a Source Protection Zone 3.</p> <p>Chapter 14 states that "<i>Details of the proposed drainage strategies for the junctions were not available at the time of writing (June 2021).</i>" It is very important that the drainage schemes are considered thoroughly within the EIA given the highly sensitive nature of the groundwater beneath the site.</p> <p>Chapter 10 indicates that areas of infilled land may exist at the site, together with potential coal mining waste. Furthermore the proposed scheme encroaches onto the fuel station site. These areas will be investigated in a Phase 2 site investigation that is planned for the scheme. This will include a controlled waters risk assessment.</p> <p>We are satisfied with the proposed EIA scope but must stress the importance of considering risks to groundwater beneath the site from the drainage scheme.</p>	Risks to the SPZ and groundwater have been considered in Volume 1a Chapter 9: Geology and Soils. A preliminary risk assessment for controlled waters has been undertaken based on the preliminary conceptual model within Appendix 9-1 in Volume 3A. A controlled waters risk assessment would be undertaken in advance of construction work.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
156	Environment Agency	Mickledale Lane Junction	Water	<p>We have paid particular attention to Chapter 10 Geology & Soils and Chapter 14 Road Drainage & the Water Environment and provide the following comments from the perspective of controlled water protection. The site overlies alluvium over the Chester Sandstone Formation. These are classified as Secondary A and Principal aquifers respectively.</p> <p>The report states the following, "Zone I of a SPZ (inner protection zone) for a public water supply is located within the study area, approximately 150 m west of Option 1 and 330 m west of Option 2. The western part of the study area is located within Zone II (outer zone) of a SPZ. This includes the majority of Option 1 and the western half of Option 2. The eastern part of the study area is located within Zone III (total catchment area) of a SPZ. This is limited to the eastern half of Option 2 and the eastern edge of Option 1.</p> <p>The whole site is also located within a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone for groundwater, with the exception of the eastern margins of Option 2. This is related to the public water supply to the west of the Scheme. Drinking Water SGZ are established around public water supplies where additional pollution control measures are needed."</p> <p>Chapter 14 states that "Details of the proposed drainage strategies for the junctions were not available at the time of writing (June 2021)."</p> <p>It is very important that the drainage schemes are considered thoroughly within the EIA given the highly sensitive nature of the groundwater beneath the site.</p> <p>Chapter 10 indicates that areas of infilled land may exist at the site. These areas will be investigated in a Phase 2 site investigation that is planned for the scheme. This will include a controlled waters risk assessment.</p> <p>We are satisfied with the proposed EIA scope but must stress the importance of considering risks to Source Protection Zone 1 (and associated groundwater abstraction) that is present within the proposed scheme.</p>	Risks to the SPZ and groundwater have been considered in Volume 1B Chapter 9: Geology and Soils. A preliminary risk assessment for controlled waters has been undertaken based on the preliminary conceptual model within Appendix 9-1 in Volume 3B. A controlled waters risk assessment would be undertaken in advance of construction work.
157	Environment Agency	Warren Hill Junction	Water	<p>We have reviewed 'A614/A6097 Corridor Improvements Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report' which has been submitted in support of this application. We have paid particular attention to Chapter 10 Geology & Soils and Chapter 14 Road Drainage & the Water Environment and provide the following comments from the perspective of controlled water protection. The site overlies the Chester Sandstone Formation which is classified as a Principal aquifer. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone 3. It is our understanding that a Phase 1 Desk Study has been prepared for this site and we would anticipate being consulted on the findings and recommendations. We would expect that potential impacts on groundwater from the proposed site drainage to be considered in the EIA.</p>	As the nature of the works proposed for Warren Hill Junction is relatively minor (a minor kerb realignment, resurfacing of the existing carriageway and changes to white lines / signage), they are not anticipated to pose a risk to groundwater. This topic was proposed to be scoped out of the EIA in relation to this Scheme. No further assessment is carried out in the ES.
158	Environment Agency	White Post Roundabout	Water	<p>We have reviewed 'A614/A6097 Corridor Improvements Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report' which has been submitted in support of this application. We have paid particular attention to Chapter 10 Geology & Soils and Chapter 14 Road Drainage & the Water Environment and provide the following comments from the perspective of controlled water protection. The site overlies the Chester Sandstone Formation which is classified as a Principal aquifer. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone 3. It is our understanding that a Phase 1 Desk Study has been prepared for this site and we would anticipate being consulted on the findings and recommendations. We would expect that potential impacts on groundwater from the proposed site drainage to be considered in the EIA.</p>	As the nature of the works proposed for White Post Roundabout is relatively minor (resurfacing of the existing carriageway), they are not anticipated to pose a risk to groundwater. This topic was proposed to be scoped out of the EIA in relation to this Scheme. No further assessment is carried out in the ES.
159	Environment Agency	Lowdham Roundabout	Flood Risk	<p>We welcome the acknowledgement in the Scoping Report that the site lies in an area, which is at risk of flooding and therefore the planning application needs to be supported by a flood risk assessment (FRA). The detailed FRA will need to contain the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - plans identifying rivers and any water body including existing culverts/flood defences, floodplain storage area, drains on site - topographical survey of the existing site levels and the proposed site levels post development - historical flood risk - flood risk from all sources (fluvial, pluvial, tidal, ground water, sewers, reservoirs etc.) and considering climate change scenarios 	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.
160	Environment Agency	Lowdham Roundabout	Flood Risk	<p>Furthermore, the FRA should also assess, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential impacts of both temporary and permanent works. For example, due to the nature of the construction works, the storage of any excavated material should be addressed within the FRA. Should any excavated heaps be stored within FZ2 or FZ3 then careful consideration to their placement so as not to impeded flood water - potential impacts of climate change - potential impacts on ongoing or future Environment Agency flood risk management schemes potentially interacting with the proposed project such as the Lowdham Recovery Works project (see section below) - potential impacts of breach and overtopping scenarios - potential impact related to ground level raising - whether floodplain compensation storage is required - any potential impacts on the Environment Agency assets - any potential impacts/alterations to existing flood flow routes - the requirements for flood mitigation measures - surface water runoff rates before and post development and how surface water runoff will be discharged off 	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application, which includes a surface water drainage strategy. This is available in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
161	Environment Agency	Lowdham Roundabout	Flood Risk	Lowdham Recovery Works - We referred you back to the Environment Agency response dated 2019 following the EIA screening request. Lowdham has an extensive history of flooding. The Environment Agency is in the process of delivering the Lowdham Recovery Works project aiming at replacing the existing flood wall (SK66794644, SK67094622) and which is located adjacent to the proposed project. The scheme will be delivered over the second half of 2021. We acknowledge the EIA Scoping report stating that discussions have been held with the Environment Agency about the scheme. However, we would request further consultations based on newer information available. Contact the Environment Agency Sustainable Place team in the first instance if you wish to undertake any further discussion.	The Flood Risk Assessment team have been in contact with the Environmental Agency to understand the current and future proposed projects for this area. These have been considered within the Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 4-3 of Volume 3.
162	Environment Agency	Kirk Hill Junction	Water	There are no constraints that fall under the remit of the Environment Agency and therefore we have no comment to make. Paul Goldsmith, Planning Advisor, Sustainable Places Team	Noted.
163	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	EIA	Thank you for consulting NWT on the above scoping consultations, this combined response outlines the matters we would need covered in EIA for each of the junction improvements, and relates to the document "A614/A6097 Corridor Improvements Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report". I welcome that Via recognises the need for an ES, not least to look at combined or cumulative effects of the 6 junction schemes	Noted.
164	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	EIA	1. Surveys and EcIA - I welcome the extensive ecological work undertaken already, and agree with the scope and scale of the work undertaken and proposed, with the proviso that the following needs to be addressed:	Noted.
165	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	1. No methodology is proposed for how the impacts of changes to noise, light and disturbance will be assessed. For example: Bat activity surveys will be required (only data searches and habitat assessments have been undertaken to date, and only roost surveys are proposed), in order to be able to assess the predicted noise changes on bat foraging activity. The Noise chapter does not describe how the impacts of changes in noise will be assessed for sensitive species, which appear to not have been considered. It is essential that noise modelling considers likely changes on sensitive species near to the junctions, e.g. roosting and foraging bats and nesting birds. The latest research should be used to inform this assessment, e.g. the large studies of noise impacts on birds such as "Noise Pollution Filters Bird Communities Based on Vocal Frequency Clinton D. Francis,1," Catherine P. Ortega,2 and Alexander Cruz1" and "Chronic anthropogenic noise disrupts glucocorticoid signalling and has multiple effects on fitness in an avian community" Nathan J. Kleista,b,1, Robert P. Guralnick, Alexander Cruza, Christopher A. Lowryd, and Clinton D. Francis, and "Vocal traits and diet explain avian sensitivities to anthropogenic noise" Clinton D. Francis. These papers can be related to the species likely to be affected in this area, particularly scarce species associated with heathlands and forests, unlike some of the older studies with poor methodologies that apply only to wetland birds	The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D.
166	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	2. I welcome the proposed air emissions modelling and the recognition of the impact of NOx, and associated N deposition on sensitive habitats, such as the heathlands and acid grassland present in several of the SSSIs and LWS close to the scheme. I note that only 1 actual monitoring location will be used to field test the modelling, at Ollerton Roundabout, but given the potential impacts on the SAC and ppSPA, NWT would expect to see further monitoring undertaken in a key protected habitats site such as the SAC or a heathland SSSI, to ensure that the modelling is correct for the areas of potential greatest irreversible habitat impact. This is because emissions modelling was incorrect for several years in using a predicted falling baseline of NOx that did not occur in reality, and this information is therefore crucial in such a sensitive area to the impacts of NO2 and N. This results should be closely monitored, with a plan in place for how it could be rectified if a problem is shown to have arisen. The latest APIS data on critical load for N deposition of 7.9 kg N ha-1 a-1 for acid grassland 8.8 kg N ha-1 a-1 for heathland should be used.	A programme of monitoring is proposed adjacent to the roadside closest to the Birklands West and Ollerton Corner SSSI in the opening year of the Ollerton Roundabout Scheme.
167	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	There could also be impacts of dust on some SSSIs and LWS in close proximity to the junctions, this should also be closely monitored, with a plan in place for how it could be rectified if a problem is shown to have arisen. In the face of the climate emergency, it is essential that accurate modelling for changes in GHG emissions are undertaken in advance, and that NCC considers how they could be reduced through this scheme.	Dust monitoring adjacent to the Birklands West and Ollerton Corner SSSI will be undertaken during construction of the Ollerton Roundabout Scheme to ensure that management measures implemented through the CEMP are successful in reducing dust impacts on this receptor. Best practice construction methods would also be required to avoid adverse effects for Alder Carr LWS at Mickledale Lane Junction. Greenhouse gases from the construction of the Project are considered in Chapter 12 of Volume 1.
168	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	3. NWT disagree with para 9.6.5 which states that the ppSPA should not be included in the HRA. Regardless of the lack of progress towards designation, due to lack of Government commitment to meet international obligations, the reasons for the designation of the ppSPA remain the same, and it still meets the necessary criteria. The principle of the need to include the ppSPA for this has been recently robustly reconfirmed by the Planning Inspector for the Mansfield LP Examination, and so is an established fact in planning practice. The ppSPA should therefore be included in the HRA, and the likely in-combination effects should be assessed for the qualifying features of both the ppSPA and SAC.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken (see Appendix 4-4 in Volume 3) which includes consideration for the Sherwood Area ppSPA and the Birklands and Billhaugh SAC. .

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
169	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	<p>4. Further surveys in the field are required as follows, to supplement those already undertaken for Phase 1 habitats, reptiles, HSI and eDNA:</p> <p>a) Bats - survey of all possible structures that may support roosts, including both day time visual inspections and evening emergence surveys undertaken at the correct times of year by suitably licensed persons. If potential tree roosts are to be lost, a dawn swarming survey should be undertaken. Continuous recording with an SM2 recorder can be helpful in recording levels of bat activity, although it is not directional and should be supplemented by conventional transect surveys in order to accurately determine foraging behaviour.</p> <p>b) Badgers (this information was redacted from the report so it is not entirely clear what surveys have already been undertaken) - surveys of the whole site and adjacent land (up to 250 m) for field signs and setts.</p> <p>c) Birds - breeding bird surveys to standard methodologies for at least 100 m around the periphery of the sites, where there may be noise impacts. In addition, focussed surveys for woodlark, nightjar and owls should be undertaken, as these species are known to both nest nearby and to fly over the road whilst foraging. Impacts may include noise, light, vibration and collision.</p> <p>d) Water voles and other riparian mammals – Searches for water vole and other riparian mammal field signs to standard methodologies should be undertaken on any potentially affected watercourses.</p>	<p>Protected species surveys have been undertaken as reported within Section 8.4 Assessment Methodology in Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist. The survey results, impact assessments and mitigation strategies are included within the ES. Surveys were carried out at optimal survey time periods as far as possible. Where this is a limitation, this is noted within the ES.</p>
170	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	<p>5. I note the proposal to follow CIEEM recommendations for the impact assessment, particular consideration should be given to the potential direct and indirect impacts of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Habitat loss or degradation - Noise - Hydrological/hydrogeological changes - Dust, NOx, GHG - Vibration - Disturbance to sensitive species 	<p>The CIEEM guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EiA) have been utilised in the EIA. The assessments are reported within Chapter 8: Biodiversity Volumes 1A to 1D, and have considered the potential direct and indirect impacts of habitat loss / degradation, noise, hydrological / hydrogeological changes, dust, NOx, GHG, vibration and disturbance to species, where relevant.</p>
171	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	All Schemes	Biodiversity	<p>6. I note the intention to undertake a BNG calculation for the scheme, which is to be welcomed, all opportunities to enhance and create/re-create habitats should be undertaken with the aim of delivering at least 20% BNG. There should be an assurance of long term funding for management of the habitats, so that they can be retained in perpetuity.</p>	<p>A BNG metric assessment has been undertaken for the Project (as can be found in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3). Post-development, the Project is expected to deliver an 18.07% gain in habitat units, a 71.75% gain in hedgerow units and a 67.14% gain in river units. All net gain requirements will be within the revised highway boundary. Funding and management will be the responsibility for NCC.</p>
172	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>Given the proximity of the Ollerton Roundabout to high-quality bat foraging habitat, I would suggest that bat activity surveys need to be undertaken at this location, and that the impact of artificial lighting and noise should be considered with the use of lux diagrams and noise contour plans, unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no significant changes to the noise and lighting environment as a result of the roundabout improvements.</p>	<p>The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Lux plans did indicate a potential adverse effect for bats for one property at Forest Side. An additional Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021) has been undertaken to determine whether suitable roosting features were present to support bats. (see Appendix 8-2 in Volume 3A). Further detail on the mitigation and the assessment is reported in Section 8.6 and 8.7 in Volume 1A.</p>
173	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	<p>Similarly, given the diverse bird assemblage supported by the wider SSSI/SAC adjacent to the Ollerton Roundabout (including heathland/woodland and nocturnal species), as well as the comments in Table 9-3 that "Suitable nesting and foraging habitat is present for nightjar and woodlark within the Scheme boundary. Therefore, effects to both species due to the removal of suitable habitat as part of the works and therefore potential impacts to the ppSPA, cannot be discounted", it is recommended that targeted bird surveys are undertaken at this location, unless sufficient data is available from other sources, such as Birklands Ringing Group/NBGRC (noting that the latter do hold bird data so it is unclear why none was returned as part of the desktop study) and/or that it can again be demonstrated that there will be no significant changes to the noise and lighting environment as a result of the roundabout improvements.</p>	<p>Additional data has been obtained from the NBGRC. The impacts to nightjar and woodlark have been assessed within Volume 1A Chapter 8: Biodiversity and within the Shadow Habitats Regulations Report (Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3).</p>
174	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	All Schemes	Biodiversity	<p>In relation to bats and potential roost sites, it is noted that in some cases buildings adjacent to the proposed works areas were not surveyed as they lie outside the scheme boundary – presumably because there will not be any direct impacts arising. Therefore, it will need to be demonstrated through the assessment process that there will not be significant indirect impacts on potential roost locations as a result of noise, lighting or general disturbance.</p>	<p>The methodology for the assessment of the impact of artificial lighting and noise can be found in Section 8.4 of Volumes 1A to 1D. Lux diagrams and noise contour plans are provided (see Figures 8-2, 8-3 and 8-4 in Volumes 2A to 2D). Embedded and additional mitigation, and the assessment are reported in Sections 8.6 and 8.7 of Volumes 1A to 1D.</p> <p>Lux plans did indicate a potential adverse effect for bats for one property at Forest Side. An additional Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021) has been undertaken to determine whether suitable roosting features were present to support bats. (see Appendix 8-2 in Volume 3A). Further detail on the mitigation and the assessment is reported in Section 8.6 and 8.7 in Volume 1A.</p>

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
175	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	All Schemes	Biodiversity	In para. 9.6.5 of the EIA Scoping Report it is stated that "ppSPA is not normally assessed via the HRA process and it is currently unclear if and when the site may be upgraded to ppSPA status and, therefore, it is proposed that the Sherwood Forest Area ppSPA is not included in the HRA for these Schemes". However, in-line with the 'risk-based approach' as set out in Natural England's Advice Note (dated March2014), I would strongly recommend that a consideration of potential impacts on the ppSPA is undertaken as part of the HRA assessment (which is required due to proximity to the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC).	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken, considering the Schemes at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and White Post Roundabout. See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3. This includes consideration for the ppSPA.
176	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	All Schemes	Biodiversity	Note that it is stated in para. 9.6.1 that the White Post Junction and Warren Hill Junction are scoped out of the biodiversity assessment; however, given that both junctions lie within the 5km buffer zone for the ppSPA, and as such, should be scoped in for the purposes of the HRA. The Lowdham Roundabout and Kirk Hill Junction lie outside the 5km buffer zone for the ppSPA And as such do not need to be considered expect as part of an in-combination assessment.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken, considering the Schemes at Ollerton Roundabout, Mickledale Lane Junction, Warren Hill Junction and White Post Roundabout. See Appendix 4-4 of Volume 3. This includes consideration for the ppSPA.
177	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	All Schemes	Biodiversity	The creation of habitat should be delivered at each location, as far as possible, for example through the planting of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows and the seeding of native wildflower seed mixes.	The design has sought to maximise habitat creation at each Scheme location as noted in the BNG Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021a) located in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3. The proposed landscape designs are specific to the character of the location.
178	Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology Natural Environment Manager	Ollerton Roundabout	Biodiversity	The Ollerton Roundabout in particular should be landscaped to reflect characteristic Sherwood habitats, e.g. acid grassland or heathland, with Silver Birch or Oak trees (if trees are considered appropriate), given it's 'gateway' location to some of Sherwood's most ecologically-important sites.	The design has sought to maximise habitat creation at each Scheme location as noted in the BNG Assessment (Baker Consultants Ltd, 2021a) located in Appendix 4-2 of Volume 3. The proposed landscape designs are specific to the character of the location, including for example, acid grassland and heathland creation are proposed, plus species including field maple, silver birch, downy birch, wild cherry, scots pine, sessile oak, English oak and rowan - all which are in keeping with the local character area.
179	Rushcliffe Borough Council - Planning	Kirk Hill Junction	EIA	One of the proposed junction improvements (Kirk Hill) falls within the Borough of Rushcliffe and I have taken the opportunity to consult with internal technical consultees on the various environmental matters that will need to be considered within the EIA. At the present time no matters have been raised with me that require further attention at this stage. I consider that the topics identified in the EIA report are considered appropriate for the scoping exercise.	Noted
180	Rushcliffe Borough Council - Planning	Kirk Hill Junction	Landscape	It would appear that the various environmental constraints have been identified including heritage assets including various listed buildings and the East Bridgford Conservation Area in close proximity to the site. The importance of mature landscaping including trees and landscaping to the entrance to the village of East Bridgford and its Conservation Area should be clearly acknowledged and considered in the preparation of any scheme.	The existing vegetation, entrance to East Bridgford and the Conservation Area are considered within the assessment reported in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual in Volume 1D.
181	Rushcliffe Borough Council - Planning	Kirk Hill Junction	Cumulative Effects	Several residential properties exist in close proximity to the improvements and the reports should clearly consider the potential impact on their amenity at both construction and operational stage. It is noted that consideration in respect to impact on these properties will be considered within the relevant technical assessments rather than as a stand alone chapter and this is considered appropriate in this instance.	The assessments reported within Volume 1D Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects and Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration, consider both the construction and operational phase of the Scheme. An in-combination assessment is provided within Volume 1 Chapter 13.
182	Rushcliffe Borough Council - Planning	Kirk Hill Junction	Consultation	The Borough Council looks forward to continued involvement in this scheme and commenting on any future planning application. These comments are made at Officer level and are without prejudice to any recommendation made by the Borough Council on a planning application which would be subject to full consultation and consideration of development management considerations. Early engagement with the local communities including East Bridgford, Newton, Shelford, Bingham and Radcliffe on Trent is encouraged.	A description of the consultation exercises carried out to date can be found within Volume 1. Chapter 1: Introduction. Shelford and Radcliffe on Trent were not consulted directly. Those invited to consult were those villages closest to the A6097 corridor and who were considered to be directly impacted by the proposed junction improvements.
183	Gedling Borough Council - Development Services	Lowdham Roundabout	General	I confirm receipt of your below e-mail and advise that Gedling Borough Council make no observations on the application (our ref: 2021/0954NCC).	Noted.
184	VIA Public Rights of Way	Ollerton Roundabout	Rights of Way	Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway no 26 is impacted by the proposed improvements to the Ollerton roundabout. This bridleway exits on to Mansfield Road (A6075) some 70 m back from the junction. A connecting bridleway (Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway no. 7) exists off Ollerton Road (reached via Newark Road and Main Street). This is a popular bridleway to/from the populated area of Ollerton. Bridleways are for the public on foot, cycle and horseback and consideration should be given to how the bridleway can be safely connected by improved crossings of the A6075 and A614 to reach Newark Road. Although the greater use will be pedestrian and cyclists, to not consider the use by equestrian would be to discourage and potentially prevent or reduce safe use by equestrians. This is usually managed by standard Pegasus crossings and horse corrals on each road. Consideration should also be given to an increased width of the roadside footways to accommodate the public safely.	The existing land and environmental constraints mean that there is no opportunity to include specific facilities for equestrian users at this location. These physical restrictions also impact on (limit) the width of other NMU provisions such as footways. While it is acknowledged that Ollerton & Boughton Bridleway 26 (BW26) intersects the roundabout from the west at the A6075, NMU survey returns did not identify any equestrian usage at the junction. The constraints of the built environment around this junction mean that incorporation of Pegasus crossings into the proposed junction improvements could not be achieved due to the design requirements associated with constructing such a facility (corral).

	Stakeholder	Scheme	Topic	Stakeholder Comments	Scheme Response
185	VIA Public Rights of Way	Kirk Hill Junction	Rights of Way	<p>East Bridgford Bridleway no 28 crosses Kirk Hill currently and will be impacted by the proposed junction improvement East Bridgford Footpath no. 27 (corner of Kirk Hill and A6097 junction) may also be impacted with any junction widening at this point.</p> <p>Neither has been recognised in the application and they are both well used and important links in the minor highway network. There is also local interest in the improvement of the bridleway, especially a safe equestrian crossing to East Bridgford Road and on to Newton. Currently there are informal equestrian crossings utilising knowledge of the phasing of the traffic lights</p> <p>However we have had discussion separately regarding impacts on the bridleway and improvements to the route and a potential equestrian crossing. I expect this to be ongoing and firmed up shortly.</p>	<p>East Bridgford Bridleway No. 28 will be diverted around the north side of Kirk Hill, crossing at the bend and linking through to the cut-through path which is currently used as an unofficial diversion route. A new 5m Bridleway will be constructed adjacent to Kirk Hill (road) with an uncontrolled Bridleway crossing point to link existing bridlepath running between the A6097 and Kirk Hill. It is anticipated that the improved facility will encourage greater NMU use, as it will be more attractive option and crosses Kirk Hill at a point that is safer i.e. away from the junction. Currently, FP 27 does not appear to link into any other registered PRoW (from definitive mapping). The provision of the diversion for of BW 28 along Kirk Hill will provide an enhanced facility crossing Kirk Hill at a point that affords good intervisibility between those crossing and vehicles on Kirk Hill, and links, via a cut-through back into the existing BW 28. This cut-through is neither recorded as a public right of way nor adopted highway but is accepted by the public as an alternative route to the obstructed definitive line of East BW28. NMUs can use this route to continue across the A6097 to Shelford FP9 on the south side of the road.</p> <p>A new Pegasus crossing will be provided 100 m east of the junction to facilitate the safe movement of equestrians across the A6097. This crossing will link into the public bridleway on the northern side and a new surfaced path with fencing will be created on the southern verge of the A6097 to link the route to East Bridgford Road.</p>
186	VIA Public Rights of Way	Mickledale Lane Junction	Rights of Way	<p>Option 2</p> <p>Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •how are equestrians to safely cross the A614 with the expected increase in use due to the informal link being closed •how are equestrians to access Mickledale Lane (structures /gaps provided) from A614 •How will equestrians navigate the new Mickledale lane roundabout including potential to cross two lanes of traffic to access Bilsthorpe and connecting routes <p>Options to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Use of Pegasus crossing and associated corrals at A614 •Move the footway/cycle way to the north side of Mickledale Lane (and new roundabout) to prevent any crossing of •the new link road for the safety of all users •Requirement for 1.5m gap in fencing to Mickledale Lane for equestrians •Ensure good visibility of traffic for equestrians to enable safe crossing decisions 	<p>See above (response to 28). The central refuge on the A614 will remain and is wide enough to safely accommodate cyclists but not equestrians.</p> <p>Mickledale Lane will be closed off to vehicles and will become a cul-de-sac accessed from the east at the mini-roundabout junction with the new link road. This means that an NMU link for equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians travelling east-west towards the BW5, PRoW at Inkersall Lane and beyond, can be maintained as a preferred route encouraging NMUs to cross the A614 at a location with the least amount of potential conflict using existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing provision which incorporates central refuges. It is anticipated that the new roundabout will generate gaps in platoons of traffic and reduced vehicular speeds which will aid east-west crossing movements.</p> <p>NMU provision will be maintained on the north side of Mickledale Lane and will continue towards the A614 within the section which will be closed to traffic.</p> <p>Visibility at the existing A614 junction with Mickledale Lane will be unaltered.</p>
187	VIA Public Rights of Way	Warren Hill	Road Safety	<p>Oxton Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) no 11 (Rob Lane) accesses on to the north section of the proposed application for road improvements at Warren Hill.</p> <p>This access is for the public on foot, horseback, cycle, horse and cart and motorised vehicle. Therefore consideration should be given to continued safe access (including any changes to the surface) and visibility for these users. Any change to the physical location of the route or access point may require a legal order to alter, however this is not anticipated.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that any diversions or suspension of this route would be required for this Scheme. No works are proposed to this route. Consideration for safety during the works would be considered during the planning of any construction traffic management.</p>