

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
4	TownLegal	09/10/2024	<p>TownLegal are our legal advisors on this DCO scheme. They have reviewed the report and commented on its appropriateness with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 6.1 – state impacts of the conflict upon the local area i.e. traffic/noise/dust etc. • Para 8.11 As the height of the grade separated junction is estimated at 7-8m above existing ground level, we should reserve the right to make representations on this during the examination once it is clarified; • Para 8.26 Viewpoints should include additional mitigation as opposed to <i>could</i>; • Para 8.27 Change to 'Would expect that lighting proposals will be modified/upgraded' and state where this assumption comes from. • Include a 'shopping list' of landscape mitigation at the end of this section and include mitigation for Winthorpe; • Query the Positive outcome for Section 9 given the information requested, suggest condition or in principle; • Para 9.41 does NSDC want to be an approving authority or consultee for a Management Plan and does this link into the requirements of the draft DCO?; • Para 10.20 query if the NPSNN has been followed given the FRA is defective; • Para 10.29 query the use of 'indifferent' and 	<p>All the points are noted, and it is considered they are reasonable adjustments to make to the LIR. These will be made following the Committee meeting with the authorisation of the Chair and Vice Chair's authorisation in conjunction with the Director/Acting Business Manager</p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>states it may be best to state that the <i>'Council is unable to reach a conclusion on this topic due to the status of the FRA'</i> and would defer to the EAs view;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 11.62 Does NSDC want to be an approving body/consultee on the Outline Mitigation Strategy and does this tie into the requirements of the draft DCO; • Section 12 needs to reference the Environmental Statement and any submitted material and if we agree with the assessment carried out; • Para 13.4 state <i>'we presume</i> educational, medical, and community facilities are included in these other sensitive receptors'; • Para 13.19 check NSDC powers are not limited by the draft DCO. Ensure the draft DCO or CEMP provides sufficient protection; • Para 13.32 should we be requesting further assessment/information/mitigation from applicant in order to reassure us of the conclusions? • Para 15.22 need to come to a conclusion on baseline data age; • Para 16.3 confirm the number of vehicles is per day/month/year; • Para 18.4 discuss the Statement of Common Ground and the Council's position here is subject to change. 	

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 OCTOBER 2024

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
4	AECOM (via Nottinghamshire County Council)	10/10/2024	<p>Amendment to report as below: Para 14.25 should read "As described in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality an air quality assessment has been undertaken following an appropriate methodology (DMRB LA 105). Construction phase dust mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 5: Air Quality paragraphs 5.10.1 and listed in paragraph 5.10.2 as well as within the FIEMP. Operational air quality costs have been calculated and are included in the Transport Assessment (Ref TR010065/APP/7.4). According to the Transport Assessment, the local air quality valuation, based on the Department for Transport (DfT) guidance is £1,747,000. This approach, based on national guidance, is more appropriate for Development Consent Order schemes, than following the SPD." Para 14.29 should read "The local air quality valuation has been determined following national guidance publish by the DfT which is considered appropriate for a Development Consent Order scheme, rather than following the damage cost methodology in the SPD. However, NSDC should still ask the Applicant to provide further information on how these air quality damage costs are being addressed locally and also request that the ExA consider any response by the Applicant against local planning policy in their recommendation."</p>	<p>This is noted and will be captured in the final version. The emphasis on the SPD has changed given its unadopted status with the Council, and national guidance is followed with DfT.</p>