

ExQ3	Question to	Question	NCC comments
Q3.0.5	The Applicant, NCC, NSDC	<p><b>Habitat Severance</b> During ISH 4 [EV10-002] it was confirmed that NSDC no longer had any concerns relating to habitat severance. NCC commented that it is still in discussion on this point and would address this through the SoCG.</p> <p>Can all parties please ensure the matter of habitat severance is included in their SoCG and confirm if they are content that this issue has been resolved. If NCC continues to have concerns, please detail these and how might they be reasonably addressed.</p>	NCC notes the applicant's response to comments on Habitat severance within REP3-037 and at EV10-002 and has no further concerns /comments. This has now been closed out on the SoCG.
Q5.0.16	Applicant, NCC	<p><b>Land Rights Tracker URN 038</b> It is stated a further meeting is being arranged for February to discuss acquisition by agreement, did this take place? Please ensure information provided as to the nature of any outstanding issues and the positions of the parties, as in the event agreement is not reached by the conclusion of the examination, the Panel will need to adjudicate and provide a recommendation to the SoS</p>	A meeting was held on 04/03/2025 to discuss Acquisition by agreement. The council doesn't hold any concerns on the proposed acquisition, and this has been agreed on the SoCG. NCC are expecting to receive draft Heads of Terms from the applicant presently.
Q8.0.1	NSDC and NCC	<p><b>Archaeology</b> Following a review of the most recent SoCGs [REP6-032] and [REP6-030], are the</p>	The applicant has undertaken sufficient evaluation to inform the overall majority of the scheme. There are two small areas that were not subject to evaluation trenching due to circumstances

		<p>host authorities content that the applicant has undertaken sufficient ground investigations to inform the most recent Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) [REP5-026] and are they in agreement with this document?</p> <p>Are all parties content with those matters included in the First Iteration EMP REAC CH1 to CH10 [REP6-012]?</p> <p>Does any party have any outstanding concerns relating to archaeology? If so, please provide details and reasonable actions to address them.</p>	<p>beyond their control (flooding and landowner issues). To address this, the applicant has included trial trench evaluation in these areas as part of the post-consent Archaeological Mitigation Plan (AMP), with provision to revise the overall AMP once the evaluation results have been obtained. This is also secured through the Requirement wording and provides confidence in the data that the applicant will be using for the final version of the AMP.</p> <p>NCC are therefore satisfied that the applicant has undertaken sufficient ground investigation to inform the scheme.</p> <p>The First Iteration EMP REAC CH1 (REP6-012) references the separate AMP in para. 1.1.4 as an important part of the EMP. It provides further outline detail on the procedures for archaeological work in Table 3.2 (Pages 22 – 26 [CH1-CH10]) and implementation of the AMP. We are happy with the matters included.</p> <p>Overall, we are happy with the applicant's proposed approach to archaeology and the provisions made within the AMP, EMP and procedure for implementation set out at Schedule 2, Requirement 9 of the Draft DCO.</p>
Q10.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Finishing Materials of Cattle Market Grade Separated Junction</b></p> <p>In [REP4-040] 3.6, page 19 the applicant confirms that the material finish of the Cattle Market grade separated junction will include a banding of red brick material and that this, coupled with landscaping, will</p>	<p>There is a need to identify the type and extent of red material being proposed, REP4-040 3.6 refers to 'blocks' rather than 'bricks', but clearly a red brick would be the most appropriate detail to tie in with the material palette of the Smeaton's Arches heritage. The use of coloured 'blocks' would offer very limited aesthetic mitigation (especially if this was simply a coloured concrete block).</p>

		assist in reducing the potential adverse impacts on views towards Newark travelling south along the Great North Road. How is this secured through the dDCO and are there any drawings and/ or documents that require to be certified to be updated to reflect this? Does this need to be captured in the Requirements and if so, should NSDC be a consultee?	The precise details of the materials need to be submitted to NSDC and NCC and examined further to ensure that they are achieving the stated aims.
Q13.0.1	The Applicant, NCC	<b>LTN Standards</b> a) Why is there a difference in opinion on LTN standards between the Applicant and NCC? b) Can anything be done to address NCC's concerns expressed in response to ExQ2 13.0.5 [REP5-069].	NCC's understanding is that the applicant considers the design acceptable based on the number of users. There is a table in LTN 1/20 that offers guidance on the width of potential shared use facilities, based on the number of users. However, it is the Council's understanding that regardless of the pedestrian/cycle volumes, the over-riding design principle is that shared use footways should be introduced only as a last resort. Para 6.5.4 states: "In urban areas, the conversion of a footway to shared use should be regarded as a last resort." In NCC's experience ATE has not supported designs that incorporate shared use at locations where the pedestrian/cycle volumes are well below the threshold set out in the document.
Q14.0.2	The Applicant, NCC	<b>Pelham Street Mitigation</b> a) If an agreement relating to mitigation is listed in the Consents and Agreement Position Statement as opposed to being entered into before a decision is made on the DCO application, how could it be guaranteed that mitigation would be secured?	The applicant has issued a draft agreement, a meeting was held 13 <sup>th</sup> March 25 and the details regarding the termination date and mitigation proposals have been agreed. We are currently negotiating the maximum cost limit, NCC has put forward an alternative value it considers more appropriate to cover the mitigation options presented, if required. The council is awaiting a response from the applicant and is aiming to have the agreement in place by deadline eight.

		b) If mitigation is not secured or implemented, please describe the impact(s) that you consider would occur and the weight that you consider should be given to the impact(s) in the overall planning balance.						
Q14.0.3	The Applicant, NCC	<p><b>A17/ Godfrey Drive/ Long Hollow Way Mitigation</b></p> <p>[REP6-037] states that NCC’s proposed solution in relation to this junction would be to enter into an agreement with the applicant to adopt a monitor and mitigate approach at this junction.</p> <p>a) What is the applicant’s position on this matter?</p> <p>b) Will an agreement be presented to the examination?</p> <p>c) If an agreement is not in place by the time that a decision is made on the DCO application, please explain the impact(s) that could occur, to inform the ExA’s / SoS’s assessment.</p>	<table><tr><td>Applicant’s response 05/03/25</td><td>NCC comments</td></tr><tr><td>Godfrey Drive at the time of VISSIM modelling was not deemed to be a significant source of traffic and was still in development and was not included. However, ARCADY modelling has been produced for this junction and does not show capacity issues (maximum RFC of 0.79). For the 2 lanes on the eastbound carriageway, 2 lanes are required to alleviate the potential queues beyond the A1 southbound slip road onto the A1 mainline. It is therefore necessary for the Scheme to revert back to the 2019 two lane layout.</td><td>There are no further outstanding matters on this junction. NCC accepts the ARCADY modelling provided by the applicant and Issue 2 is now agreed on the SoCG.</td></tr></table>		Applicant’s response 05/03/25	NCC comments	Godfrey Drive at the time of VISSIM modelling was not deemed to be a significant source of traffic and was still in development and was not included. However, ARCADY modelling has been produced for this junction and does not show capacity issues (maximum RFC of 0.79). For the 2 lanes on the eastbound carriageway, 2 lanes are required to alleviate the potential queues beyond the A1 southbound slip road onto the A1 mainline. It is therefore necessary for the Scheme to revert back to the 2019 two lane layout.	There are no further outstanding matters on this junction. NCC accepts the ARCADY modelling provided by the applicant and Issue 2 is now agreed on the SoCG.
Applicant’s response 05/03/25	NCC comments							
Godfrey Drive at the time of VISSIM modelling was not deemed to be a significant source of traffic and was still in development and was not included. However, ARCADY modelling has been produced for this junction and does not show capacity issues (maximum RFC of 0.79). For the 2 lanes on the eastbound carriageway, 2 lanes are required to alleviate the potential queues beyond the A1 southbound slip road onto the A1 mainline. It is therefore necessary for the Scheme to revert back to the 2019 two lane layout.	There are no further outstanding matters on this junction. NCC accepts the ARCADY modelling provided by the applicant and Issue 2 is now agreed on the SoCG.							
Q14.0.4	NCC	<p><b>Great North Road Southbound</b></p> <p>[REP6-037] states that ARCADY modelling outputs “provide a level of comfort on this matter”. Are there any outstanding issues which you consider should be addressed. Is any mitigation needed?</p>	Since comments at the last deadline, 2043 AM Vissim modelling was presented by the applicant, with sensitivity testing of a proxy reduction in flow rate via application of reduced speed areas. The outputs of this were accepted and there are no further outstanding matters on this point.					

Q15.2.1	NCC, The Applicant	<b>Surface Water Discharge Flows/ Volume</b> Please provide an update with respect to the discussions between the LLFA and the applicant on surface water drainage and detail all outstanding matters. This should relate to only those statutory functions of the LLFA. Considering the SoCG with the EA [REP6-028], the LLFA should detail any outstanding concerns that relate only to their statutory function.	Issue 31 has been agreed on the SoCG.  The Applicant has confirmed that 40% climate change allowance is being used for the detailed design and that the 30year design standard has been consulted with the EA & IDB.		
			NCC comment	Applicant's comments	NCC position
			A requirement for site investigations to confirm potential for infiltration and to incorporate infiltration where feasible should be considered as a condition of the scheme.	11/03/25 This can be added to the Statement of Common Ground and agreed at detailed design stage. There is no need for a condition to be applied. However as stated within the DSR the majority of the Scheme lies within a flood plain and ground water is present at ground level or just below and a review undertaken to the east of the A1 shows that conditions are not suitable.  18/03/25 If infiltration tests are required it is proposed to undertake one within the southern section flood zone and one between Friendly Farmer Link Road and Winthorpe Roundabout. However, the Applicants would assess the materials used for the swales and ponds as these need to be	Justification for why infiltration testing cannot occur has been accepted.

			<p>90% impermeable to prevent highways rainfall run-off entering the ground prior to cleaning within each basin. Infiltration therefore can't be incorporated into the design solution due to this impermeability requirement of the swale and pond linings and there seek agreement not to undertake filtration tests in accordance with BRE363.</p>	
There are no further outstanding matters.				