

APPENDIX A

Sima Odedra

From: Catherine Townend
Sent: 13 August 2026 15:21
To: Ryan Dawson
Cc: Sima Odedra; Harjinder Jheeta
Subject: Toton Obligation (draft) - NH comments - 13-08-26
Attachments: Toton Cumulative Obligation RG PTKC1 - NH comments 13-08-26.docx

Hi Ryan,

Thanks for sharing the draft Obligations for the Toton West application with me.

Please find National Highways comments and tracked changes on the attached.

Kind regards

Catherine Townend

Spatial Planner

Midlands Operations Directorate – *Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and North Leicestershire*

catherine.townend@nationalhighways.co.uk

Mobile: +44 (0) 7710 365579

Web: www.nationalhighways.co.uk

My working days are Monday to Thursday

Upcoming leave:

For information on working with National Highways on planning matters, please see the below guidance:

https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/imvluu5w/final-cre23_0370-nh-planning-guide-2023.pdf

From: Ryan Dawson <Ryan.Dawson@broxtowe.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 July 2026 12:55
To: Catherine Townend <catherine.townend@nationalhighways.co.uk>
Subject: Fw: Toton Obligation

Catherine,

With regards to the ongoing discussions about Toton and the forthcoming appeal..

Please find attached an obligation which is likely to be included in any forthcoming legal agreement.

We are happy with this in principle, but may need some refining.

Welcome your thoughts.

Thanks

Ryan

Kind Regards,

Ryan Dawson
Interim Director, Planning and Economic Development

Broxtowe Borough Council
Planning and Economic Development
Foster Avenue
Beeston
Nottingham
NG9 1AB

Tel: 01159173653



www.broxtowe.gov.uk

From: Robert Gardner <Robert.Gardner@bloorhomes.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 9:58 AM
To: Ryan Dawson <Ryan.Dawson@broxtowe.gov.uk>
Cc: Jan Witko <jan.witko@nottsgov.uk>
Subject: Toton Obligation

Ryan,

Latest version of the proposed obligation is attached.

We're happy for you to share with NH.

Regards,

Rob Gardner

Robert Gardner
Strategic Planning Director

Bloor Homes East Midlands
First Floor, 1 Wheatfield Way, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 1YG

Mob: 07773651772

Email: Robert.Gardner@bloorhomes.com



Disclaimer

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact Broxtowe Borough Council on Customerservices@broxtowe.gov.uk or telephone 0115 917 7777 . Senders and recipients of email should be aware that, under current legislation, the contents may be monitored and will be retained. The contents of the email may have to be disclosed in response to a request. This disclaimer confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses..

Bloor Homes – East Midlands

Toton West Outline Appeal

Draft Heads of Terms of Cumulative Assessment Based Planning Obligation / Condition

Draft Heads of Terms

No more than 300*** of the dwellings authorised by the permission shall be occupied until a Strategic Highway Assessment and Mitigation Strategy (SHAMS) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

The methodology for the preparation of the SHAMS shall be developed in consultation with the Highway Authority.

The methodology for the preparation of the SHAMS must identify the extent of the geographic area to be covered by it.

The SHAMS must include the following

1. Assessment of the cumulative transport impacts arising within the SHAMS area from the development traffic associated with the existing or emerging Toton and Chetwynd allocation and any planning applications which include land within the existing or emerging allocation.
2. Assessment of the interaction between the County Road Network, the Strategic Road Network and the proposed Toton Link Road.
3. Assessment of the operation and performance of the following junctions

- (i) A6002 Coventry Lane / A6007 Ilkeston Road
 - (ii) High Road / Nottingham Road;
 - (iii) Swiney Way and its interaction with Stapleford Lane;
 - (iv) the proposed Toton Link Road terminal junctions
- [A52 Bardills roundabout](#)
[A52 Bramcote roundabout](#)
[M1 J25](#)

4. A draft condition / obligation (the Chetwynd connection condition / obligation) which is to be attached to future planning permissions for development on the Chetwynd Barracks site to ensure the delivery of a connection between the Link Road / Chetwynd spur and the Chetwynd site.

5. Identify all potential highway infrastructure, traffic management measures or other mitigation that might reasonably be required to mitigate cumulative impact across the geographic area considered by the SHAMS. The identification of mitigation measures shall not place any obligation on the developer to fund or deliver mitigation required to address cumulative impacts beyond [the extent to which such impacts are attributable to the development authorised by this permission.](#)

6. ~~those arising from the development authorised by this permission.~~

Commented [CT1]: Where has the 300 homes trigger point been derived from? This should be evidence based

Commented [SO2]: Suggest that this be amended to “submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the relevant Highway Authority”

Commented [SO3]: Change to Local Road Network

Commented [SO4]: Amendment to ensure that the developer may be required to contribute proportionately towards mitigation of cumulative impacts attributable to the development, whilst maintaining protection against liability for impacts not attributable to the development.

6. Identify highway infrastructure, traffic management measures or other mitigation that could reasonably be required to mitigate the impacts of the development authorised by this permission ('the Toton West Mitigation measures'). This exercise shall be carried out with reference to any relevant planning permissions within the SHAMS area.
7. Provide details of the proposed timing, phasing and trigger points for the implementation of the identified any agreed Toton West mitigation measures to be delivered in association with this permission;
8. The Local Planning Authority and Highways Authority will review the SHAMS and provide timely feedback on its provisions [**need legal wording for this, plus a review mechanism and time constraints for the Councils**]
9. Toton West Mitigation Measures, if approved by the relevant highway authorities, shall then be delivered in accordance with the agreed SHAMS.
10. Chetwynd connection condition / obligation shall be attached to future planning permissions for the development of the Chetwynd site.

Commented [S05]: If the intention is that mitigation identified under paragraph 5 can be carried forward into delivery obligations under paragraphs 6 and 7, I would have thought that there ought to be a link between them. Something along the lines of "The Toton West Mitigation Measures may include any highway infrastructure, traffic management measures or other mitigation identified pursuant to paragraph 5 to the extent that such measures are reasonably attributable to the impacts of the development authorised by this permission" to be inserted at the end of the current drafting?

Explanation

Bloor controls land which comprises part of emerging Policy 21 in the Examination version of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP).

Emerging Policy 21 is a housing lead, mixed used, allocation which comprises land at Toton, controlled by Bloor, and the Chetwynd Barracks site, controlled the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). The DIO is the land and property department of the Ministry of Defence.

Bloor's land comprises three parcels – West, East and North. All of the West and East parcels are within the emerging allocation. Some of the North parcel is within the emerging allocation and some is outside it. Bloor is promoting the inclusion of all of the North parcel in the allocation at the ongoing GNSP Examination in Public (EiP).

Much of Bloor's landholdings are already allocated for housing in the adopted development plan.

Planning applications have been submitted on all of Bloor's sites, as follows; West – outline (at appeal) and hybrid; East – detailed application; north – outline application.

The creation of a link road, "the Toton Link Road" has long been promoted as the solution to accommodating traffic from the existing and emerging allocations. Two attempts to secure public funding for the link road (HIF and Levelling Up) have been unsuccessful.

The link road would connect Stapleford Lane, between the East and West parcels, with the A52, in the North Parcel. In addition, a spur would connect the link road to the Chetwynd site.

Neither Broxtowe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council or National Highways intend to deliver the link road. The ~~adopted and~~ emerging Local Plans assume the link road is to be delivered by a private sector party; Bloor Homes.

Bloor intend to deliver the link road as part of the implementation of three planning permissions (West (hybrid or outline) East and North).

The Borough Council, County Council ~~and National Highways~~ acknowledge there is no town planning justification to insist that development on the whole allocation is consented through a single application.

Commented [CT6]: The Broxtowe LP did not consider the new link road

Commented [CT7]: NH haven't been asked this question

Bloor has instructed consultants SYSTRA to use the "East Midlands Gateway Model" to assess the effectiveness of the link road in mitigating traffic impacts from the emerging allocation. The draft results of this exercise demonstrate that the proposed link road would deliver the mitigation expected of it.

The unverified transportation modelling work carried out to date confirms-suggests that traffic generated by Bloor's West, East and North parcels could be accommodated on the highway network without the need for a connection between the Toton and Chetwynd parcels.

The Toton and Chetwynd allocation will be brought forward in phases. Development on the sites controlled by Bloor is likely to commence first. Development on Chetwynd will come forward in due course.

Bloor expects the Borough Council, County Council and National Highways to maintain control over the delivery of the link road through conditions, obligations or both attached to the three permissions (West, East and North).

Bloor also expects the Borough Council, County Council and National Highways to maintain control over any appropriate improvements or mitigation on the network required in addition to the link road through conditions, obligations or both attached to the three permissions (West, East and North).

Conditions and obligations attached to permissions will control key matters including; the alignment and specification of the road and the triggers for its commencement and completion of its component parts.

Bloor expects the developer of the Chetwynd part of the emerging allocation to make a financial contribution towards the cost of constructing the link road and the Chetwynd Spur. The mechanism for this is to be defined by a condition and or obligation attached to a future planning permission (s) to develop the Chetwynd site. The mechanism is needed to ensure the Chetwynd part of the proposed allocation can be delivered using use the Link Road and Chetwynd spur.

An outline application is currently the subject of an appeal against non-determination. A committee resolution from Broxtowe Borough Council confirms its support for the proposals, subject to withdrawal of objections from Nottinghamshire County Council and National Highways.

The only areas of disagreement between Bloor and Nottinghamshire County Council / National Highways relate to highways matters. NCC and NH are broadly content that traffic from the West site only is unlikely to have a severe impact on the highway network after appropriate mitigation measures are applied. National Highways can't say either way at this time as the updated junction modelling files were only submitted on 31 July 2026.

Commented [CT8]: Not true. The Toton West junction impact assessment review is incomplete

The County Council and National Highways wish to receive a cumulative assessment of the potential impacts of new traffic on the highway network surrounding the Toton and Chetwynd allocation. The assessment will factor in the mitigation delivered by the link road. It will also inform other potential mitigation that may reasonably be required in addition to the link road;

The Borough Council, County Council and National Highways will use the cumulative assessment as the starting point for assessing the highways impacts of future applications.

The County Council and National Highways also wish reserve the opportunity to request further appropriate mitigation from the West site if the assessment of cumulative impacts indicates this would be necessary and reasonable, and that the schemes are in alignment. -

Bloor is willing to add additional provisions to the draft S.106 agreement relating to the preparation of a cumulative assessment.

APPENDIX B

From: Steve Freek
Sent: 05 December 2025 11:14
To: Josh Norris
Cc: Law, Daniel; Jessica Leung
Subject: Toton Sites - Strategic Modelling Update

Categories: Yellow Category

Hi Josh,

Thank you for sharing two technical notes TN01 - Toton EMGM Strategic Modelling Validation v1.3 & TN02 - Toton - Reference Case Assumptions v1.1 in support of three applications at Toton in Nottingham as outlined below.

- Toton North (App Ref: 25/00306/OUT);
- Toton East (App Ref: 25/00255/FUL); and,
- Toton West (App Ref: 25/00371/OUT).

We have reviewed the technical notes and have a few comments.

General

The East Midlands Gateway Model has a base year of 2016, which is now quite outdated given the significant changes over the past ten years, including the impacts on travel behaviour and patterns due to COVID. Ideally, we recommend that a more recent traffic model be used for the Traffic Assessment; however, considering that an alternative EMCA model is under development, we are prepared to accept the use of this model in this instance. We recommend that local authorities consider updating the model to a more recent year for any future use.

Document TN01 – TOTON EMGM STRATEGIC MODELLING VALIDATION

Area of influence

We are satisfied with the Area of Influence (AOI) being defined by a change in traffic flows of $\pm 5\%$ compared to the 2041 EMGM, a change in traffic flow exceeding 30 vehicles, or where development-generated traffic causes the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to exceed 85%.

We are also content with the final AOI presented in Figure 2. Could you clarify whether the 2041 future-year model was used to derive the AOI?

Link calibration and validation

We note that, for total vehicles AOI link calibration, the AM and PM peak modelled flows satisfy the TAG 'Pass' criteria, while for validation, the AM-peak accuracy is only 79 per cent, and the PM is 80 per cent.

We also observe that, for the SRN link car validation, the AM and PM peak accuracy is only 80 per cent; however, overall, the combined AM and PM peak total flows still meet the TAG 'Pass' threshold, which we consider acceptable.

Reviewing the spatial analysis presented in Figure 3 and Figure 4, we note that the count locations on the SRN that fail are dispersed, except for the two locations listed below:

- M1J25; and
- A52 Bramcote Island

While Appendix A provides further information on the links that are failing, we struggled to identify the exact links as the link IDs for AM and PM appear to be changing and are not consistent with those presented in the 'SRN Count Location References' figure. For example, the table in Appendix A lists reference ID 9 as 'M1 J25 - ARM C WB' in the AM peak, while in the PM peak, reference ID 9 is shown as 'M1: J24A-J25', whereas in 'SRN Count Location References' this appears to be the A52 EB slip road to M1 Junction 25. Could the details from the Appendix A table for these two junctions be presented more clearly?

Journey Time validation

We note that journey time validation information has been provided for the following two Strategic Road Network (SRN) routes in proximity to the development site.

- M1 – Between Junctions 23 and 29
- A52 – Between Derby and Nottingham (SRN sections only)

Journey time routes that do not meet the TAG 'Pass' criteria are listed below:

In AM peak:

M1 southbound: the modelled journey time is faster by 18 per cent, exceeding the TAG 'Pass' criterion by 3 per cent. Table 3 of the Technical Note incorrectly labels this route as 'slow'; it should be corrected to 'fast'. We also note that, 34 km southbound from the origin, the difference between modelled and observed journey times shows the model running much slower on the approach to J25 and much faster thereafter. Consequently, while strategic trip choice is likely acceptable, the modelled flows and congestion levels at M1 J25 may be inaccurate. This discrepancy should be recorded and revisited if mitigation at this junction is required.

A52 Westbound: The modelled journey time is faster by 21 per cent (-140 seconds), exceeding the TAG 'Pass' criterion threshold by 6 per cent (-40 seconds). The exact start and end points for this journey time route are not mentioned; however, it appears from Figure 10 that most of the divergence occurs in the eastern section. Could a description of the timing points for this route be provided?

In PM peak:

A52 Eastbound: The modelled journey time is slower by 24 per cent (+153 seconds), exceeding the TAG 'Pass' criterion threshold by 9 per cent (+57 seconds). While the journey time graph in Figure 11 shows that this route is passing! We interpret from the graph that the modelled journey time is approximately 700 seconds, whereas Table 4 indicates a value of 799 seconds. Could this anomaly be clarified?

Document TN02 - TOTON - REFERENCE CASE ASSUMPTIONS

Section 2.1.7

We note that TRICS 7.5.1 has been used for the trip rates rather than the latest version of TRICS. Our understanding is that using the latest TRICS in conjunction with the EMGM model is likely to create issues with the forecasting procedures. Could you please clarify this?

Section 3.2.1

Please confirm that the inclusion of committed infrastructure and development proposals will adhere to the criteria listed in TAG Unit M4 Table A2.

Section 3.2.1, Table 2

Regarding the committed infrastructure schemes presented in Table 2, reproduced below, briefly what do the following schemes comprise:

- M1 J20 - M1 J27 improvements

In addition, A50 J3a proposed Deepdale Lane GSJ – any reason why this scheme is not included?

Section 3.2.2, Tables 6 to 8

We recommend that any development or scheme not adhering to Table 9 TAG guidance in your note be excluded from core scenarios and, if required, be tested as a sensitivity scenario.

Section 3.3, Table 9

Reference Case Committed and Proposed Development Inputs to be agreed with local authorities based on TAG guidance provided in Unit M4 Table A2.

Subject to satisfactory response to our queries raised above, we will be happy to approve the base model for Toton Assessments.

It is important to note that these comments imply no pre-determined view of the acceptability of the proposed development in traffic, environmental or highway terms. These comments relate specifically to matters arising from National Highways' responsibilities to manage and maintain the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England in line with DfT's Circular 01/2022 to support sustainable delivery of growth. Comments relating to the Local Road Network should be sought from the Local Highway Authority

Regards

Steve Freek, MCIHT

Assistant Spatial Planner – Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, N Leicestershire

National Highways (Area 7), Stirling House, Lakeside Court, Osier Drive, Sherwood Business Park
Nottingham NG15 0DS

Tel: 0300 470 4457

Mob: 07712 543047

Email: steve.freek@nationalhighways.co.uk

My working days are Tuesday - Friday

For information about our engagement with the planning system please visit: :

<https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-roads/planning-and-the-strategic-road-network-in-england/>



From: Josh Norris <joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk>

Sent: 20 November 2025 11:33

To: Planning M <PlanningM@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Brittany Grosvenor <brittany.grosvenor@nationalhighways.co.uk>; pabc@broxtowe.gov.uk; Matt Leek <Matt.Leek@nottscc.gov.uk>; Mark.Thompson@broxtowe.gov.uk; Oliver.Wells@broxtowe.gov.uk; development management <development.management@nottscc.gov.uk>

Cc: O'MARA Helen <homara@systra.com>; IRONS Duncan <dirons@systra.com>; Patrick Magner <patrickmagner@modetransport.co.uk>; Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>; Rebecca Mcaleenan <rebeccamcaleenan@modetransport.co.uk>

Subject: Toton Sites - Strategic Modelling Update

Morning All,

I trust you're all keeping well.

Just by way of an introduction, mode transport planning is assisting Bloor Homes in relation to the post-application elements of the transport modelling work for the three live planning applications at Toton:

- Toton North (App Ref: 25/00306/OUT);
- Toton East (App Ref: 25/00255/FUL); and,

- Toton West (App Ref: 25/00371/OUT).

Owing to the comments received in response to the various live applications, mode (on behalf of Bloor Homes) has approached SYSTRA, who operate the East Midlands Gateway Model (EMGM), in order to consider an updated assessment for the three live applications.

As part of the standard methodology for utilising the EMGM, SYSTRA have completed an initial Area of Influence (AOI) modelling run, using an existing version of the EMGM, to identify the key areas where developments impacts are likely to occur, from which an assessment of the fitness for purpose of the model with the AOI has been made. Please see attached Technical Note (TN01) which details the process and outcomes of the AOI assessment. I have cc'd in Helen and Duncan who are our contacts at SYSTRA for the relevant work which has been undertaken using the EMGM.

The note presents the AOI and assesses the level of validation and calibration achieved against the Department's guidance detailed in TAG. The TN concludes that the EMGM is 'Fit for Purpose' for the assessment of the proposed developments at Toton. The note is attached **above** for your consideration, and I would be grateful if you could please provide any comments / queries on the attached by COP next Friday (28th November), so we can move with the next steps of the modelling work.

SYSTRA have also prepare a Reference Case Assumptions Note (TN02) which defines the inputs to the relevant Do Minimum model in terms of infrastructure and development inclusions. Please could any comments / queries on TN02 be provided by Friday 6th December.

If helpful, it may be appropriate to arrange a teams call with all parties so any queries tabled can be discussed further. Please let me know if this would be helpful and I can circulate some dates / times to see when everyone is available.

Many thanks in advance for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards,

Josh

Josh Norris BSc (Hons) MSc MCIHT
Associate

☎ 0121 794 8390

☎ 07990 276 384

✉ joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk

www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning

Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW

keep up with mode: [in](#) [tw](#) [f](#)



be green, keep it on the screen!

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

APPENDIX C

From: Catherine Townend
Sent: 30 July 2026 16:30
To: David Frisby
Cc: Ben Fairgrieve; Josh Norris; Patrick Magner; Jan Witko; planningappeals; PABC; Law, Daniel
Subject: Toton West - Outstanding modelling items
Attachments: NH Comments Log_A52 Land W of Stapleford Ln - v1.xlsx; Re: [SendTo for SYSTRA] HARRHY Huw has dropped off files for you; MIDLANDS - Toton West - Post-Application Response to Standalone Assessment Queries

Hi David,

Thank you for sharing SYSTRA's response (titled *NH responses v2.docx*) with responses to our queries (your email of 8 July).

We also acknowledge the email sent on 23 July (attached), which we note states that output files for Scenario 4 can be downloaded and that an accompanying report shall follow. This has not yet been reviewed considering the accompanying report is not yet available which we anticipate provides necessary context, and given that this was submitted whilst the review of *NH responses v2* was still underway. Submitting data and evidence in clear response to requested outstanding matters would assist progress in closing out all outstanding matters.

Ahead of the submission of proofs next week, I hope to summarise in this email the outstanding modelling matters (from NH perspective).

Cumulative Assessment

For ease, we have now created an attached comments log to track and close the pending issues. The attached log relates to the cumulative modelling only.

Could you please review our further comments and provide your response to help progress towards closing them out? We note that it is mentioned by SYSTRA that TN03 was shared with Mode (the response states "*sent to Josh 27/02/2026*"), but we cannot find it. Could you kindly share for our review?

Alongside this, we recommend the following model files be shared with us, as they may help resolve many of our queries more quickly:

We request the SATURN model assignment files (.UFS files) from SYSTRA for us to review the model coding and results for the following scenarios in the AM and PM peaks, along with the observed data and validation dashboard for M1 J25 and A52 Brian Clough Way:

1. Base Year
2. Reference Case 2041
3. Do Something Scenarios 2041

Standalone Junction Assessments

We have still not received the updated LinSig files and some associated data. We last requested these on 14 July (attached again for ease). We cannot validate the LinSig models and ultimately the standalone assessment until we have received these.

Kind regards

Catherine Townend

Spatial Planner

Midlands Operations Directorate – *Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and North Leicestershire*

catherine.townend@nationalhighways.co.uk

Mobile: +44 (0) 7710 365579

Web: www.nationalhighways.co.uk

My working days are Monday to Thursday

For information on working with National Highways on planning matters, please see the below guidance:

https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/imvluu5w/final-cre23_0370-nh-planning-guide-2023.pdf

From: David Frisby <davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk>

Sent: 08 July 2026 09:58

To: Steve Freek <Steve.Freek@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Catherine Townend

<Catherine.Townend@nationalhighways.co.uk>

Cc: Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>; Josh Norris <joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk>; Patrick

Magner <patrickmagner@modetransport.co.uk>; Jack Smyth <js@no5.com>; Harjinder Jheeta

<Harjinder.Jheeta@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Jan Witko <jan.witko@nottsc.gov.uk>;

planningappeals@broxtowe.gov.uk; PABC <pabc@broxtowe.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: National Highways comments on TN01, TN02 and TN04 (Toton EMGM cumulative modelling)

Dear Steve

This was sent to Catherine yesterday evening; I forward now to you as well for completeness

Thank you

Kind regards,

David

David Frisby BEng (CEng) FCIHT
Director



0121 794 8391



07812 049 202



davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk

www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning

Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW



be green, keep it on the screen!

From: David Frisby <davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk>

Date: Tuesday, 7 July 2026 at 17:42

To: Catherine Townend <Catherine.Townend@nationalhighways.co.uk>

Cc: Daniel Law <daniel.law@aecom.com>; Jessica Leung <Jessica.Leung@aecom.com>; Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>; Josh Norris <joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk>; Patrick Wagner <patrickmagner@modetransport.co.uk>

Subject: Re: National Highways comments on TN01, TN02 and TN04 (Toton EMGM cumulative modelling)

Dear Catherine

Comments back from Systra in relation to the queries raised by AECOM.

Kind regards,

David

David Frisby BEng (CEng) FCIHT
Director

 0121 794 8391

 07812 049 202

 davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk

www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning

Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW

keep up with mode:   



be green, keep it on the screen!

From: Catherine Townend <Catherine.Townend@nationalhighways.co.uk>

Date: Thursday, 2 July 2026 at 11:04

To: David Frisby <davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk>

Cc: Daniel Law <daniel.law@aecom.com>; Jessica Leung <Jessica.Leung@aecom.com>; Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>; Josh Norris <joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk>; Patrick Wagner <patrickmagner@modetransport.co.uk>

Subject: National Highways comments on TN01, TN02 and TN04 (Toton EMGM cumulative modelling)

Morning David,

Thanks for your email yesterday evening containing a draft SoCG. I will look at that today although I didn't want to delay sending you our comments on your previous submissions.

Firstly, thank you for your previous response to our queries related to TN01 and TN02, provided on 29 May (attached). AECOM (on behalf of NH) has reviewed these responses and outstanding items are detailed below.

The base model struggles to replicate flows at the following four links. Therefore, these links should be included in detailed assessment, irrespective of what V/C ratios show.

Our observations on the comments received:

1. **AM Link ID 6 (Derby Rd/Brian Clough Way/Nottingham Rd, Arm F EB):**
 - Confirmed as the 'Eastbound A52 on-slip at Spondon Roundabout'. Figure 3 does not show this. The model overestimates traffic by 40% in the AM. Please clarify how this will be accounted for in interpreting forecast results.
2. **AM Link ID 4 (M1 J25, Arm D NB):**
 - Modelled flows are 20% higher than observed in the AM peak, likely resulting in higher V/C in the model than in reality. This discrepancy will carry forward to future scenarios, possibly masking real changes in V/C. How will this be addressed in future modelling?
3. **AM/PM Link ID 9 (M1 J25, Arm C WB):**
 - Confirmed as 'Eastbound off-slip of the A52 at M1 J25'. Modelled flows are up to 60% higher than observed.
4. **AM/PM Link ID 16 (M1 J25, Arm F EB):**
 - Confirmed as 'Eastbound on-slip of the A52 at M1 J25'. Modelled flows are 30% less than observed.

While 3 arms are affected at M1 J25, we see from the trip distribution that these arms are used by the development traffic and could impact / misreport the overall junction capacity (noting this is a signalised junction).

As previously mentioned, if an intervention is required, the following junctions/links will require further agreement on detailed assessment methodology, as the strategic model does not validate adequately at these locations:

- M1 J25
- Bramcote Island
- A52 westbound near Lodge Lane
- Derby Rd/Brian Clough Way/Nottingham Rd (Link ID 6 – subject to confirmation)

Review of TN04 – Strategic Modelling Draft Report

We note that we have not received or reviewed TN03 (reference case definitions and modelling scenario), which is regularly referred to in TN04 and used for comparison. As such, our comments below assume that differences between reference and development scenarios include both

development trips and associated network changes, with same background traffic and no further mitigation.

Please note our comments below on TN04:

1. **Chetwynd Development Inclusion:**

- TN04 does not mention inclusion of Chetwynd development (1,500 units), whereas an email from David Frisby (June 2026) states this scenario includes Chetwynd. Please clarify if Chetwynd is included in all scenarios, including the reference case?

2. **Reference Case Assumptions (Section 7.1):**

- Please confirm the assumptions for the “respective reference cases” mentioned.

3. **Background Traffic Reassignment (Section 7.2.8):**

- Can a wider area plot be shared, showing redistribution effects on background traffic, covering A38 and Leicestershire (possibly A38 and A50) for a fuller picture?

4. **Flow Changes (Section 7.2.12 onwards):**

- Why are there no changes in traffic volumes on M1 south, given that many development trips use this route in the distribution and reassignment plots?

5. **Figures 15 and 16:**

- These figures may be mis-represented, especially M1 J25, considering some approaches are modelled with higher flows than observed. This may show overcapacity in the base/reference case and little change in Scenario 3 even with added trips?

6. **Table 2:**

- Why does only the 2026 AM peak show an increase in overcapacity queues, while this decreases for 2026 PM and 2041 AM/PM?

7. **Comparing Tables 2 and 3:**

- The statistics do not show consistency within years or between peaks. Can this be explained?

8. **Scenario 3 with Link Road:**

- While the report concludes that Scenario 3 leads to overall congestion improvement, AM 2026 is an outlier with more overcapacity queues. Also, the lack of impact on M1 south needs further investigation, as flow difference plots show no change, yet distribution plots indicate significant development traffic on this route. Please provide a wider area plot capturing all rerouting in respective peaks/years.

We look forward to receiving responses to the above points.

Kind regards

Catherine Townend

Spatial Planner

Midlands Operations Directorate – Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and North Leicestershire

catherine.townend@nationalhighways.co.uk

Mobile: +44 (0) 7710 365579

Web: www.nationalhighways.co.uk

My working days are Monday to Thursday

Upcoming leave: 6th – 17th July 2026

For information on working with National Highways on planning matters, please see the below guidance:

https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/imvluu5w/final-cre23_0370-nh-planning-guide-2023.pdf

From: David Frisby <davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk>

Sent: 12 June 2026 16:57

To: Jan Witko <jan.witko@nottscc.gov.uk>; Catherine Townend <catherine.townend@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Darren Ottewell <darren.ottewell@broxtowe.gov.uk>; Spencer Claye <spencer.claye@bloorhomes.com>; Robert Gardner <robert.gardner@bloorhomes.com>; James Hicks <james.hicks@pegasusgroup.co.uk>; Alan Siviter <alan.siviter@pegasusgroup.co.uk>

Cc: Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>; Josh Norris <joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk>; Patrick Magner <patrickmagner@modetransport.co.uk>

Subject: Toton EMGM cumulative modelling results

Dear Jan/Catherine,

We are pleased to inform you that the EMGM strategic modelling has now assessed the full Toton allocation, comprising Toton West (420 dwellings), Toton East (155 dwellings) and Toton North (880 dwellings), together with the Chetwynd Barracks (1,500) allocation.

The assessment therefore responds directly to the requests made by National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council for a cumulative assessment of the wider growth area.

The modelling demonstrates that the Toton Link Road performs the strategic function for which it was envisaged. Development traffic is principally accommodated via the A52 and M1 Strategic Road Network, whilst the Link Road provides an alternative route that removes traffic from existing constrained parts of the local network, particularly around Bardills Roundabout and Toton Lane.

Whilst the introduction of the new signalised junction on the A52 inevitably alters traffic patterns, the modelling shows that traffic redistributes across the wider network and that the Link Road successfully relieves pressure on key existing routes.

Importantly, the assessment identifies a general improvement in network performance across much of the area. Reductions in traffic flow and congestion are observed on several existing routes and at key junctions. The modelling also demonstrates that a significant proportion of development traffic is attracted directly to the Strategic Road Network, thereby limiting impacts on the surrounding local highway network.

Accordingly, the strategic modelling confirms that the full Toton allocation, including Toton West, can be accommodated within the highway network and that the Toton Link Road fulfils its intended role as the principal piece of transport infrastructure supporting growth in the area.

The results provide clear evidence that the allocation can be delivered in a coordinated manner and do not identify any network-wide impacts that would justify withholding planning permission for Toton West.

I would welcome a discussion around this next week at your earliest convenience.

Kind regards,

David

David Frisby BEng (CEng) FCIHT

Director

☎ 0121 794 8391

☎ 07812 049 202

✉ davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk

www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning

Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW

keep up with mode: [in](#) [twitter](#) [f](#)



be green, keep it on the screen!

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Three Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Three Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Three Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

NH responses v2.docx by Systra

Sl No	NH Query - 02/07/2026	Consultants Response - 07/07/2026	NH Comments - 30-07-2026	Consultants Response - xx/xx/2026
1	The base model struggles to replicate flows at the following four links. Therefore, these links should be included in detailed assessment, irrespective of what V/C ratios show.	The EMGAI is a large strategic model and whilst we aim to achieve validation in the AOI for each study it is not always possible to achieve this for every count without extensive recalibration of the model. We use our knowledge of the model and the local area to determine if this would be appropriate for the scale of the study, on this occasion we did not think it was necessary. Should any junctions require mitigating, detailed junction modelling will be carried out where modelled flows can be furnished.	We agree that detailed junction assessment will require furnishing, the methodology for which should be agreed in due course. Furnishing would be informed by the flow changes in the strategic model, which clearly show that the junctions and road section likely to be affected by the Toton development includes M1 J25 and the A52 Brian Clough Way. Accordingly, the strategic model is expected either to reflect local conditions or to be refined if it fails to meet the TAG pass criteria in the local area. The junctions in question cannot be ignored simply because the model was not originally intended to test this stretch.	

NH responses v2.docx by Systra

TN01 - Toton EMGM Strategic Modelling Validation v1.4.docx

Sl No	NH Query - 02/07/2026	Consultants Response - 07/07/2026	NH Comments - 30-07-2026	
1	1.AM Link ID 6 (Derby Rd/Brian Clough Way/Nottingham Rd, Arm F EB): - Confirmed as the 'Eastbound A52 on-slip at Spondon Roundabout'. Figure 3 does not show this. The model overestimates traffic by 40% in the AM. Please clarify how this will be accounted for in interpreting forecast results.	Please see a zoomed in plot below showing the link IDs around Spondon Roundabout. This junction is located in Derby, some distance from the proposed development.	While the junction is located some distance away on the other side of the motorway, it is still on the A52 SRN and within the AOI. If this approach breaches our AOI threshold criteria, we will require a detailed assessment at this junction.	
2	2.AM Link ID 4 (M1 J25, Arm D NB): - Modelled flows are 20% higher than observed in the AM peak, likely resulting in higher V/C in the model than in reality. This discrepancy will carry forward to future scenarios, possibly masking real changes in V/C. How will this be addressed in future modelling?	Whilst the modelled flow is higher than the observed flow, the V/C for the link and the approach to the junction are not over capacity. This means that any further usage of the link in future years will show up in V/C analysis. It also means that because there is still capacity available, there is no effect on strategic route choice in future years.	To our knowledge, M1 J25 regularly experiences M1 off-slip queues reaching the M1 mainline. We would like to review the model at this junction. Could you please share the model .JFS files along with the observed flow used to inform the model so that we can satisfy ourselves with the model performance?	
3	3.AM/PM Link ID 9 (M1 J25, Arm C WB): - Confirmed as 'Eastbound off-slip of the A52 at M1 J25'. Modelled flows are up to 60% higher than observed.	As with Link ID 4, the link and approach to the junction are not over capacity, meaning that any further usage of the link in future years will show up in V/C analysis. There would therefore be no effect on strategic route choice in future years.	To our knowledge, M1 J25 regularly experiences queues on the A52. We would like to review the model at this junction. Could you please share the model .JFS files, along with the observed data to which it is calibrated, so that we can be assured of the model's accuracy?	
4	4.AM/PM Link ID 16 (M1 J25, Arm F EB): - Confirmed as 'Eastbound on-slip of the A52 at M1 J25'. Modelled flows are 30% less than observed.	Noted.	To our knowledge, M1 J25 regularly experiences queues on the A52. We would like to review the model at this junction. Could you please share the model .JFS files, along with the observed data to which it is calibrated, so that we can be assured of the model's accuracy?	
5	While 3 arms are affected at M1 J25, we see from the trip distribution that these arms are used by the development traffic and could impact / misreport the overall junction capacity (noting this is a signalised junction). As previously mentioned, if an intervention is required, the following junctions/links will require further agreement on detailed assessment methodology, as the strategic model does not validate adequately at these locations: •M1 J25 •Bramcote Island •A52 westbound near Lodge Lane •Derby Rd/Brian Clough Way/Nottingham Rd (Link ID 6 – subject to confirmation)	As well as at M1 J25, the links at Bramcote Island that have more modelled flow than observed flow have V/C ratios that are not over capacity, so there is still remaining capacity.	To our knowledge, Bramcote Island regularly experiences queues. We would like to review the model at this junction. Could you please share the model .JFS files with us so that we can be satisfied with the model.	

NH responses v2.docx by Systra

Review of TN04 – Strategic Modelling Draft Report

Sl No	NH Query - 02/07/2026	Consultants Response - 07/07/2026	NH Comments - 30-07-2026	
1	We note that we have not received or reviewed TN03 (reference case definitions and modelling scenario), which is regularly referred to in TN04 and used for comparison. As such, our comments below assume that differences between reference and development scenarios include both development trips and associated network changes, with same background traffic and no further mitigation.	sent to Josh 27/02/2026	Can TN03 be shared with us?	
2	1.Chetwynd Development Inclusion: - TN04 does not mention inclusion of Chetwynd development (1,500 units), whereas an email from David Fridley (June 2026) states this scenario includes Chetwynd. Please clarify if Chetwynd is included in all scenarios, including the reference case?	Chetwynd is included in all scenarios including the reference case. It does not have any additional infrastructure that may be required to deliver the development with access provided off Stapleford Lane. Details of the reference cases are provided in TN02.	Noted. Can you please confirm that all demand from the Chetwynd development is able to load onto the network, and that no demand is held back within the development zone?	
3	2.Reference Case Assumptions (Section 7.1): - Please confirm the assumptions for the "respective reference cases" mentioned.	Details of the reference cases are provided in TN02 which has been sent previously and reviewed.	Noted/closed.	
4	3.Background Traffic Reassignment (Section 7.2.8): - Can a wider area plot be shared, showing redistribution effects on background traffic, covering A38 and Leicestershire (possibly A38 and A50) for a fuller picture?	Please see the plots showing a wider area at the end of this document. Note that further from the development, the impacts get smaller and sit within the 'No significant change' band.	Thank you for sharing the wider area plots. Referring back to section 7.2.8, we are unable to align the analysis with the plots. Regarding traffic rerouting, the section states, "This includes routes away from the immediate vicinity of the development, such as the A38 between Derby and the M1 and the A46 between Leicester and the A606 (both not shown in the plots)." We understand that the reassignment represents the OS background traffic (OS flows minus development traffic) compared to the reference case background traffic (without development). Therefore, the overall number of background trips should remain the same, and the plot should reflect only the changes in route choice. Consequently, the overall reduction in trips should be balanced by an increase in trips on other roads, which we cannot see in the reassignment plots. Could you please confirm our understanding of the reassignment trips and the analysis presented here?	
5	4.Flow Changes (Section 7.2.12 onwards): - Why are there no changes in traffic volumes on M1 south, given that many development trips use this route in the distribution and reassignment plots?	The distribution plots show where traffic from the development are travelling, the distribution plots have an increase in traffic on the M1 south. The reassignment plots show the change in background traffic. This is calculated by removing the development trips from the overall flows. This plot shows a decrease in the background traffic on the M1 South. The overall flow change plot has no change on the M1 South as the site distribution and the reassignment are in effect cancelling each other out.	Our understanding is that development traffic will displace some background traffic from motorway sections where alternative routes offer a lower generalised cost. Therefore, once the development trips load onto the motorway, a proportion of background trips should divert to other routes, but the motorway should still carry a higher overall volume, unless it is operating at capacity and can accept no additional traffic. Please confirm that the VDM has been run only for the reference case, and that, for the development scenario, the development trips have simply been added to this reference case within the highways-only model, without re-running the VDM. If the development scenario has been run through the VDM, this could explain some of the anomalies we are observing, and we would need to investigate the results in more detail.	
6	5.Figures 15 and 16: - These figures may be mis-represented, especially M1 J25, considering some approaches are modelled with higher flows than observed. This may show overcapacity in the base/reference case and little change in Scenario 3 even with added trips?	As identified in our responses to your comments on TN01/TN02 above, the identified approaches to the M1 J25 roundabout and Bardills Roundabout are below capacity in the base model. Because there is still capacity on these approaches, it is expected that the additional traffic in the Future Year models will be able to take up this route. Any significant increase in traffic would show up on congestion change plots.	Can your response be supported by any observed queue and delay data? To our knowledge, this is a congested section of the network and regularly experiences queues.	
7	6.Table 2: - Why does only the 2026 AM peak show an increase in overcapacity queues, while this decreases for 2026 PM and 2041 AM/PM?	All scenarios show a general decrease in congestion across the AOI with increases at the new junctions created for the Toton Link Road. In 2026 AM traffic has chosen to stay on the most direct route along the A52 despite it being slower and taking longer leading to an increase in congestion of 12 PCU hrs. In 2041 AM traffic is rat running along a variety of routes, travelling for greater distance, due to increases at Clifton Boulevard which sits outside of the AOI and therefore is not included in the statistics. It is possible for us to extend the AOI if it is deemed necessary.	Thank you for clarifying that the Network Statistics are reported only for the AOI, in which case the network statistics may change due to wider route choice. Closed.	
8	7.Comparing Tables 2 and 3: - The statistics do not show consistency within years or between peaks. Can this be explained?	All of the scenarios are seeing similar changes in terms of congestion change and flow change within the plots. Some of these changes are occurring outside of the AOI therefore the statistics may be slightly skewed.	Noted/closed.	
9	8.Scenario 3 with Link Road: - While the report concludes that Scenario 3 leads to overall congestion improvement, AM 2026 is an outlier with more overcapacity queues. Also, the lack of impact on M1 south needs further investigation, as flow difference plots show no change, yet distribution plots indicate significant development traffic on this route. Please provide a wider area plot capturing all rerouting in respective peaks/years.	See answers above explaining what we are seeing within the modelling. Plot provided.	As mentioned earlier, please provide the relevant .JFS files for our review to facilitate faster closure of the comments and final conclusions.	
10				

From: Steve Freek
Sent: 14 July 2026 09:18
To: Josh Norris
Cc: Catherine Townend; Daniel Law; Jessica Leung
Subject: MIDLANDS - Toton West - Post-Application Response to Standalone Assessment Queries

Hi Josh,

Further to your email below, we have reviewed your Technical Note dated 24 June 2026 in response to our previous comments sent on 15 June 2026, relating to the Outline Planning Application for up to 420 residential dwelling on the land located to the west of the B6003 Stapleford Lane in Broxtowe, Nottinghamshire (Broxtowe Borough Council's Application reference 25/00371/OUT) (Toton West).

Based on our review of the TN004 provided, we would comment as follows:

Cumulative Assessment - EMGM

We welcome the applicant preparing the cumulative assessment of the developments in Toton West, East and North using the EMGM, which is to be provided for our review separately. Once we receive the latest submission of this EMGM assessment by the applicant, we shall endeavor to review and provide comments within the usual 2-3 week consultation period.

Distribution Assumptions

While we agree that the impact of the distribution to and via Zone G for MSOA in Broxtowe and Nottingham are unlikely to generate significant changes to the demands on the SRN when considering the Toton West development independently, we are now content with the updated distribution to and via Zone G.

General comments for all junctions modelled

In our previous correspondence, we requested that the applicant provide us with supporting data used to build the models. Whilst the applicant has provided us with the controller specifications documents, these do not tell us about the actual stage durations and cycle times.

Although the junctions operate under MOVA control where timings continuously adapt to the traffic levels, an analysis of the peak hour data could be undertaken to determine average signal timings. This would correspond to how LinSig models an average cycle within the peak hour. The applicant should confirm what observed signal data they have to ensure that the base models represent the observed signal timings as close as possible. Please provide any analysis that has been used to construct the models.

In relation to the traffic flow analysis spreadsheets, we appreciate that the applicant has included the traffic flow diagrams. However, we require the flow spreadsheets so we can understand how these flow diagrams link together and back to the observed data. We need to be able to confirm the flow calculations have been undertaken accurately and we need to see the analysis to confirm that is the case.

When it comes to model validation, it needs to be demonstrated that the models accurately represent the existing operation, as best as possible. Whilst we appreciate that there are limitations with queue length validation, a comparison of modelled versus observed queue length

data is better than nothing. This analysis will demonstrate that the models are as accurate as they could be and there are no major issues with the accuracy of the model which could have a severely detrimental impact on the ability of the model to forecast future development impacts.

Please can the applicant confirm whether any queue length data was collected at the time of the traffic surveys. The best way of validating models is with Degree of Saturation surveys, but we appreciate this is not always possible and the applicant may not have collected this data. When undertaking our review of the models, we will take into account these limitations of the data that the applicant has or does not have. Linking into the applicant's response about a lack of observed signal data, this provides us with more doubt about how accurately the models represent the existing operations. It is important for us to have base models as accurate as possible to give us as much confidence as possible that we understand the level of development related impact in the future year scenarios.

Although updated model input / output data has been provided in this TN004, we ask that the applicant provide us with the actual LinSig models to aid our review as not all input parameters are included in the data provided.

M1 Junction 25

Whilst we appreciate that the lane lengths on Arm 14 have been updated using a short lane flare in the model following our previous comments, we would appreciate submission of the actual model files for our review and check.

A52 Bardills Roundabout - Existing

An explanation has been provided as to the give way parameters used on the Garden Centre approach. Whilst we accept the principle of increasing the Slope and Intercept values on give way entries to signalised roundabout, we would appreciate some confirmation as to the suitability of the values chosen when it comes to reviewing the model validation information. The applicant's response also talks about possibly altering the clear conflict values to something more suitable, but as these values are not shown in the LinSig report, it is difficult to understand what has been implemented in the model.

In the absence of any model validation, we feel that it is important to understand whether the junction runs with the stage sequence in the CLF plans or not.

A52 Bardills Roundabout – Mitigation

Whilst we follow the rationale behind using the cycle time optimisation tool to change the cycle time, there is a chance that the signal controller is fixed to a specific cycle time. We would therefore advise that the applicant undertake the main mitigation test with the existing cycle time and run a sensitivity test with a revised cycle time, if needed.

A52 Bramcote Roundabout

No further comments at this time.

B6003 Park & Ride – Existing

No further comments at this time.

B6003 Park & Ride – Proposed

The applicant has been unable to provide us with a CAD drawing of the proposed layout, which is requested to ensure the modelled junction accurately reflects the actual scheme to be delivered. The responsibility lies with the applicant to demonstrate development impacts on a junction, and that that junction has been modelled accurately. In the absence of this CAD drawing, the applicant should therefore provide the necessary information to demonstrate this. Please clarify how this junction model has been built and share this such that we can verify the suitability of the measurements in the model.

Regards

Steve Freek, MCIHT

Assistant Spatial Planner – Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, N Leicestershire

National Highways (Area 7), Stirling House, Lakeside Court, Osier Drive, Sherwood Business Park Nottingham NG15 0DS

Tel: 0300 470 4457

Mob: 07712 543047

Email: steve.freek@nationalhighways.co.uk

My working days are Tuesday - Friday

For information about our engagement with the planning system please visit :

<https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-roads/planning-and-the-strategic-road-network-in-england/>



From: Josh Norris

Sent: 24 June 2026 15:37

To: Catherine Townend ; Daniel Law ; Darren Ottewell ; Ryan Dawson ; Jan Witko ; Matt Leek

Cc: Alan Siviter ; James Hicks ; Robert Gardner ; Spencer Claye ; David Frisby ; Ben Fairgrieve ; Patrick Magner ; Richard Doffman

Subject: Toton West - Post-Application Response to Standalone Assessment Queries

Afternoon All,

Further to our previous meetings and additional comments received by National Highways and Nottinghamshire Council comments received on 4th June and 16th June respectively, the following comments are provided in response in the form of a Technical Note (TN004) and relevant appendices contained in the following [WeTransfer Link](#).

The TN focuses on the standalone assessment comments presented as part of the TA and subsequent post-application response (TN003), and does not review the cumulative assessment work. It is understood that review of the model runs from the cumulative assessment work is being carried out by AECOM on behalf of National Highways and is expected to conclude by 1st July.

Off Site Pedestrian Improvements

Paragraphs 3.5.1 - 3.5.2 of the TN refer to off-site pedestrian improvement works in two locations to the south of the application site. The works are proposed as part of the “Toton East” application (Ref. no. 25/00255/FUL). The purpose of the works is to enhance accessibility for pedestrians along Stapleford Lane. Bloor is willing to facilitate the delivery of the works as part of an obligations package to accompany the grant of outline planning permission for 420 units on Toton West. We are mindful that the proposed crossings were part of a package of transport measures approved under the grant of extant planning permission ref: 12/00585/OUT and 17/00131/ROC. This permission

was secured by Peveril Homes in July 2016 and June 2017 respectively. The proposed crossings were carried forward into the planning application for Toton East. However, their location and design pre-dates the involvement of Bloor and its highways consultants, mode.

We assume the works can be carried out within the boundaries of the existing public highway, but would be grateful for confirmation from NCC before finalising commitment to delivery as part of the scheme for West. We request that delivery should be secured through a S106 contribution, with the works carried out by NCC.

Mitigation at Bardills Junction

Following a review of the modelling comments provided by NH, we have noted that a further improvement in capacity could be achieved through a minor amendment to the road markings proposed as part of the mitigation scheme referenced in our TA. This relates to the right turn lanes on Toton Lane South. The flows are such that the model operates more efficiently if the far offside right turn lane is for the A52 (E) and the nearside right turn lane is for the B6003 exit. This represents a very minor deviation from the proposed mitigation drawing (Drawing J32-8827-PS-003 of the TA) to amend the proposed painted road markings on these approaches. A revised drawing including this amendment (Drawing J32-8827-PS-003 Rev A) is provide at Appendix H of the TN for reference.

Kind Regards,

Josh Norris BSc (Hons) MSc MCIHT
Associate Director

☎ 0121 794 8390
☎ 07990 276 384
✉ joshnorris@modetransport.co.uk
www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning

Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW

keep up with
mode:



be green, keep it on the screen!

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Three Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Three Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

Sima Odedra

From: Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>
Sent: 23 July 2026 17:01
To: Robert Gardner; Spencer Claye; Jan Witko; Matt Leek; Catherine Townend; James Hicks; Alan Siviter
Cc: Josh Norris; David Frisby
Subject: Re: [SendTo for SYSTRA] HARRHY Huw has dropped off files for you

All,

We received the interim results outputs for scenario 4 relating to the combined implications of the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks sites as per the below transmittal from Systra earlier this afternoon. I am circulating these for information with the updated modelling report to follow.

We are still completing our review but felt it would be useful for the various parties to also have sight of these to enable early consideration.

Regards

Ben Fairgrieve BA (Hons) MCIHT
Director

☎ 0121 794 8390
☎ 07957 374 465
✉ benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk
www.modetransport.co.uk

mode transport planning
Griffin House, 18-19 Ludgate Hill, Birmingham, B3 1DW

keep up with mode:   

From: SendTo for SYSTRA <noreply-sendto@systra.com>
Date: Thursday, 23 July 2026 at 14:58
To: Ben Fairgrieve <benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk>
Subject: [SendTo for SYSTRA] HARRHY Huw has dropped off files for you

You don't often get email from noreply-sendto@systra.com. [Learn why this is important](#)



This is an automated message sent to you by the SendTo for SYSTRA service.

HARRHY Huw <hharry@systra.com> has dropped off 16 files for you.

IF YOU TRUST THE SENDER and are expecting to receive a file from them, you may choose to retrieve the d

following link (or copying and pasting it into your web browser):

<https://sendto.systra.com/pickup?claimID=UK7QB92RVHrq4jUG&claimPasscode=wynHfr42Gr9hHH>

You have 5 days to retrieve the drop-off; after that the link above will expire.
If you wish to contact the sender, just reply to this email.

Full information about the drop-off:

Claim ID: UK7QB92RVHrq4jUG

Claim Passcode: wynHfr42Gr9hHHuv

Date of Drop-off: 2026-07-23 15:58:36

“ Sender ”

Name: HARRHY Huw

Organization: SYSTRA

Email Address: hharrhy@systra.com

IP Address: 10.100.40.61 (10.100.40.61)

“ Files ”

Name: 2026 AM Distribution.png

Size: 4.5 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 8ACCC6DBE907646E0FF1E31C2226BB378F4070BDE82CAF18520DC4E170315631

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 AM Flow Change.png

Size: 4.3 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 377CAD05B123C3B799347C544A1F906BAAB217F2658405D074D62D7884D7B213

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 AM Redistribution.png

Size: 4.3 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 1D096A1B02E732F109C35236A69D3EDDEF1CFB6319526E4FAE2EC2EB452083A2

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 AM VC Change.png

Size: 4.4 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 62E850A1A46C35A677AA28188FCD491746FF90F5EDF7C1A6159E73B4F4B2F779

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 PM Distribution.png

Size: 4.5 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 152E2A4A4AD32A6EEFA7DBCB7A45B2F2841EF7D418D74538A2344427B83A69C7

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 PM Flow Change.png
Size: 4.4 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: C36F880EA05A38E3A02F7A5D7A753CB28FA6C53605D91F387F46D62B40A3C836
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 PM Redistribution.png
Size: 4.3 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: 11C763D78DCF192ED7E212C708F41D21C9EDC174F3C21A4F5735272BAA2A4C2E
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2026 PM VC Change.png
Size: 4.4 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: 8C9CF2ECB7D1E5E73E0D6C32559FF5D3AAA525F54AFCD87AFBA41B14114B6948
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 AM Distribution.png
Size: 4.5 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: 770157C30B5D114D75205357D3177BA5D85C442EE28C5DC0DD148DBC25703D1
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 AM Flow Change.png
Size: 4.4 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: 4EE666FCD259ED42FF26D35D63D6C2352C27BBEAE98ED7BB1A01F78CF7CAE6
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 AM Redistribution.png
Size: 4.2 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: AD751B57FA789988E6063708699F562606788CA4167A21815C671B46D224D004
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 AM VC Change.png
Size: 4.4 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: C679E9292869C995A7B2BD717509EF60BFEE2CCC2B66F842BF9CBD5F2B7C1542
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 PM Distribution.png
Size: 4.5 MB
SHA-256 Checksum: F3F119EC74BD190544EA72283C062AF096F77F9137E11799F572D11EA435653E
Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 PM Flow Change.png
Size: 4.4 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 881FED3240E2D1109FCA6AD8C4662C290AA484F0922E1C4DD78B1353AA792CF3

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 PM Redistribution.png

Size: 4.2 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: 0DBEABC293DD0B59ADD98F36534989B2E568CA2A93E5A1168BC12141CFAC5C6

Content Type: image/png

Name: 2041 PM VC Change.png

Size: 4.4 MB

SHA-256 Checksum: AD8E4F1646C780393C7794612EF61DF3F2EEA82FE0C20F5947A87D401BF235F3

Content Type: image/png

Copyright Â© 2026 ZendTo | [About SendTo for SYSTRA](#)
This service is powered by a copy of [ZendTo](#)

=====
This message has been scanned for malware. This message and any attachments (the "message") are confidential, intended solely for the addressees, and may contain legally privileged information. Any unauthorised use or dissemination is prohibited. E-mails are susceptible to alteration. Neither our company or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates shall be liable for the message if altered, changed or falsified.

=====
Ce message a ete verifie et ne contient pas de programme malveillant. Ce message et toutes les pieces jointes (ci-apres le "message") sont confidentiels et susceptibles de contenir des informations couvertes par le secret professionnel. Ce message est etabli a l'intention exclusive de ses destinataires. Toute utilisation ou diffusion non autorisee est interdite. Tout message electronique est susceptible d'alteration. Notre societe et ses filiales declinent toute responsabilite au titre de ce message s'il a ete altere, deforme falsifie. I