

A46 Cov_8May_ISH1_PT1

Project Length: 01:26:18

File Name: A46 Cov_8May_ISH1_PT1

File Length: 01:26:18

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:23 - 00:00:09:26

Good morning. Can all of those present? Hear me clearly.

00:00:11:24 - 00:00:48:14

Thank you. Can I confirm the live streaming of this event has commenced? Thank you. It's now 10 a.m.. And welcome to this first issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by National Highways, who we will refer to as the applicant for the order granting development consent for the A46 Coventry Junction Walls Graves project. As described in the application form, the application seeks powers to enable the replacement of the current at grade roundabout at the junction of the A46 and the B4 A2, with a grade separated junction to the north of the existing roundabout.

00:00:49:02 - 00:00:57:16

My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I will be chairing this hearing and making some introductory comments. Can I ask my colleague to introduce himself?

00:00:59:14 - 00:01:07:02

Good morning. My name is John McEvoy. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this examining authority. Thank you.

00:01:08:05 - 00:01:45:05

We have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be members of this examining authority, and we constitute the examining authority, or Xa, for this application. We will be reporting to the Secretary of State for transport as to whether development consent orders should be made. For those here in the venue. You may have met Mr. Simon Redwood, who is case manager at the Planning Inspectorate, is supported today by Mr. Harrison Coles from the keys team. If you have any questions about the examination process or the technology we are using, the case team should be a first point of contact before we consider the items on the agenda.

00:01:45:07 - 00:02:16:04

A few housekeeping matters we need to deal with. Firstly, can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent? There are no scheduled fire alarm tests or drills today, so in the event of a fire alarm, Please exit via the doors at either end of this room, and the fire evacuation assembly point is just outside the main entrance. Toilets are located on this floor. In addition to this in-person event, the hearing is taking place on the Microsoft Teams platform and is being both live streamed and recorded.

00:02:16:15 - 00:02:50:02

For those persons joining online, you may switch camera and microphone off if you are not participating directly in the discussion. Should you wish to raise a question, please raise the Microsoft Teams hand function and when invited to, please turn your microphone and camera on. On that note, please be advised that the chat function on Microsoft Teams is disabled and cannot be used. If we have to adjourn proceedings today, including for breaks, we'll have to stop the live stream. We will then recommence the meeting and restart the live stream.

00:02:50:11 - 00:03:27:06

You will need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream. Because digital, the digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a public record, and they can contain your personal information to which the General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR, applies. The planning Inspectorate's practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be live streamed and recorded and a digital recording will be published.

00:03:27:16 - 00:03:57:18

If you don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. The only official record of proceedings is this recording, which will be uploaded onto the Inspectorate's website as soon as possible after the hearing. Tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application. The hearing today will be structured discussion which the Xa will lead based on the agenda that has already been published.

00:03:58:03 - 00:04:33:00

We will be asking questions to ensure that we have information. We may. We need to make our recommendations to the Secretary of State. We are familiar with the documents already submitted. So when answering a question you do not need to repeat at length something that has already been submitted. When referencing a document, please give the appropriate pins examination library reference. Additionally, the first time you use an abbreviation or acronym. Can you give the full title as there are people participating or observing that may not be familiar with the documents? You are as you are.

00:04:34:23 - 00:05:04:21

This hearing will focus on issues which we will address primarily to the applicant. We acknowledge that interested parties have not submitted submitted written representations, and local authorities have not submitted their local impact reports. Matters arising from such submissions and residual matters arising from this hearing will be addressed subsequently if necessary. We look to take a break at around 1145 until a little after 12, to allow for a two minute silence at 12.

00:05:06:07 - 00:05:39:29

We will look to take a break for lunch sometime around 130. For about 45 minutes or an hour and if we need to, an afternoon break around 315. But at the very latest, we intend to close the hearing no later than 4:30 p.m.. It is not our intention to do full introductions at this point. However, for the purpose of identification and for the benefit of those who may be watching the digital recording later, those intending to speak are asked to state your name, who you represent, and any preference on how you wish to be addressed.

00:05:40:22 - 00:06:11:10

Please speak clearly into the microphone. Additionally, please give your name and organization you are representing every time you are asked to speak during the hearing. I would now like to turn to the agenda for this hearing. The agenda for the hearing was published and placed on the Planning Inspectorate website on the 29th of April, 2025. Examining authority has decided to hold this issue specific hearing because we wish to discuss matters relating to the submitted application documents and irrelevant representations.

00:06:12:17 - 00:06:49:11

We will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of it. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be completed or are to take longer than anticipated today, it may be necessary to prioritise, prioritise matters and defer other matters to written questions. It is that it is important that we get the right answers to the questions we are going to ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require time to get the information requested.

00:06:50:10 - 00:07:23:29

Rather than giving a restricted or potentially wrong answer for the smooth running of the examination. Can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing, and we can then defer the question to the next round of written questions, all later hearing. As noted at a preliminary meeting, the examination is predominantly a written process, supplemented where necessary by hearings. For the avoidance of doubt. To conclude, each agenda item will be asking the applicant for any final comments they have on any representations made during the discussions on each item.

00:07:25:06 - 00:07:58:19

Finally, this is a hearing and not an inquiry. There will be no formal presentation of cases or cross questioning of other parties. As such, questions that you may have for other parties need to be asked through the examining authority. This approach is set out in section 94 of the Planning Act 2008. Before we move on to agenda item two, due to the availability of some parties, we intend to amend the running all of the agenda items from the published agenda after item two. We'll move to agenda item five,

00:08:00:11 - 00:08:11:29

then six, and then nine. After that, we'll return to agenda item three. Item four. Item seven. And item eight.

00:08:14:29 - 00:08:17:00

Is everyone okay with that?

00:08:19:07 - 00:08:36:05

Um. Good morning, Sir Angus Walker for the applicant. Um, yes, that is fine. Although we'll probably need to. We had prepared our, um, because for the first three items. So we will do a bit of shuffling around, if that's all right. That's fine. Thank you.

00:08:39:28 - 00:08:48:28

I would now like to, um. I'd like to move to agenda item two, and I'll pass to Mr. McEvoy to take us through the next item.

00:08:50:17 - 00:09:26:24

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Excuse me. This hearing seeks to consider a range of issues arising from the submitted application documents and comments made in relevant representations. We are aware that this hearing has come early in the examination and before written representations and local impact reports from the relevant local authorities are due. The purpose of this hearing is to enable us, as the examining authority, to gain a further understanding of the evidence relating to the examination of the application to help the running of the hearing go as smoothly as possible.

00:09:26:27 - 00:09:50:07

In general, we intend to run through our questions on each topic agenda item before asking for contributions from others present. Can I ask, are there any questions so far on the purpose of the hearing? I see no hands raised. Okay, now we'll move to agenda item number five. We're both. Mr. Humphrey and I will ask a number of questions. Thank you.

00:09:51:23 - 00:10:09:06

Sir. Could I just ask a question about Angus Walker for the applicant in terms of recording any actions that are, um, identified during the hearing? We would be happy to do that and then read them out at the end for you. Um.

00:10:09:24 - 00:10:15:25

That would be fine, because we will keep a record and we can at least check them. And so we've both got the same ones.

00:10:16:26 - 00:10:17:19

Thank you sir.

00:10:19:27 - 00:10:51:13

Okay, moving on to item five then. As I understand it, the scheme will require the removal of the existing earth bond and associated landscaping adjacent to the existing roundabout. In order to facilitate the changes to the A46, the southbound two lane carriageway will move closer to the Whom Park boundary, and it also intended that a boundary fence to the country park will be renewed and repaired at this point, and a noise barrier installed.

00:10:51:27 - 00:10:58:06

It might be useful at this point if we could have up. That's. Is that the general arrangement plan?

00:11:00:00 - 00:11:12:11

Well, the general arrangement plan shows, um, a barrier, but provides no details of the barrier. Now, also, if we could look at figure 8.3 of up 52.

00:11:15:17 - 00:11:16:24

That shows.

00:11:28:26 - 00:11:31:17

And that shows a much longer barrier.

00:11:35:24 - 00:11:37:13

Is that 8.3.

00:11:45:14 - 00:11:46:09

That's the one.

00:11:46:20 - 00:11:55:23

I think that shows a much longer barrier than it's on the general arrangement plans. Could you explain why those are different for me to start?

00:11:59:25 - 00:12:03:01

Thank you sir. Angus Walker for the applicant. Um.

00:12:05:08 - 00:12:10:25

If I could ask Janet Lascelles to, um, respond to your question. Who is. Thank you.

00:12:15:12 - 00:12:32:29

On behalf of the applicant. Could we get the general arrangement up again? Sorry, I can talk through. So the existing bond will be partially removed because the as you say, the road alignment will come closer to complete. Um,

00:12:34:20 - 00:13:03:27

there is no there will be a new fence installed on the triple A side boundary, but there's no permanent noise barrier proposed along that section. The noise barrier, which is shown on the other plan that we was on the screen in a minute ago 8.2. Application 052. Thank you. Application documents. Hyphen 052. That is purely for the construction period.

00:13:06:07 - 00:13:07:15

Right. Yeah.

00:13:09:01 - 00:13:15:12

I mean, it's very difficult when you see that plan at any scale. But on the general arrangement plan, sorry to keep switching

00:13:16:27 - 00:13:21:09

on the general arrangement plan. It does say new barrier, does it not? On the legend.

00:13:40:19 - 00:13:44:19

That refers to a safety barrier. A cool restraint system.

00:13:44:21 - 00:13:45:06

Okay.

00:13:45:08 - 00:13:50:21

It is not clear who says new barrier. So that's one of the things I want to be clear about. So that is a safety barrier.

00:13:50:24 - 00:13:51:09

Yes.

00:13:51:19 - 00:13:54:24

Right. Okay. That, that that probably answers that question.

00:13:56:13 - 00:13:57:00

Um,

00:13:58:19 - 00:14:17:27

I think that's fine with the, um, the general arrangement plan now. Could you put back figure 8.3? Because I've got a general point about figure 8.3. Figure 8.3 shows a noise plot for the with um.

00:14:22:01 - 00:14:35:24

With the scheme. Uh, with the scheme with before and after. Without the barrier. Is that right? But it hasn't got a noise plot for the existing layout. Is that would that be possible to have. So we could understand the difference.

00:14:40:17 - 00:14:46:09

Sir, if I may. Angus Walker, for the applicant, asked Caroline Hudson to answer that question for you.

00:14:47:08 - 00:15:19:15

Caroline Hudson, construction environment lead for the applicant. The two plans that you can see on the screen at the moment, the one at the top is, um, without the barrier and the one at the bottom is showing it with the barrier and the, uh, darker colored highlights of the noise. Contours are reduced with the barrier in the second plan below. This is a temporary situation.

00:15:19:24 - 00:15:28:29

So this is the noise associated with the construction in that area during this time period. So the barrier that is shown in dark purple

00:15:30:20 - 00:15:42:24

is a temporary feature which will be put up during construction and removed. When that piece of work is completed and when the noise impact has reduced.

00:15:44:04 - 00:15:59:20

So is what you're saying that that particular drawing is purely about the construction process? Correct. Forget. What is it? Is there a sort of comparable one that shows the operational, if you like, existing and proposed noise.

00:16:01:16 - 00:16:06:21

Why have we got our noise expert here or would you like me to.

00:16:06:23 - 00:16:07:13

Or could we, could.

00:16:07:15 - 00:16:11:10

We could you consider whether we could have one? It's probably the question.

00:16:14:16 - 00:16:17:07

Janet, the sales on behalf of the applicant. Sorry.

00:16:19:19 - 00:16:30:09

Uh, yes. Uh, the, uh, the noise experts in here unfortunately, today. But, um, yeah, we can review and see what images we can provide to, uh, to address that requirement.

00:16:30:18 - 00:16:31:03

Thank you.

00:16:31:05 - 00:16:33:24

Yeah. I think Mr. McAvoy has a question. Yeah.

00:16:35:27 - 00:17:13:04

Mr. Humphrey, thank you. Yes, I do. Uh, again to the applicant, I think we, um, we do need a clearer understanding of the proposed extent, the layout, the dimensions of the proposed temporary noise barrier. It's not an insignificant, temporary structure. And it seems to be a lack of, from my reading, a lack of clarity or detail about the, uh, the temporary construction, which I accept is temporary, but it's still not insignificant. Um, could you provide sort of the details of the scale of works associated with the provision of that temporary barrier? Is that is that possible? Thank you.

00:17:13:18 - 00:17:55:01

Angus Walker for the applicant. Um, yes, we can provide that. Um, perhaps I could explain a little, um, about this barrier that it is at the moment, a significant adverse impact. The noise, Is from construction on Kuhn Pool. And so the barrier is designed to mitigate that. More advanced, detailed design is being carried out earlier than it would normally be to try and, uh, get more granularity about what is going to happen with, um, in this area so that the conclusions hopefully will be that it's reduced the impact of, of the, of construction noise.

00:17:55:21 - 00:18:31:01

Um, one of the team may be able to, um, supplement what I'm saying, but I believe that the noise barrier will be Harris fencing two meters high, which is that sort of metal grill shape with a a sort of blanket attached to it, uh, which will, um, protect from the noise. And it'll we're proposing this little move be moved along as the construction takes place. As is it is, um, protecting people from the construction as it progresses.

00:18:32:08 - 00:18:36:06

I don't know if any member of the team wishes to add anything more. Yes, Miss Hudson.

00:18:38:10 - 00:19:11:08

Uh, Caroline Hudson for the applicant. Um, as Angus said, the. Sorry. Mr. Walker said the, um, temporary barrier is on Harris panels, which, as you're aware, are temporary feature. They are along the line of the existing post and rail fence along the edges of Quin Pool. Um, we will put up the Harris panels along that barrier. That that demarcation line. Um, prior to that piece of work beginning, the acoustic blankets are then fixed to the Harris panels.

00:19:11:28 - 00:19:43:02

Um, temporary works design, obviously, uh, would take place initially and the the acoustic blankets would remain in place whilst that piece of work was undertaken. Acoustic blankets are fairly thin, but quite effective. They would fit the entire piece of Harris, so they're two meters high by 3.5m wide each panel, and they're fixed so that there is no gap between each of the blankets to be an effective noise, um, absorption screen.

00:19:44:04 - 00:20:14:04

Those blankets are, I'm afraid, are not moved along. We would put them up in place. They are fixed. They are very dark colour. They wouldn't create a visual, um, impact from users of criminal or to the wildlife. I don't believe, um, but we have ecologists with us today, and, um, the barriers would be taken down when that piece of work was completed. Um, the environmental statement.

00:20:14:06 - 00:20:16:21

Chapter eight app.

00:20:18:28 - 00:20:39:21

13. Thank you. 33 I've, um, states that the, uh, noise barrier would be designed at detailed design, and the, uh, local authority would be consulted when designing that final, uh, temporary work design.

00:20:41:15 - 00:20:45:24

That's pretty helpful. Thank you. Just to confirm which local authority will be confirming the design.

00:20:49:00 - 00:20:49:22

At both.

00:20:50:12 - 00:20:51:20

Okay. That's helpful.

00:20:52:13 - 00:21:03:22

The previous scheme. We consulted with both local authorities for every piece of work that affected the, um. The noise. Okay. Both local authorities, local environmental health officers.

00:21:04:04 - 00:21:10:20

So if I'm clear, essentially, you have a moving temporary work situation. This prior will be moved as the construction progress.

00:21:10:22 - 00:21:12:10

No, the barrier remain in situ throughout.

00:21:12:12 - 00:21:13:15

Okay. Okay.

00:21:13:17 - 00:21:15:28

Because the works are mobile.

00:21:16:21 - 00:21:17:06

Okay.

00:21:17:08 - 00:21:20:24

So in order to to to reduce the noise across that length, we would put them up.

00:21:20:28 - 00:21:54:22

It's a really helpful description. I was going to ask for a post technical post hearing technical note, but I'm less inclined to do so. But I think you've given a pretty good explanation. Um, my next question really was linked to the environmental effects of the barrier itself, because given the extent that's shown on 8.3, I just wonder whether there's been any consideration in the EIA of the impact of the temporary barrier itself is not an insignificant structure. So will will that barrier have environmental impacts, and if so, have they be considered as part of the EIA? Thank you.

00:21:58:28 - 00:22:03:13

If I could pass that question to my colleague Henry Goodman.

00:22:05:08 - 00:22:06:02

Do you want to swap?

00:22:11:21 - 00:22:15:10

This is um, Henry Giblin who's going to answer this question for you?

00:22:20:24 - 00:22:45:23

Sir Henry Gibson on behalf of the applicant. In regards to the noise barrier you're referring to specifically, which is included, um, within the, uh, biodiversity, uh, es chapter. Um, reference app 030. Um, that barrier has been included and assessed as part of the environmental impact Assessment and the various environmental statement chapters.

00:22:47:18 - 00:22:49:08

Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you.

00:22:51:09 - 00:23:22:23

Sarah, if I could just go back to the request from Mr. Humphrey about, um, showing the noise changes with and without the scheme at both in, during. Well, particularly during operation, after construction. And we will put this in our summary. But the figures relating to chapter 11 do show this. So figure

11.6 shows the long term noise contours us without the scheme, and 11.8 shows long term noise change with the scheme.

00:23:23:18 - 00:23:26:26

We'll refer to that in our summary of the hearing.

00:23:26:28 - 00:23:33:04

Okay. That's fine. I mean, if it is there then that will probably suffice. Thank you.

00:23:36:09 - 00:24:17:11

I think Mr. Mcavoy's finished with that point. One more point before we move on from the pool. I mean, I was trying to. We're removing the. We're removing the existing bond and all the landscaping and moving the carriageway nearer the fence, the boundary fence. And I looked at the section, the engineering sections, and none of the sections actually run through that specific part. They don't what I was going to request. Is it possible to have a section that went through the middle of the roundabout, but the existing roundabout across to the edge of the pool, so we could understand the difference in the landscape now and then.

00:24:17:13 - 00:24:32:02

It doesn't have to be a pure engineering section. It would be helpful if you actually had the indicative sort of heights of landscaping on as well. Just to give us a clear picture of what's changing and how it's changing, because I don't think that the plans I've seen to date show that very clearly.

00:24:32:21 - 00:24:37:20

Thank you, Sir Angus Walker, for the applicant. Yes, we can certainly provide that for you. Thank you.

00:24:38:26 - 00:24:42:18

I think unless anyone else has any comment on

00:24:44:10 - 00:24:56:26

item five, the relationship of the project and pool nobody from the council. Then we'll move on to item six and I'll pass to Mr. McEvoy. Thank you.

00:24:57:26 - 00:25:28:10

Mr. Humphrey. Thank you. Um, on item six, we're going to examine the noise abatement characteristics of the proposed temporary noise barrier, which we have learned from agenda item five is to be located between the proposed A46 realignment and the western side of the pool. triple C Site of Special Scientific Interest to the applicant, Mr. Walker. I would go again if you could show a figure 8.3 from the environment. The examination library app is 052.

00:25:29:22 - 00:25:31:18

The grade point three. Thank you.

00:25:49:15 - 00:26:24:10

Thank you indeed. By the end of this agenda item, we will want to have heard from the applicant about the effectiveness of the proposed temporary noise barrier and other mitigations to reduce noise levels impacting the pool side during construction. Let's start there with the applicant's assessment of the residual noise impacts upon pool. I'm going to refer to the applicant's environmental statement. Chapter eight biodiversity, which is the examination library reference app Dash 030.

00:26:25:08 - 00:27:03:02

The assessment presented in chapter eight identified significant residual effects for noise impacts upon pool side during construction. The overall significance of effect during construction and pool was assessed by the applicant as large adverse. This is presented in table 822 of chapter eight. Chapter eight goes on to say that the applicant proposes to install the two metre high noise barrier along the boundary of the triple C for the duration of construction works that lead to significant noise effects.

00:27:04:06 - 00:27:25:22

My question to the applicant, Mr. Walker, what confidence can we have that? The installment of the temporary noise barrier, to the extent and layout shown in figure 8.3 is achievable. So is it technically achievable to put a barrier of that extent along the extent shown in figure 8.3?

00:27:27:17 - 00:27:41:03

So Angus Walker for the applicant, and I'm confident that the applicant can install the noise barrier it has proposed. I don't know if any and anyone would like to confirm that. Jan lascelles.

00:27:46:21 - 00:27:47:21

Caroline Hudson.

00:27:49:10 - 00:27:59:06

Caroline Hudson for the applicant. Yes. We confirm we can install that noise barrier. Um, along that length, as shown in the bottom figure.

00:28:00:14 - 00:28:01:27

Thank you. Thanks.

00:28:02:09 - 00:28:48:05

Perhaps Angus Walker for the applicant. It would help to say that, as I mentioned earlier, the. And we brought forward some of the more detailed consideration of construction and scenarios to, um, see if this large adverse effect can be reduced. And we are confident, at least optimistic, if not confident, that this can be done by more precise specification of construction. And we were we are going to be in discussion with Natural England about what is proposed and hoped to by deadline three, to be able to report any amendment to the noise chapter that hopefully will reduce this, um, significant impact.

00:28:50:05 - 00:28:51:04

That's helpful.

00:28:52:21 - 00:29:12:19

Mr. Walker, it is. You've actually preempted my next question. How clever. Um, really, the question I wanted to ask would you've answered was what confidence can we have that the noise barrier will

reduce noise levels impacting the site? From what you're saying, you have a degree of confidence at this time, but you're doing further work to to improve the.

00:29:13:01 - 00:29:16:03

Worker for the applicant. Yes, that's correct sir. Um.

00:29:18:12 - 00:29:42:07

Because we're conscious of this significant, um, impact, we are doing more work than, than we would normally do at this stage to seek to reduce it. And these will be presented to you with a revised chapter eight. Um, and any other changes to the environmental impact assessment. We're aiming for deadline three to be able to do that.

00:29:42:18 - 00:30:05:18

Mr. Walker, thank you very much. And just in terms of the submission of deadline three, will you have revised your assessment of the significance of effects on noise impacts with the barrier in place? Because currently with large adverse effects with no barrier, I presume chapter eight at deadline three will include a revised assessment of the significance of effects with the barrier in place.

00:30:05:28 - 00:30:14:06

Mr. Walker? Yes, that is for the applicant. That is precisely the applicant's intention to be able to reduce that impact that.

00:30:16:11 - 00:30:18:24

Hutson would like to add something.

00:30:21:22 - 00:30:55:25

Caroline Hudson for the applicant. We're currently looking at program timings, plant lists, more detailed construction, um, undertaking. So we're looking at the whole effect of noise and whole creation of noise in that area. We're not relying on the final element which is the barrier. So what we're trying to do is to reduce the actual impact of noise created. So the significance of the noise prior to we're not going to take the barrier away. Don't worry. That's the temporary barrier will be part of the temporary construction works.

00:30:56:01 - 00:31:02:10

But we are trying to reduce it at source rather than just rely on the final element, which is a barrier.

00:31:04:23 - 00:31:28:11

That is very helpful. You've again pre-empted my next question. Always good to hear. Um, which really was focusing on the administrative, um, mitigations, which I think relate to the use of construction plans or programming works. So again, from what you're saying, that is your clear intention to reduce the noise at source and if at all possible, avoid the use of the barrier. Okay. Thank you.

00:31:31:24 - 00:31:57:07

Uh, Caroline Hutson for the applicant. Um, we would keep the barrier in, I believe, unless we manage to reduce that noise source, um, significantly. Um, because it is going to be reduced, but it will still be

a noise source for a short period of time in that area. Um, but yes, definitely the the last part of your question, which I've completely forgotten.

00:31:59:23 - 00:32:11:27

Angus Walker for the applicant. It is it is not just the very, in other words, that that we are working on to reduce the impact of noise. And that sums it up really.

00:32:15:18 - 00:32:49:21

I think it is helpful because I was going to raise a point, um, which you state in the application in chapter eight where the phrase where practicable is tied into it qualifies your intentions to avoid to work avoiding sensitive periods using quieter machinery. Machinery would be developed at detailed design where practicable. When I read those words, there's generally some doubt sown in my mind. But from what you're saying, you're really putting a lot of effort into determining, uh, the control of noise at source.

00:32:49:25 - 00:32:51:03

Am I correct? Yes.

00:32:51:05 - 00:33:01:09

Angus Walker for the applicant. That's right. We are hopefully be able to remove those words where practicable, because we all know whether it is practical or not. By deadline three.

00:33:03:16 - 00:33:13:11

Thank you very much. I'm just looking for contributions from and around the table. No hands raised, no hands raised online. No.

00:33:15:13 - 00:33:27:01

That's fine. Thank you very much. That concludes that agenda item. Uh. We're next. Given the changes to the running order. We're now going to move to agenda item nine, dealing with biodiversity.

00:33:31:17 - 00:33:32:02

Okay.

00:33:33:17 - 00:33:34:21

So rearranging.

00:33:37:11 - 00:33:37:26

Okay.

00:33:39:24 - 00:33:59:07

Okay. Thank you. Um, we have five items to discuss under this agenda item. So moving to item 9.1 which is the woodland creation proposals. And my first questions are to the applicant. Um, please can we go to your environmental statement, chapter two

00:34:00:25 - 00:34:05:07

title the scheme and paragraph 2.5.127.

00:34:10:08 - 00:34:15:11

So we'll just Angus walk with the applicant. We'll just bring that up. That's app 024.

00:34:41:08 - 00:35:16:08

Mr. Walker thank you. So I'll just read briefly from paragraph 2.5.127. The area chosen for ecological mitigation north of Coombe Abbey Park enables compensation habitat to be provided as close as possible to the areas affected, and will benefit the same habitats and species affected. To the applicant, we'd like to gain a greater understanding of the woodland creation proposals. How far along are you in developing your habitat creation proposals for this area? Thank you.

00:35:20:14 - 00:35:27:17

Angus Walker for the applicant. If I can ask Doctor Martin Brammer to respond to you. Martin Brammer, on.

00:35:27:19 - 00:35:52:12

Behalf of the applicant, um, we, as I understand it, have plans, uh, landscape plans for that area. Um, so they have to find the location for them. Yeah. So in the in in app 043. Figure 2.4. There is a, a landscape plan for that of that area with information about what's to be put in that woodland block.

00:35:56:08 - 00:35:57:11

That's helpful. Thank you.

00:35:59:26 - 00:36:12:02

So again, following on from that, I just want to refer the applicant to paragraph 2.5.129, which is two paragraphs down from one we've just looked at. And it's in your chapter two

00:36:13:26 - 00:36:35:09

just it's examination library ref app dash 024, which states National Highways organization objective currently requires the scheme to provide 10% biodiversity net gain. My question to the applicant how confident are you that a 10% biodiversity net gain would be achieved by the scheme? Thank you.

00:36:36:19 - 00:36:51:23

Angus Walker for the applicant. We are confident that 10% biodiversity net gain will be achieved by the scheme as as is shown by our calculations in the Biodiversity Games statement. Is that the name of the Document. Yes.

00:37:01:05 - 00:37:05:26

So it's a biodiversity net gain report, which is AP 076.

00:37:10:14 - 00:37:13:03

Mr. Walker, thank you. That's quite clear. Answer. Um.

00:37:17:08 - 00:37:19:00

No contributions, no hands raised.

00:37:21:13 - 00:37:54:25

That ends that question. I'm not going to turn to Coventry City Council. Um, again, we're referring to the applicant's environmental statement, chapter two, and it's the section on page 31 of 51 land for mitigation. And again, it's paragraph 2.5.127. The applicant gives specific mention of the city council, uh, in terms of the city council's responsibility to maintain Tain this woodland creation area. Am I correct that the City Council will be maintaining that area?

00:37:59:03 - 00:38:03:09

That's paragraph 2.5.127 of chapter two.

00:38:14:02 - 00:38:35:12

I own Williams County Council. Um, I'm presuming that if that land is within our ownership, as we do own, um, two maybe in terms of the council, um, we, we have Rangers, etc. within that, that area. Um, I would have thought we would be looking to, to help maintain it.

00:38:36:19 - 00:38:37:26

You don't seem very sure.

00:38:40:17 - 00:38:48:17

Um, without seeing the exact area that it is in, the within a, you know, boundary plan, etc., and ownership of details.

00:38:48:19 - 00:39:04:17

Then the area is shown in the work plans. I can give you the reference if you wish. I can refer you to the relevant work, its work plan to A5 and its document app 013 the Examination library.

00:39:11:13 - 00:39:12:18

Yeah. Yeah.

00:39:21:08 - 00:39:28:07

I'm just going to refer back to the applicant. Are you aware of the conversations with the City Council regarding the maintenance of the woodland creation area? Thank you.

00:39:28:27 - 00:39:50:13

Angus Walker for the applicant. Yes, sir. You haven't seen it yet, but in our in the statement of Common Ground with Coventry City Council, this is one of the very few items that are still under discussion. Is the responsibility With responsibility and funding of the maintenance of the biodiversity area.

00:39:52:14 - 00:39:54:08

We hope to resolve that soon.

00:39:58:01 - 00:40:03:03

Okay, so in terms of the paragraph in chapter two that's unresolved, am I correct?

00:40:05:25 - 00:40:13:23

So the paragraph states it also enables future maintenance to be facilitated by Coventry City Council as part of the Abbey Country Park Estate.

00:40:14:25 - 00:40:41:18

Angus Walker for the applicant. That is certainly the intention, um that that Coventry City Council will because it's going to become part of the maybe country park which they currently maintain. Um, but it's just the arrangements and the, the funding of such additional any additional, uh, obligations that is still under discussion.

00:40:42:19 - 00:40:45:19

Mr. Walker, thank you. Your hand raised? Yeah.

00:40:45:21 - 00:40:46:06

Sort of.

00:40:46:08 - 00:41:13:15

John Seddon from the City Council. And I can confirm that those discussions are underway in terms of the potential for land transfer as well, which would then bring some of that landscaped area within to the Park estate and therefore within our overall management responsibility. So I think the the key issue and the key thing rights not shown as resolved at the moment is working with National Highways colleagues on the exact mechanism to achieve that.

00:41:15:03 - 00:41:41:09

Thank you. That's helpful because it also leads to my next question was linked to the maintenance of that area and references mentioned in chapter two to an access road over the Hungary Farm overbridge linking into the proposed Woodland Creation Area. So in terms of gaining access to the woodland creation area, that's also stated as coming under the responsibility of Coventry City Council. So I presume that that point is also under discussion.

00:41:45:21 - 00:42:07:09

Angus Walker for the applicant. I just clarify that it is not part of this scheme to make that overbridge a public right of way. That is for a future. Um, well, it's up to Coventry City Council and indeed it's crosses over into, um, Warwickshire County Council slash rugby borough council.

00:42:08:26 - 00:42:17:18

But but it would certainly be enabled by this. Not. This project won't stand in the way of that happening, but it is not actually part of the application.

00:42:19:03 - 00:42:24:21

Thank you, Mr. Walker. I think that specific point will come a bit later in the agenda as well. But thank you.

00:42:27:07 - 00:42:37:03

Thank you. That ends that particular item. So moving to item 9.2. This question is to the Environment Agency. I trust they are online. I'm looking to the my case colleague.

00:42:38:19 - 00:42:41:02

That's correct. So the Environment Agency. Can you hear me?

00:42:42:27 - 00:42:45:14

Yes, sir. Kerry Jones from the Environment Agency.

00:42:46:00 - 00:43:22:28

Thank you very much. Um, this question is too good, sir. I'm referring to your relevant representation, which is the examination library reference dash 012 and paragraph 5.3 of that representation. In that you state, you make your case for a requirement to be stitched into the draft development consent order related to the delivery of biodiversity net gain measures. Can I ask you, please, why you consider it's necessary for a requirements linked to biodiversity net gain to be included in the development consent order.

00:43:23:00 - 00:43:23:18

Thank you.

00:43:25:10 - 00:43:56:08

Thank you sir. I'm the one of the account managers for transport schemes. Um, we've had a change in personnel from our biodiversity specialist this week. So if I could bring in, um, Rosamond Hare her as she picked up the case file on Tuesday. So she's been able to, um, um, answer, uh, or clarify the question for you. If we could defer to representative, uh, written questions, um, we would, uh, be grateful for that. Um, Rosalind, are you able to come in there?

00:43:59:09 - 00:44:15:07

Hi. Yeah. Rosalind here from the Environment Agency. Um, I would appreciate being able to do written response just because I haven't worked on this project. Um, it will give me longer to get up to speed with why that was requested.

00:44:18:12 - 00:44:21:22

Understood. Thank you for that. Does anybody have any contributions to make on that query?

00:44:23:26 - 00:44:40:21

Angus Walker, on behalf of the applicant. Um, as we've just discussed, we are confident that we can achieve 10%. So I guess, um, although it's not a legal obligation for development consent orders. That is something we are happy to seek to achieve.

00:44:42:07 - 00:44:48:21

Um, we will consider whether we would agree to it being a requirement and how that would be specified.

00:44:49:27 - 00:45:32:10

Mr. Walker, thank you. No other contributions? Okay. Um, moving on to item 9.3. This again is a question for the Environment Agency. It's related again to your relevant representation. Um, and I'm going to refer to two parts of that representation. The first part is on the fifth page. The end of the fifth page is reference 4.5.1, dealing with your request for enhancements to watercourses. And secondly to reference are the ten which is at the mid-point of the sixth page, and it's requesting an edition of biodiversity features in the proposed detention basins.

00:45:33:12 - 00:45:51:28

So my question to the agency is, firstly, we'd like to understand your position on the applicant's proposals to protect and enhance watercourse habitats. And secondly, on the development of new habitats in the proposed detention basins. What are your views, please?

00:45:54:20 - 00:46:09:24

Thank you, Rosamond, for Environment Agency. Um, I would probably have to say please. Can I have written response again? Um, I am not up to speed with the plans of this project.

00:46:12:28 - 00:46:13:13

Okay.

00:46:13:15 - 00:46:50:12

Thank you for that. And if not, then there. Um, app 043, which is, um, what's it called? Environmental statement figures. Figure 2.4 the environmental master plan. Um, sheets three and four of that show the detention basins and that there is some planting proposed there. And the applicant would be happy to consider doing more, as long as it doesn't interfere with the purpose of the basins to retain the amount of water they are designed for.

00:46:52:08 - 00:47:04:04

So in terms of the detention basins, would there be a net gain in terms of habitat creation through the construction of the basins and the formation of new habitats? It wouldn't be neutral. It would be a net gain in terms of biodiversity.

00:47:04:22 - 00:47:21:16

Angus Walker for the applicant. I'm I don't know the answer myself to that. If there'd be a net gain just specifically on those basins, um, common sense would suggest that there would be. Um, but perhaps Doctor Brammer can answer that.

00:47:22:26 - 00:47:32:09

Martin Brammer, on behalf of the applicant, uh, there would be an increase in the amount of standing water that isn't currently there. So that would form part of the net game.

00:47:34:02 - 00:47:35:06

That's helpful. Thank you.

00:47:40:10 - 00:47:53:00

My follow up question, which was to the Environment Agency. I hope you're still there. Um, can the agency provide examples of suitable and practicable enhancement measures for watercourses and the proposed detention ponds?

00:47:59:28 - 00:48:04:27

Environment agency that probably be easier to do in routing.

00:48:07:12 - 00:48:38:21

Okay. Thank you. Uh, moving to item 9.4. And this is on the potential impacts of unnatural lighting on Compal AC. So again, my question to the agency. Can I direct you again to your relevant representation. And in this case it's reference 8.8.104 which is the fifth page of your representation. You've used an issue impact solution framework to explain your views on the effects of unnatural lighting on people.

00:48:41:02 - 00:48:45:23

And my question is, can you provide us with your explanation of these effects? Thank you.

00:48:50:08 - 00:48:58:29

What's the Environment Agency? Um, can you clarify? Was this during construction or, um, operation?

00:49:01:08 - 00:49:04:10

Allow me to check. I'm just running. I'm just gaining access to document. Now.

00:49:10:11 - 00:49:16:21

I'm just working for the applicant. I would guess this would be during construction, because there isn't going to be any lighting during operation. Okay.

00:49:17:12 - 00:49:18:05

Thank you.

00:49:22:15 - 00:49:40:20

But we haven't got a fisheries specialist on the call. Um, but lighting does disrupt navigation of migratory fish, and it can alter their feeding and foraging behavior. Um, so it would need to be included in this scoping as an impact.

00:49:44:05 - 00:49:53:27

Okay. Thank you for that. I'm going to look for some contributions. But perhaps if I look to the applicant, did you intend to provide mitigation for unnatural lighting? Is a part of your proposals.

00:49:54:02 - 00:50:15:23

Angus Walker for the applicant? Um, yes. We already have a commitment in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments or the Reac, which is, um, app 110 um, commitment G3 is about reducing light disturbance during the works. Um.

00:50:18:17 - 00:50:38:10

But it also covers during operation. So there may be some lighting columns on the on the highway. When we finished building it. Um, we can discuss further with the Environment Agency if they would like more of a commitment in that to be added to that commitment.

00:50:39:17 - 00:50:41:21

Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you indeed. Thank you.

00:50:56:21 - 00:51:26:29

Thank you. Just moving to item 9.5, which is the last item on this agenda sub item. Um, this deals with green engineering methods to protect watercourse beds and banks. And again I'm looking to the Environment Agency. I'm referring to reference Rd 11. It's near the end of the sixth page in your relevant representation. Uh, we want to understand from the agency the range of green engineering options available as suitable alternatives to hard scour protection. Thank you.

00:51:28:14 - 00:51:43:21

Mr. Environment Agency. Um, we would probably need to discuss this with our geomorphologist. Specialist, um, who is not on the call. So if we could give a written response with our geomorphology specialist, that would be great.

00:51:47:05 - 00:51:53:21

Thank you. Can I just make one point? Please? When do you intend to issue those submissions on the questions raised?

00:51:55:16 - 00:51:57:22

By which deadline, please? Thank you.

00:52:00:26 - 00:52:06:04

Yes. Thank you. Um, Kerry Deans, the environment agency. We can issue those by the next deadline.

00:52:07:26 - 00:52:11:24

It's deadline one. Thank you. Noted. Are there any comments.

00:52:13:11 - 00:52:45:12

For the applicant? Um, at the moment, we haven't committed to anything to. For green engineering methods, um, relating to scour uh, because that would normally be a detailed design, but we would be happy to commit to giving a preference to green engineering methods where those were feasible instantly. Are you referring to agenda items like 9.4? But we don't. The official agenda only has 9.1 in it.

00:52:45:14 - 00:52:48:14

Are you have you got some secret other agenda or.

00:52:50:23 - 00:52:59:12

I think I think the items are mentioned as a list. They're not they're not broken down into 9.1, but they actually feature as a list. So the items are listed on the they were all yes.

00:52:59:14 - 00:53:00:29

I agree they were all lifted.

00:53:01:01 - 00:53:01:16

Yeah.

00:53:01:18 - 00:53:03:03

But there was a slightly different order as well.

00:53:03:05 - 00:53:05:29

Um, okay. Thank you. Noted. Oh sorry.

00:53:06:01 - 00:53:12:21

Our apologies for that. It's just so we on our script can keep the thing separate rather than running to one to the other.

00:53:15:11 - 00:53:23:06

Mr. Walker, thank you and again, for your commitment to work with the Environment Agency in relation to the use of green engineering methods. That is noted. Thank you.

00:53:35:19 - 00:53:42:05

I have no further items to add that that ends our discussion on that agenda item. And I'll hand you back to Mr. Humphrey.

00:53:43:17 - 00:53:48:16

Thank you, Mr. McEvoy. And I think I can safely say this is item 3.1 because that is on.

00:53:50:03 - 00:53:50:18

Yes.

00:53:52:00 - 00:54:09:22

Um, it's about the development of the walking, cycling and horseriding links around and across the A46. I think we understand the applicant's commitment to enable those as far as they can within the scheme.

00:54:11:22 - 00:54:16:00

Um, and there's a provision made for a future route to be developed along the,

00:54:17:16 - 00:54:44:12

uh, along the B40B4082 over what is now the farm accommodation bridge. I'm aware, as well as development of cycle infrastructure along Beenleigh Road and Bridge below and the potential extension northwards to along Clifford Bridge Road. But I'm not clear of a few things. Could I run through them? The first one is for Coventry, about when the next section of the cycle route would be constructed.

00:54:48:07 - 00:55:21:07

Uh, John Seddon from City Council. The section on Bridge Road from Winslow Road through to Dorchester Way, which is the the missing section, I guess, between what's already been built on New Road and bungalow and what's already been built around University Hospital, uh, that is now undergoing final detailed design. Preparatory works have taken place in terms of removal of trees to accommodate the cycle route going in. and we're looking to be starting on site probably in June with completion towards the end of this year.

00:55:21:19 - 00:55:22:05

So it would.

00:55:22:07 - 00:55:27:16

Be completed by the time construction started on this. Correct.

00:55:29:27 - 00:55:54:06

Well, one of the things I'm not quite clear about is how you get across to the bit further up Clifford Bridge Road, across the B 482, where the applicant's proposing a pedestrian crossing as part of the project. If you're talking about cycle is the cycle route on the other side of the roundabout. So it wouldn't need to be a toucan crossing. It would only. Is that right?

00:55:54:28 - 00:56:04:10

That's correct. The cycle route is on the Coventry side, right around the western side. It crosses the river south on an existing bridge on that side of the roundabout.

00:56:05:03 - 00:56:23:21

Okay. Sarah Angus Walker for the applicant. If it exists, we are displaying figure 12.2, which is from app 058. So you can see the existing cycle route in solid yellow and the the missing link, if you like, in in dashed yellow going down from the roundabout.

00:56:24:09 - 00:56:38:01

Yeah. And I think it's because well, probably because we're both engineers, we're actually deal in detail and and it's how it actually fits together is more is of interest. So, um.

00:56:40:28 - 00:56:56:06

I mean, is there a is there a plan showing how that would be connected to this notional route across the A46? Is there any wider consideration of how that will work? Which way, which route it would take?

00:57:00:24 - 00:57:48:27

Not being developed up as a plan at this stage by the city council? Um, but the concept would be to take it along the road and link Inc. and to then cross the new section of road being constructed by National Highways. Yeah. Um, to access the under the bridge. And then it would be, you know, sort of linking to park that way. So the principles that we end up with a, you know, safer walking and cycling route linking the Coventry urban area to the country park at Coom without the need for people to use their road as they do at the moment, which is, you know, not a satisfactory route, but it's not yet developed in terms of a scheme design.

00:57:49:28 - 00:58:03:17

So if the the new, the one shown on that plan is on the western side of the roundabout. And this notional future route is on the eastern side of the roundabout, how do you get across to it? How would that be done?

00:58:05:13 - 00:58:18:19

Because that way around, if you if you do it on the north side of the roundabout, you don't need this crossing to be a toucan crossing. If you do it on the south side of roundabout, you do need this crossing. The proposed one in this scheme to be a toucan crossing, do you not?

00:58:31:15 - 00:59:11:11

Pass over Johnson City Council? Um, in terms of the connections across the road at the roundabout, um, there's there will be a toucan crossing as part of the scheme being currently delivered, which will be to the north of the roundabout. And that would be joining the, you know, the new section of soccer route with the existing section of soccer hospital. Okay. At the roundabout itself, there's informal crossing points which are linking to, you know, access then towards the, um, Tesco developments and connections to the housing on the, South eastern side of the roundabout.

00:59:12:01 - 00:59:39:21

Um, in terms of how we would be connecting in on Clifford Road and Link, that would be on the northern side of the link road, sort of, which is where within the, uh, design drawings that National Highways have produced. That's where that's facilitated in terms of The Verge. So we'd be logically connecting to that from the new cycleway on the northern arm of the junction.

00:59:41:07 - 01:00:02:03

Thank you for that. I realise it's not permitted this route, but it would be helpful for us if you could provide a sort of even if it's indicative plan of how these things would connect, that would be very useful. Sort of related question to that about, as I understand it, the land around Hundley Hall Farm is allocated for housing.

01:00:04:00 - 01:00:04:29

Is there any

01:00:06:18 - 01:00:16:01

Part of that consideration is given to developing a route through the housing area towards the Hungary Hall Farm Bridge.

01:00:18:29 - 01:00:21:19

Or is it only ever going to be along the road and up?

01:00:24:13 - 01:00:48:06

Neil Bennison, Coventry City Council um, we've had some very early preliminary discussions with the developer. Um, who owns that piece of land? That is a local plan site coming through. Uh, we would be looking at creating links to the existing, uh, sustainable and active travel network, but we

haven't got any details at the minute. That will be something that will come forward as that scheme is developed.

01:00:49:27 - 01:00:51:12

Thank you. Um.

01:00:54:17 - 01:01:10:05

I mean, I think that part of the project is. Mr. Walker, correct me if I'm wrong. Is it will be ducting provided across the link road of the B for 4082 to enable a crossing of the link road at some point in the future.

01:01:11:24 - 01:01:41:25

And I suppose the importance of this isn't necessarily to us is is what what we what we're presented with here is very much one solution. This is the solution it's going to be, even though it's not by any stretch certain to be that solution. What we want to want to try and understand is if the housing develops the way you imagine, and there are routes through that housing area, how do they then get across the link road? And there's things like that that we're trying to understand.

01:01:41:27 - 01:02:03:02

I admit I'm quite open to the fact that it's none of it's committed yet, but the issue is with the DCO, for instance, widening The Verge actually has implications for CCA to accommodate something that, if it ends up not being the route, is it legitimate to say something that's just a wide verge? birch.

01:02:04:18 - 01:02:54:07

Angus Walker for the applicant. Um, we don't take we take your point. So we are trying to have a balance between being accommodating to Coventry's, um, as yet not fully defined requirements. So we want to try and increase opportunities for active travel, but we can't seek to acquire land for something that isn't really part of the main project and might not be needed in the future. So we have fairly limited, um, future proofing, if you like, included in the application generally land that we are already acquiring for the project, but but we'll, um, construct it so that it can accommodate, um, future active travel routes.

01:02:55:13 - 01:03:04:02

So, I mean, I suppose, are you saying then that you that you'd compulsory acquisition this land, whether or not that route was allotted.

01:03:07:02 - 01:03:08:03

For the applicant.

01:03:09:20 - 01:03:16:24

I can't say for sure, but we can confirm that. Yeah. I mean, you know, some of the.

01:03:16:26 - 01:03:25:23

Not in transport sense, but it's an important part of what we will have to report on whether or not the compulsory acquisition is in the public interest.

01:03:26:00 - 01:03:48:05

Yes, sir. We thank the applicant. We certainly take that point and are very conscious of it. So we as I say, it's a balance between accommodation not standing in the way of, of, um, accommodating future developments while not overreaching with our compulsory acquisition powers as a result of that.

01:03:48:26 - 01:04:11:14

I thank you for that. I do we do understand that. And we don't want to be in the way either, of preventing such a thing happening. Um, there's one thing just for a wider point about what do we know Warwickshire's and rugby's view of this, because obviously this is a link that goes to a bridge that then goes out of Coventry.

01:04:18:03 - 01:04:18:19

To anyone.

01:04:18:21 - 01:04:26:07

Angus Walker for the applicant, if I can introduce Ian Bullard, who is our rights of way and expert.

01:04:27:20 - 01:05:04:08

And allied on behalf of the applicant, um, as we understand it, um, the, uh, liaison that's been undertaken, um, through the process, the design process, um, Rugby Borough has expressed an interest in greater connectivity. They're worried, um, the A46 as it exists results in a severance of the community, and they have concerns that the scheme.

01:05:04:22 - 01:05:43:08

Will worsen that effect. Um, the applicant doesn't share that, um, opinion. Um, the there is a public right of way shared between Coventry and Warwickshire as the highway authority. Um, to the north of the scheme uh, and Brinkley's road, um public highway to the south of the scheme above provide access to Coom Park from the residential area. And the scheme in its design, uh, doesn't worsen those connectivity points.

01:05:44:01 - 01:05:57:13

Um, and obviously with the various mitigation, uh, including the crossing on, uh, Clifford Bridge Road seeks to improve connectivity and therefore reduce severance.

01:05:59:12 - 01:06:11:00

Thank you. But, um, maybe I could ask Coventry. Are they have they discussed with rugby or Warwickshire? You know what happens at the other end of the bridge?

01:06:11:19 - 01:06:36:16

Uh, Neil Benson, Coventry City Council. Yes. There's been a number of meetings with National Highways, Warwickshire and Rugby present, um, discussing the future provision of this route. And it is an action and Warwickshire acknowledged that it's something that we're going to have to work together to, to deliver. And it's been positive so far. And it's an action that will take on once the the junction goes ahead.

01:06:36:21 - 01:06:39:24

I don't know who to ask this to, but it would help again

01:06:41:10 - 01:07:00:13

because Warrington Rugby aren't here. Whereas I've asked you whether you could provide a sort of indicative plan of how these things would connect and go to the bridge, whether and it may be something we do in written questions to Warrington Rugby and say, well, look, we've got this from Coventry and you respond,

01:07:02:03 - 01:07:08:03

but equally it'd be helpful if you are in and it goes to the applicant to if there is discussion about it, if it could be

01:07:09:20 - 01:07:16:19

clear from Warwickshire or Rugby before those written questions. That that would be much appreciated.

01:07:17:14 - 01:07:21:18

Angus Walker for the applicant. We can certainly raise this in our discussions with them.

01:07:22:04 - 01:07:22:24

Thank you.

01:07:24:10 - 01:07:24:27

Um.

01:07:28:04 - 01:08:00:26

I think I've actually covered item 3.2. In a discussion about the first bit, which is about the compulsory acquisition of land. I've got one more point about the to actually about The verge, paragraph 8.14 of the to, which is app 134 states would be no verge widening on existing B40 A82 to deter unauthorised Eyes towards the A46. Now the verge is already wide and wide enough to be used that way.

01:08:00:28 - 01:08:18:10

I didn't really understand that comment because clearly, if the new slip road has a widened verge, it must connect onto this road which has a which already has the verge. It has, and by definition must be wide enough. It's just that statement doesn't seem to make sense.

01:08:19:18 - 01:08:22:22

Angus Walker, if I can ask Mr. Bullard to respond to your question.

01:08:24:04 - 01:08:54:21

Thank you. On behalf of the applicant, um, the verge is wide enough to to walk down currently, but it's on surfaced, and it's, uh, not to any standard. Um, I think the the applicant's position is that provision of engineering works along that section would, uh, attract, um, Usage by walking, cycling, horse riding, of which currently there is none.

01:08:55:15 - 01:09:09:13

Um, because obviously the route as it stands is unsuitable and has no destination. So the it's the it's the introduction of a viable visible route is the the concern.

01:09:09:18 - 01:09:18:08

Okay. I understand. So if you did the hard surfacing as part of the scheme that would encourage people to walk. No. Well nowhere at the moment. Yeah.

01:09:18:21 - 01:09:21:01

Because there would be no crossing. Yeah. Exactly.

01:09:21:03 - 01:09:30:20

Yeah. Okay. Understand? Thank you very much. I think that concludes agenda item three. Move on to agenda item four.

01:09:32:21 - 01:09:51:13

Um, it's about the modelling around the introduction of cycling facilities along Bingley Road and Brownlow Road. Am I correct that I'll ask Coventry first, that when those cycling facilities were put in that there was no modelling done. Of the effect is that is that right?

01:09:54:08 - 01:10:15:09

And so the modelling that was. Sorry. Neil Bennison Coventry City Council. The modelling that was done for the cycle route itself was a specific detailed modelling of junctions and how it would affect that a new junctions. Um, there wasn't any specific strategic modelling done for bhindi cycle scheme, although it is.

01:10:18:13 - 01:10:56:03

We've just gone through a creating a new model. So our original model, the Coventry area strategic model, um, had the route in as a committed development and also had the Balls Grove junction in, although it was a slightly different version than one that's being considered for the D2 application. Um, we've just launched a new model, the Coventry strategic modelling tool. Um, and that has got both the scheme in and the current version going forward. If the wall space game. So whenever we look at games in 2031, in the old model, in 2041, in the new model, the effects of both are in there.

01:10:56:25 - 01:11:10:03

Um, the effect of putting the soccer on Billy Road had some sort of minor increases in sort of congestion for car vehicles along there, which you would expect for this kind of scheme, but not any sort of noticeable impacts on the wider network.

01:11:10:22 - 01:11:13:15

Okay. Thank you. It's good to understand.

01:11:16:09 - 01:11:53:08

Um, as I understand the to again, which is at one three for the 2043 sensitivity scenario and looking at figures 6.13 and 6.14, which you don't have to put them up, but it seems that the impact on the local roads is not just down to the, um, the impact of the junction, alterations to facilitate the cycle facilities

And figures 6.10 and 6.11 tend to show that the project has some impact on local roads in similar areas.

01:11:54:00 - 01:11:59:29

I mean, would you agree that the that the project does have some impact on local road congestion?

01:12:02:12 - 01:12:12:19

Angus Walker for the applicant, if I could introduce Rachel Walker no relation. Um, who is the transport and economics lead on the project?

01:12:14:02 - 01:12:47:05

Rachel Walker for the applicant. Yes. Part of the assessment, um, looks at the wider scale rather than just the impact of the junction low, very locally for the junction itself. By, um, releasing the bottleneck, potentially of congestion, traffic at the existing walls, grave junction, some trips that would want to get to the local routes would be able to do that, which currently can't happen. So there is a potential for some areas of congestion to increase. However, that's also counterbalanced by current vehicles that are running through that area.

01:12:47:07 - 01:13:14:28

That would then switch back on to the strategic road network that as we would want them to. So yes, some areas get worse, but some get better. And it's that balance that we're looking to achieve where only the trips that are that should be used in that area are using that area. And we're taking off some of the, the, the ones that are shifting to that to avoid congestion. But yes, there will be potential for some local, um, additional congestion at specific points.

01:13:15:10 - 01:13:52:17

Okay. Thank you. Could there's just one. Maybe I've misunderstood this, but the sensitivity analysis is being done. What I think you're showing in most of the figures is the with with project, with scheme and with scheme sensitivity, which tends which isn't the sort of traditional way of looking at it, because what you're showing is the, the impact of something that already exists, which is a cycle way. Have you done the the the cycle way which is without project and the scheme.

01:13:53:11 - 01:14:00:21

So it shows the impact of the scheme rather than trying to show the impact of the cycle way which it currently seems to be doing.

01:14:01:06 - 01:14:33:04

Yeah. Rachael Walker for the applicant. Yeah. So the the analysis in the transport assessment on this is, uh, not fully clear cut. Um, when the strategic model was developed, not all aspects of the cycle route were committed. So the cycle lanes specifically on Clifford Bridge Road and some of the cycle enhancements that those junctions weren't fully weren't incorporated into the strategic model. Um, we are looking to do that in the same way that Coventry City Council is in our modelling going forward, but that will be beyond the scope of the DCO process.

01:14:33:22 - 01:15:07:03

Um, so the sensitivity test itself was to look at the potential worst case impact. If the congestion that currently happens at Ward's grave does get into the area. What are the local impacts? However, the demand for trips from the strategic model doesn't take into account the capacity constraints that effectively makes the local roads less attractive to through trips. So it's more additional information rather than our core scenario of what we expect to happen.

01:15:07:15 - 01:15:33:10

Um, just to see what the impact is. So we will continue to enhance the modelling, but it was to further understand some of the potential impacts, but from a very worst case. So you've got the higher level of traffic, but the worst capacity for them, because you're taking that away from vehicular traffic and giving it to cycles. So again, it was it was more of an information package. Um.

01:15:34:00 - 01:15:42:14

But could it, could it be presented the other way round? Is it Inasmuch as without going into doing modeling beyond what you've already done,

01:15:44:05 - 01:16:18:28

that you show the scheme, you show the network with the scheme which you've already done. Yeah. And you show it with the sensitivity test done with the scheme. And that would in effect, um, if you show it with the cycleway on the existing on the. With what, what I did originally. What if what I want to understand is what I think you're currently showing in the sensitivity test is the impact of the cycleways rather than the impact of the project.

01:16:19:09 - 01:16:32:00

And the traditional way is to show without the project and with the project. And if the without the project has the cycleways, then the with the project with the cycleways will show the difference due to the project.

01:16:32:10 - 01:17:11:20

Okay. Rachel Walker for the applicant. Um, the Not sensitivity test doesn't have any of the cycle provisioning and looks just at the impact of the scheme if the cycle provision didn't go ahead. The sensitivity test has the cycle junction improvements, which were committed at the time of modelling at the Brinkley Road and Brandon Road junction, both with and without the scheme. So the difference between those plans is still the difference because of the scheme. When you look at the assessments between the normal version and then the sensitivity test in effect, yes, that as a byproduct gives you the difference because of those capacity constraints.

01:17:12:10 - 01:17:51:11

But that's not the intention of those. You can use it for that comparison. Right. Um, but the it's the pairs of figures together that are the comparison on those pages. So you've got the with and without scheme, without the cycle provision. And if the cycle provision was in the in and the out with the cycle provision in in place. So with and without scheme. But, but yes, as you say, if you compare the two scenarios, the sensitivity against the not sensitivity, then that effectively shows you the impact of those cycle schemes where the demand has not been reduced to take account of the fact that the capacity is reduced.

01:17:51:16 - 01:17:52:01

Okay.

01:17:52:03 - 01:17:59:17

So okay, maybe I'll ask Coventry. Are you content with the modelling that's been done on it and its implications?

01:18:02:23 - 01:18:31:00

Neil Bennison Coventry City Council yes, I mean we we have some ongoing concerns about congestion on the Clifford Bridge Road corridor, which isn't linked to this scheme. So we are looking at the area carefully and working with, uh, the developments coming forward in the local plan and sort of changes around the university hospital. We we take that into account when we're looking at the modelling and examining the, um, we we're confident that it's going to help the situation rather than exacerbate it.

01:18:31:09 - 01:18:40:09

Okay. Thank you. Well, unless the applicant wants to make another comment, I think that probably will suffice on that topic as well.

01:18:40:16 - 01:18:57:04

Um, I would only just for context say that the the cycle scheme along the road was only approved in January and then it was subject to a judicial review that was unsuccessful but was not resolved until March. So it's all very recent and that's why we haven't included it in our modelling.

01:18:58:11 - 01:19:08:24

Thank you. Okay. Well that concludes agenda item 034. I now move to agenda item seven.

01:19:26:07 - 01:20:05:09

Thank you very much, Mr. Humphrey. Moving to agenda item seven which is protection of soil resources. My questions are to the applicant in the main said to Mr. Walker. Um, several obligations related to the management and protection of soil resources as set out in section six of your environmental Statement. Appendix 9.2. That's examination library reference app dash 093. By our own count, there are 67 such obligations in all dispersed among eight subsections in section six.

01:20:06:01 - 01:20:24:04

These obligations are related to preventing soil loss, soil damage, and land degradation. The information we need to know is whether all these obligations will be woven into the relevant management plans and the development consent order. Thank you.

01:20:26:05 - 01:20:48:25

Angus Walker for the applicant. And the intention is that it will, um. We do have some commitments already in the Reac um, under GHS one, GHS three, four and five. Um, there will be a soil handling management plan,

01:20:50:25 - 01:21:13:04

which will be in the second iteration, environmental management plan. And that in turn will contain a soil resource plan. So that's where it's all going to be specified. It is a bit of a complex nesting of plans. I apologize for that. Um, perhaps I can ask Mr. Giblin to provide some further, uh, answer to you?

01:21:13:19 - 01:21:55:05

Yeah. Henry Giblin, uh, on behalf of the applicants. Yeah. So as as Angus said, um, as part of the. Well, sorry, as listed in the first iteration, environmental management Plan reference EP 109. Um, we. We do state that, um, various management plans will be produced, and that includes what, um, my colleague and Mr. Walker has just stated the soil handling management plan, which does include a soil resource plan and it's all handling strategy. And these will be produced as part of the second iteration, environmental Management Plan, which is secured through requirement for of the draft development consent order, uh Application Reference PD 1003.

01:21:55:24 - 01:22:13:18

And again, to reiterate Mr. Walker's point, um, we do specifically reference that in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. Reac. Um, that's reference EP 110 er commitments GHS one, three, four and five specifically.

01:22:15:12 - 01:22:39:13

It's helpful. Thank you very much. Will there be parity between the commitments and the obligations set out in application Ape 093 and the proposed soil management plan. So in terms of the number of obligations that are stated in that document, which is in the application bundle, will there be parties between those commitments, those obligations, and what you intend to provide in the various management plans? Thank you.

01:22:40:27 - 01:23:02:18

Yeah. Henry Giblin, on behalf of the applicant, in regards to the specific obligations laid out within the years. Appendix 9.2 Agricultural Land Classification ABP 093. We would um, obviously draft the soil handler management plan, soil resource plan. And so handling strategy and taking into account the obligations and accounting for the obligations set out within that report.

01:23:04:21 - 01:23:44:21

Thank you. That's my question answered. Thank you indeed. Um, just to follow up on that, it's in relation to, um, the consistency of the management plan titles in your environmental statement. Chapter nine, Geology and Soils. Uh, paragraph 9.3.16. That's examination library reference app Dash 031. It's paragraph 9.3.16. There's reference made to a soil management plan. There's no reference to a soil management plan in the draft development consent order, which is app Dash 005 Examination Library reference.

01:23:45:09 - 01:23:51:08

I just wonder, is that a mistype or is there an intention to provide a soil management plan? Thank you.

01:23:51:19 - 01:23:55:09

Thanks for the applicant. I think this is one for Mr. Giblin.

01:23:57:13 - 01:24:11:23

Yes. Henry Gibson, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. As I previously stated on the previous point, it's the soil handling management plan that will be produced. I believe the reference to a soil management plan was an incorrect an error, and we can rectify that.

01:24:13:08 - 01:24:33:13

Thank you very much. Thank you. And again, one follow up question in relation to monitoring. So we seek information about the applicant's proposals for the monitoring of soil protection, including reinstatement and return to agricultural use. Can you clarify your proposals for monitoring of soil protection? Thank you.

01:24:37:27 - 01:24:41:27

Guest worker for the applicant. Mr. Giblin again. Began.

01:24:44:13 - 01:25:00:05

Henry Giblin on behalf of the applicant. Um, so in regards to the reinstatement of land, I obviously I believe that it is is stated within the appendix 9.2 agricultural land classification ABP 093. And that will be further stated within those various management plans that will be stated.

01:25:03:00 - 01:25:09:01

Thank you. That's sufficient. Um, that completes this agenda item. I just to confirm my colleague. Thank you.

01:25:10:09 - 01:25:18:13

Just just to supplement that Angus Walker for the applicant, we can provide some specific references in that appendix in our summary of case.

01:25:35:24 - 01:26:00:01

I think, um, as yesterday, we're getting through this quite quickly. Um, so the difficulty is I'm aware that we do need to have a break at 12. So I think what we'll do is take an extended break now and come back and do item uh eight, which is flood risk after the break. If that's why everyone. So the time is 1135.

01:26:01:08 - 01:26:03:09

So 20 1120.

01:26:03:11 - 01:26:12:07

1120 1126 exactly. I was looking at it blocked. 1126 thank you. Mr.. So we'll adjourn for now. Thank you.