

A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Scheme Number: TR010066

8.14 Applicant's Summary of Issue Specific Hearing 1

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rule 17(1)

Planning Act 2008

Volume 8

May 2025

Deadline 1

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave)
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**APPLICANT'S SUMMARY OF
ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 1**

Rule Number	Rule 17(1)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010066
Application Document Reference	TR010066/EXAM/8.14
Author	A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	May 2025	Deadline 1

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	4
2.	Post-hearing submissions in response to matters raised at Issue Specific Hearing 1	5
3.	Hearing action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1	16

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. The Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) for the A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Consent Order (DCO) Application was held at MTC Sopwith Building, Airfield Drive, Coventry, CV7 9BF, on Thursday 8 May 2025, commencing at 10:00am. Participation was possible virtually on Microsoft Teams as well as by attendance in person.
- 1.1.2. The Examining Authority (ExA) invited National Highways (the “Applicant”) to respond to matters raised at the Hearing, but also in writing following ISH1.
- 1.1.3. In Section 2, this document summarises the responses made at ISH1 by the Applicant and addresses the representations made by Affected Parties, Interested Parties and other parties attending.
- 1.1.4. The Applicant has responded to the topics raised by each of the attending parties in the sequence that the ExA invited them to speak. It provides cross references to the relevant application or examination documents in the text below.
- 1.1.5. The Applicant has provided in Section 3 of this document a list of actions captured during ISH1, where relevant the Applicant has provided a response to those actions. The Hearing action points are set out in the document: Action Points from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - 08 May 2025 (**EV4-006**).

2. Post-hearing submissions in response to matters raised at Issue Specific Hearing 1

* Column 3 wording *Question/ Issue raised at ISH1* comes from the Agenda for Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) (**EV4-001**).

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
Agenda item 3.1	Applicant	The ExA would like a greater understanding of the development of the WCH routes in the vicinity of the A46 and possible future connections across the trunk road. In this case the ExA will have questions for both the applicant and local highway authorities.	<p>Coventry City Council stated its plans to develop a connection across the A46 to the as yet to be built cycle route along Binley Road were not developed at this stage.</p> <p>In relation to the Applicant's proposed earthworks, to widen the verge along the new section of the B4082 link road to facilitate future segregated walking and cycling connectivity to the proposed cycle route to be developed by Coventry City Council, the Applicant confirmed it is seeking to find a balance between considering expanding active travel (as per paragraphs 4.57 and 4.72 of the National Networks National Policy Statement 2024 (NPS NN)) and accommodating future connectivity to Coombe Abbey Park, with the requirements that there be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council's views on a possible future walking, cycling, and horse riding (WCH) link between the Local Authority areas, the Applicant confirmed its position that the Scheme will not worsen connectivity in the area. There are existing public rights of way between Coventry City Council's and</p>	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>During the design of the A46 Scheme, it was originally proposed that the existing Hungerley Hall Farm accommodation bridge be demolished. This would have required farm vehicles wanting to access fields to the east of the Scheme to use the B4082 and the eastern dumbbell roundabout. Coventry City Council raised safety concerns regarding this arrangement, particularly in relation to the potential presence of mud on the carriageway and the interaction of slow-moving agricultural vehicles with general traffic at the new junction.</p> <p>In response to these concerns, and as part of ongoing design, it was determined that the accommodation bridge could be retained for farm traffic. This decision eliminates the need for agricultural vehicles to use the B4082 and the new junction, thereby addressing the Council's concerns and improving operational safety and efficiency.</p> <p>To enable continued access for farm vehicles via the bridge, the vertical alignment of the B4082 had to be raised, and a crossing of the B4082 incorporated into the design.</p> <p>Upon review of the design, and considering the obligations of the NPS NN to consider</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
			<p>Warwickshire County Council's areas to the north of the Scheme (using Farber Road overbridge), and Brinklow Road to the south of the Scheme, that provide access to Coombe Pool from the proposed residential area to the west of the Scheme. The Scheme will not worsen these existing connectivity points. In addition, the introduction of a new signalised crossing of the B4082 road as part of the Scheme will improve connectivity in the area.</p>	<p>enhancement opportunities for active travel (paragraph 4.72), and to address concerns raised by the Local Authorities and other stakeholders, it was recognised that this modification could incorporate provision for a future WCH route along the B4082, utilising the accommodation bridge rather than a longer route around the junction, which would be less desirable for WCH users and the operation of the junction. This concept, in addition to the retention of the Hungerley Hall Farm accommodation bridge, was discussed with Coventry City Council and other stakeholders, with the aim of promoting local improvements for active travel that would remove the need for additional land acquisition and significant changes at a later stage, reducing the overall cost to the public purse.</p> <p>Coventry City Council has advised that this future route will feature in its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, due to be produced later this year. Demand for it is likely to increase as development land to the west of the A46 is brought forward for housing (see paragraph 12.8.3 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) (APP-034)).</p> <p>Furthermore, the passive provision of the WCH route in the verge area has a purpose of improving the Scheme's earthworks cut and fill balance. Raising the B4082 reduces the amount of cut material generated and as such more material would need to be imported; by incorporating the WCH route, this impact is mitigated as more cut is generated meaning less imported fill. This contributes to a reduction in vehicle movements associated with material import and helps reduce the overall carbon footprint of the Scheme's construction and construction traffic on the surrounding transport</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
				<p>network.</p> <p>In summary, the principal justification for the compulsory acquisition of land is to enable the delivery of the Scheme. However, through the evolution of the Scheme design and engaging with Local Authorities and other stakeholders, the Applicant is of the opinion that they have considered opportunities to support WCH, as well as improving future local connectivity and accessibility in developing infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that the widened verge to allow this futureproofing forms part of three land parcels, 2/1h, 2/3g and 3/2b. Parcel 2/1h (the B4082 and its verges) is already in the Applicant's ownership, parcel 2/3g and 3/2b are in the same ownership and are already needed for works 2C, 2E, 2G and 2H, as set out on page 55 of the Statement of Reasons (PD1-007).</p>
Agenda item 3.2	Applicant	The ExA in addition would like to fully understand how the future WCH provision would be accommodated within the draft DCO to enable possible future connections and the extent of additional land and/ or rights being acquired to facilitate such future provisions.	In response to a question regarding the comments in paragraph 8.1.4 of the Transport Assessment (APP-134) that no widening is proposed to the existing B4082 verge, the Applicant stated the existing verge is wide enough to walk along, however it is currently unsurfaced and not built to the required standard for use as a WCH route (LTN 1/20). The Applicant's position is that no widening be undertaken along the existing B4082 as such works, for example hard surfacing, may encourage use of the existing verge as a WCH route. This is undesirable as there is no clear route or connectivity from the existing B4082.	No further response is required.
Agenda item 4.1		The ExA would like to better understand the position with respect to the modelling undertaken around	In response to question regarding whether the Scheme would have an impact on local road congestion, the Applicant confirmed	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>Developments and infrastructure are included in</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
		<p>the introduction of cycling facilities along Binley Road and Brinklow Road and the implications for the modelling of the effect of the project on congestion on local roads in this area. The ExA would like to hear the views of both the applicant and Coventry City Council in this regard.</p>	<p>that by releasing the congestion and traffic at the existing Walsgrave junction, this may increase vehicles accessing the local network, which are currently held up as a result of the existing congestion, as set out in Section 6.6 of the Transport Assessment (APP-134). However, the Scheme will also draw vehicles from rat runs within the local road network back onto the strategic road network, as a result of the reduced congestion and queuing on the A46, thereby easing congestion on the local road network. The intent of the Scheme is to enable road users to more efficiently access the part of the road network most appropriate for their journey.</p> <p>In the context of a discussion about the introduction of cycling facilities along Binley Road and Clifford Bridge Road by Coventry City Council, some of which are yet to be delivered, the Applicant confirmed that the sensitivity testing in the Transport Assessment (APP-134) included the cycle junction improvements that were committed to at the time of modelling. The Applicant noted that the cycling routes along Binley Road were only approved in January 2025, and were then the subject of a judicial review that was unsuccessful but not resolved until March 2025.</p> <p>Coventry City Council stated it has some ongoing concerns about congestion on the Clifford Bridge Road corridor, however Coventry City Council confirmed that congestion is not linked to the Scheme.</p>	<p>the transport modelling for the Scheme based on the best available data at the time of modelling.</p> <p>For the modelling carried out for submission of the DCO application, the infrastructure changes for the two junctions of Clifford Bridge Road/Brinklow Road and Brinklow Road/Brandon Road were not included in the main modelling. However, as these junction schemes were then constructed during the modelling period, a sensitivity test was carried out to understand <i>the impact of the Scheme</i> once they were in place using the operational model. These junction schemes will be included in the update to the model currently being carried out but not available until after the end of the DCO process for both 'without' and 'with' Scheme models.</p> <p>Similarly, the Clifford Bridge Road cycle way scheme was not a committed development at the time of modelling and so was omitted from both the 'without' and 'with' Scheme models. For the modelling currently being updated (but not available until after the DCO process), the Clifford Bridge Road cycleway scheme will be included in both 'without' and 'with' Scheme models, as it is now a committed scheme. This is in line with Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Analysis Guidance for forecasting and uncertainty (Unit M4).</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
Agenda item 5.1		Reference will be made to Sheet 2 of the General Arrangement plans (AS-002). The ExA would like to better understand the proposed physical changes to the landscape between the existing and proposed A46 and the western edge of Coombe Pool.	The Applicant confirmed that the barrier shown on Sheet 2 of the General Arrangement (AS-002) described as 'Proposed Barrier' is a safety barrier, not the proposed construction noise mitigation barrier.	No further response is required.
Agenda item 5.2		Reference will also be made to ES Figure 8.3 (AS-052) showing a construction mitigation noise barrier between the proposed A46 and the western edge of Coombe Pool. The ExA will need a clearer understanding from the applicant of the scale of works of the proposed barrier.	<p>In response to a question regarding the proposed extent, layout and dimensions of the proposed temporary noise barrier at the western edge of Coombe Pool, the Applicant stated the temporary noise barrier will be comprised of Heras panels, measuring approximately two metres high, that will be secured to the existing post and rail fence along the edge of Coombe Pool. Acoustic blankets will then be fixed to the Heras panels, with no gap in between the blankets to provide effective noise absorption. The acoustic blankets will remain in place whilst the construction work is undertaken. The Applicant confirmed further detail regarding the temporary noise barrier will be undertaken during detailed design stage of the Scheme. Coventry City Council and Warwickshire County Council will be consulted during that design process.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the impacts of the temporary noise barrier have already been included and assessed as part of the environmental impact assessment for the Scheme, see paragraph 8.13.4 of ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030).</p>	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>The short and long term operational noise impacts with and without the Scheme are shown in ES Figures 11.6 (Noise difference contour: Long-term noise change without the Scheme), 11.7 (Noise difference contour: Short-term noise change with the Scheme) and 11.8 (Noise difference contour: Long-term noise change with the Scheme) (APP-055).</p>
Agenda item 6.1		The ExA will need to better understand the effectiveness of the site-specific mitigation techniques the applicant will use to reduce noise	The Applicant confirmed that the instalment of the temporary acoustic barrier is technically feasible, and that the barrier will work as a noise mitigation method to reduce	No further response is required.

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
		impacts upon Coombe Pool Site of Special Scientific Interest during the construction stage and the operation stage. The ExA will have questions for the applicant related to ES Figure 8.3 (AS-052) and Table 8-22 of ES Chapter 8 - Biodiversity (APP-030).	<p>noise impacts to Coombe Pool during construction. The temporary acoustic barrier has been included in the current noise modelling of construction work and is required for mitigation, as set out in ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030).</p> <p>The Applicant is confident it can also reduce noise levels at source during construction, by bringing forward its detailed consideration of construction processes, including programme timings and plant lists. Notwithstanding any reductions in noise levels at source, the Applicant is committed to using the temporary acoustic barrier as a mitigation method.</p> <p>The Applicant will issue a revised ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030) at Deadline 3 that will further assess the impacts of its proposed noise minimisation and mitigation methods during construction and provide an updated conclusion on the predicted level of impact.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the qualification in paragraph 8.13.4 of ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030), that further mitigation options would be developed during detailed design 'where practicable' to further reduce the noise levels impacting the SSSI during construction, the Applicant confirmed that it is undertaking consideration of those mitigation measures now (see above regarding the Applicant's investigations to reduce noise levels at source during construction). The Applicant will employ best practicable means for noise mitigation upon</p>	

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
			ecological features.	
Agenda item 7.1	Applicant	The ExA will refer to the obligations set out in Section 6 of the ES Appendix 9.2 (APP-093). The ExA will seek clarification from the applicant on how these obligations will be collated into the relevant management plans.	<p>The Applicant confirmed that the obligations in the ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093) will be secured by management plans.</p> <p>The Applicant stated that a Soil Handling Management Plan (which includes a Soil Resource Plan) will be produced as part of the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (EMP). This requirement is secured by Requirement 4, Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order (draft DCO) (PD1-003).</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the Soil Handling Management Plan will take into account the commitments and obligations in ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093).</p> <p>In response to a question seeking clarification on the Applicant's proposals for monitoring of soil protection, including reinstatement and return to agricultural use, the Applicant confirmed that those obligations are included in section 6 of ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093).</p>	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>To manage the impacts on soils from temporary and permanent land take, Commitment GS3 in the First Iteration EMP Annex A Register of Environmental Actions and Commitment (REAC) (APP-110) refers to the production of the Soil Handling Management Plan (SHMP) - including a Soil Resource Plan and a Soil Handling Strategy to be included in the Second Iteration EMP.</p> <p>The SHMP will be in parity with the obligations in section 6 of the ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093).</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) (APP-031) paragraph 9.3.16 – stated "Soil Management Plan (including a Soil Handling Management Plan)". This has been changed to – "Soil Handling Management Plan (SHMP) - including a Soil Resource Plan and a Soil Handling Strategy" (to align with GS3 wording, and ES Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) (APP-031) has been resubmitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Proposals for the monitoring of soil protection including reinstatement and return to agricultural use are included in section 6 of ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093) and will be in the Soil Handling Management Plan.</p>
Agenda item 8.1	Applicant	The submitted flood risk assessment: References from Section 13.4 of Environmental Statement Chapter 13	The Applicant and Coventry City Council confirmed that the Scheme, including the proposed earthworks works to the bund adjacent to Coombe Pool, does not pose an	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (AS-012) sets out the Applicant's position that the Scheme does</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
		(Road Drainage and Water Environment), (APP-035) and Table 3-1 of the Consultation Report (APP-115) will be made by the ExA about the applicants ongoing engagement with Coventry City Council. The ExA will need to understand the position the City Council hold on the flood risk assessment.	unacceptable flood risk, and that any residual reservoir risk from Coombe Pool is acceptable.	not pose an unacceptable flood risk. This is a position that is supported by the Environment Agency and Coventry City Council.
Agenda item 8.2	Applicant	<p>Coombe Pool Flood Mitigation Scheme:</p> <p>References from Section 8.7 (Reservoir Flood Risk) of Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 (Flood Risk Assessment) (AS-012) and Relevant Representation (Coventry City Council) (RR-013) will be made by the ExA to the Coombe Pool Flood Risk Mitigation Scheme. To more fully understand the risks to the A46, the ExA will want to hear the views of Coventry City Council and the applicant on potential mitigation options.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirmed that a catastrophic failure of Coombe Pool resulting in a breach that would cause flooding impacts to the A46 was a remote risk, the impacts of which would be the same with and without the Scheme. It was noted that the earthen embankment adjacent to Coombe Pool is unlikely to have been constructed as a flood retaining structure. Nevertheless, the Reservoirs Act 1975 requires that Coventry City Council routinely inspect and maintain Coombe Pool, to mitigate the risk of a catastrophic failure. A catastrophic failure of Coombe Pool is considered to be a residual risk in planning policy, as set out in paragraph 041 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>Coventry City Council confirmed it is satisfied with the level of resilience with respect to Coventry City and the A46.</p>	<p>Applicant's post hearing note:</p> <p>The FRA (ES Appendix 13.1 (AS-012)) sets out that Coombe Pool is classified as a Category B large raised reservoir under the Reservoirs Act, 1975. This requires that a robust inspection, maintenance and management regime is put in place by the reservoir owner and operator (Coventry City Council) and overseen by the Environment Agency. This means that any failure of the reservoir is unlikely and is classed as a residual risk, as set out in paragraph 4 of the Flood and Coastal Change PPG.</p> <p>However, in the very unlikely event of a sudden catastrophic failure of Coombe Pool, then the water which is currently retained would pond behind the A46. Under the current scenario the water would reach greater depths behind the bund in its current form than the proposed scenario. Coventry City Council agree that it is unlikely that this bund was constructed as a water retaining structure, therefore in such an event it would be likely to rapidly fail releasing water across the A46. However, in the proposed scenario, lower depths of water would be retained, and the elements of the retained bund would be strengthened to help prevent rapid failure.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware that Coventry City Council</p>

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
				has received the Environment Agency's reservoir inundation model for Coombe Pool. Coventry City Council confirmed it is satisfied with the mitigation measures in place.
Agenda item 9.1	Applicant	<p>The ExA would like to gain a deeper understanding of a number of topics related to biodiversity including the woodland creation proposals, the impacts of unnatural lighting on Coombe Pool, water course and detention basin enhancements, and green engineering methods. References will therefore be made by the ExA to Environmental Statement Chapter 2 (The Scheme) (APP-024), and relevant representation (RR-012) (Environment Agency). Under this agenda item, the ExA will have questions for the applicant, Coventry City Council, and the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Woodland creation</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed it has landscape plans for the woodland habitat creation mitigation proposals, that are included in the ES Figure 2.4 (Environmental Masterplan) (APP-043).</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the Scheme can achieve 10% biodiversity net gain as set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report (APP-076).</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the maintenance of the proposed woodland habitat creation area, the Applicant confirmed the intention is that Coventry City Council maintain the proposed woodland area as part of the Coombe Abbey Country Park Estate. The Applicant is confident these arrangements will be agreed with Coventry City Council before the end of the examination period. This matter is covered in 8.6 Statement of Common Ground with Coventry City Council (TR010066/EXAM/8.6) submitted at Deadline 1. A joint meeting was held between the Applicant and Coventry City Council on Tuesday 15 April 2025. At this meeting, the Applicant proposed to Coventry City Council that as part of the Scheme, the Applicant would transfer the triangle wedge of land (land parcel 2/3b) back to Coventry City Council to help facilitate a potential future WCH link into Coombe Abbey Park</p>	No further response is required.

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
			<p>via the Hungerley Hall Farm Overbridge. Coventry City Council have, in principle, agreed to this subject to the mechanism for transferring the land being agreed as well as agreement of any associated commuted sums.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that plans to make the Hungerley Hall Farm overbridge a public right of way are not part of the DCO Application but not prevented by the Application.</p> <p>Unnatural lighting on Coombe Pool</p> <p>In response to a question as to whether the Applicant intended to provide mitigation for unnatural lighting on Coombe Pool as part of the proposals, the Applicant confirmed that commitment G3 in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (APP-110) secures mitigation methods to reduce lighting disturbance during the construction works and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Water course and detention basin enhancements</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the ES Figure 2.4 (Environmental Masterplan) (APP-043) shows the detention basins and the proposed planting in those areas. The Applicant confirmed it would be happy to consider the inclusion of suitable planting, as long as it does not interfere with the purpose of the basins. The planting design will be developed through detailed design and will be consulted on as part of Requirements 4 and 6 of the draft DCO</p>	

Ref	Comment / Representation by	Question / Issue raised at ISH1	Applicant's response at ISH1	Applicant's written response
			<p>(PD1-003).</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that there would be a net gain in terms of habitat creation through the construction and formation of the detention basins, partly due to the increase in standing water.</p> <p>Green engineering</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed it will work with the Environment Agency regarding potential green engineering solutions, in particular in relation to green engineering alternatives to scour protection.</p>	

3. Hearing action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1

* Hearing action points from Action Points from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - 08 May 2025 (**EV4-006**).

Action	Description	Action by	When	Applicant's Response
1	To provide an indicative plan of how the proposed cycle ways might connect across the A46.	Coventry City Council	Deadline 1	<p>A joint meeting was held with Coventry City Council, Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council (the Local Authorities) on 15 May 2025. It was agreed that the Applicant would send AutoCAD models of the Scheme to Coventry City Council to mark up the proposed cycleways to submit at Deadline 1. These were sent to Coventry City Council on 15 May 2025</p> <p>Coventry City Council has advised that the future WCH route across the A46 (along the B4082 and across the existing Hungerley Hall Farm Overbridge to Coombe Abbey Park) discussed at the hearing, will feature in its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, due to be produced later this year. Demand for it is likely to increase as development land to the west of the A46 is brought forward for housing (see paragraph 12.8.3 of ES Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) (APP-034).</p>
2	To discuss with Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council what their view is on a future potential link between local authorities.	Coventry City Council / The Applicant	Deadline 1	A meeting was held with Coventry City Council, Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council (the Local Authorities) on 15 May 2025 where a future potential link was discussed. The Local Authorities agreed to come up with a joint response regarding a future potential link.
3	To confirm whether the land required at the verge, is required for the scheme or whether it is only being acquired for futureproofing purposes.	The Applicant	Deadline 1	See response to Agenda Item 3.1 in Section 2 above. Part of the land is for the future public right of way and to reduce the quantity of imported material required for the Scheme, to comply with the NPS NN and Coventry City Council's active travel proposals. It forms part of only three land parcels, one of which is already in the Applicant's ownership and the remaining other two are needed for other works.
4	Provide a plan showing a comparison of the impacts of operational noise with and without the scheme (may already have that in Figures 11.6 and 11.8).	The Applicant	Deadline 1	<p>ES Figure 11.6 (Noise difference contour: Long-term noise change without the Scheme) (APP-055) shows the noise difference contours for the operational scenario at 2043 without the Scheme.</p> <p>ES Figure 11.8 (Noise difference contour: Long-term noise change with the Scheme) (APP-055) shows the noise difference contours for the operational scenario at 2043 with the Scheme.</p>

Action	Description	Action by	When	Applicant's Response
5	Provide a section that goes through the existing roundabout across to the end of Coombe Pool showing indicative heights of landscaping etc.	The Applicant	Deadline 1	Two cross sections have been produced at chainage 690 (Section A1 to A2) and chainage 850 (Section B1 to B2). These cross sections illustrate the relationship between the existing levels and the adjacent Coombe Pool, alongside the proposed Scheme works, which include highway alignment, earthworks, and associated landscape proposals. This drawing is submitted at Deadline 1: 8.15 Additional Cross Sections through the Existing Walsgrave Junction (TR010066/EXAM/8.15).
6	Update Environmental Statement chapter 8 including a revised assessment of the noise impacts to Coombe Pool during construction, to take into account ongoing work in relation to reducing noise at source.	The Applicant	Deadline 3	An updated ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030) will be submitted at Deadline 3 to include a revised assessment of the noise impacts to Coombe Pool during construction, to take into account ongoing work in relation to reducing noise at source. In addition, the Applicant will also submit a revised ES Appendix 8.16 (Assessment of Noise Impacts on Ecological Features) (APP-091) at Deadline 3.
7	Environmental Statement chapter 9 APP-031, para 9.3.16 to be amended to refer to the soil handling management plan (rather than soil management plan).	The Applicant	Deadline 1	An updated ES Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) (APP-031) has been resubmitted at Deadline 1, and paragraph 9.3.16 has been amended to refer to the "Soil Handling Management Plan (SHMP) - including a Soil Resource Plan and a Soil Handling Strategy" (rather than "Soil Management Plan (including a Soil Handling Management Plan)").
8	In the summary of submissions made at ISH1, provide references from Appendix 9.2 for the Applicant's proposals for monitoring soil protection and reinstatement of land to agricultural use.	The Applicant	Deadline 1	To manage the impacts on soils from temporary and permanent land take, Commitment GS3 in the First Iteration EMP Annex A REAC (APP-110) refers to the production of the Soil Handling Management Plan (SHMP) - including a Soil Resource Plan and a Soil Handling Strategy to be included in the Second Iteration EMP. The SHMP will be in parity with the obligations in section 6 of the ES Appendix 9.2 (Soil Resource Plan and Agricultural Land Classification) (APP-093).
9	To provide a written response about whether or not the maintenance work to the reservoir has the potential to impact on the works for this scheme.	Coventry City Council	Deadline 1	
10	Provide written responses to questions raised during ISH1 in relation to the following: • Why does the Environment Agency consider it necessary for there to be a	Environment Agency	Deadline 1	

Action	Description	Action by	When	Applicant's Response
	<p>requirement in the draft DCO in relation to providing 10% Biodiversity Net Gain?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the Environment Agency's position on the Applicant's proposals to protect and enhance watercourses and the development of new habitats in proposed detention basin? Can the Environment Agency provide examples for the suitable and practicable enhancement for the watercourses and detention basin? The Environment Agency has used an issue impact solution framework to explain its views on the effects of unnatural lighting on Coombe Pool Site of Special Scientific Interest. Can the Environment Agency provide an explanation of these effects? Can the Environment Agency explain the green engineering solutions available as suitable alternatives to harm and scour protection? 			
11	<p>Provide written responses to questions raised during ISH1 in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of woodland area 	Coventry City Council	Deadline 1	A joint meeting was held with Coventry City Council, Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council (the Local Authorities) on 15 May 2025. At this meeting, the Applicant proposed to Coventry City Council that as part of the Scheme, the Applicant would transfer the triangle wedge of land (land parcel 2/3b) back to Coventry City Council to help facilitate a potential future WCH link into Coombe Abbey Park via the Hungerley Hall Farm Overbridge. Coventry City Council has, in principle, agreed to this subject to the mechanism for transferring the land being agreed, as well as agreement of any associated commuted sums.
12	To discuss with the Environment Agency if they would like some further detail in relation to the commitment G3 in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (APP-110), to reduce light	The Applicant	Deadline 1	ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030) is being amended to add in impacts from light pollution as an example of indirect impacts and will be submitted at Deadline 3. Further amendments are being made to ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030) to include the light pollution impacts on fish. Measures which would mitigate light disturbance impacts on fish are already detailed within the Chapter as mitigation for

Action	Description	Action by	When	Applicant's Response
	disturbance during construction and operation.			<p>other ecological features, include those within paragraph 8.10.7 of ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (APP-030) and are included in the First Iteration EMP (APP-109) and EMP Appendix A REAC (APP-110). As such residual effects on fish due to the Scheme are assessed as neutral (not significant) in both the construction and operational phase.</p> <p>The Applicant will discuss the issue with the Environment Agency, however, has not managed to do this by Deadline 1.</p>
13	To discuss further with the Environment Agency in relation to whether they would like something further in relation to green engineering options relating to harm and scour protection	The Applicant	Deadline 1	<p>Scour protection may be required on new outfalls discharging road runoff from the Scheme. The outfalls from the Scheme are on small ordinary watercourses. Paragraph 6.2.9 of the ES Appendix 13.5 (Hydromorphological Report) (APP-105) states that scour protection will only be incorporated where necessary following the findings of a scour assessment. The scour assessment and subsequent design will be undertaken as part of the detailed design phase and seek to use green engineering methods where feasible.</p> <p>The wording in the REAC (APP-110) (which is Appendix A of the First Iteration EMP (APP-109)) has been updated to better reflect what is noted in the Hydromorphology Report and will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant will discuss the issue with the Environment Agency, however, has not managed to do this by Deadline 1.</p>
14	The Environment Agency is to set a date by which it would report back on whether they would release their reservoir flood maps to the applicant. The agency have not released this to date due to national security considerations.	Environment Agency	Deadline 1	