



National Infrastructure  
Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer 0303 444 5000  
Services: a46walsgrave@planninginspectorate.gov.uk  
e-mail:

---

The applicant, interested parties and  
affected persons

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010066

Date: 31 July 2025

---

Dear Sir/ Madam

## **The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) – Rule 17**

### **Application by National Highways for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Project**

#### **Request for further information**

We are writing under Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) with respect to three matters.

#### **1 Potential change to the examination timetable.**

We are proposing to reduce the length of the current examination timetable set out in Annex A of our Rule 8 letter [\[PD-007\]](#). We have taken account all of the submissions before us to date and consider that there are relatively few matters where we still need further information during the examination.

The revised timetable we are proposing is set out in Annex A of this letter.

Should the amended timetable be implemented, we would remind all parties, notwithstanding the additional clarification questions explained in part 2 of this letter, all final submissions must be made by not later than 23.59 on **deadline 6 (D6) Tuesday 09 September 2025**. Annex B of this letter sets out the required final applicant's update that has been amended from the existing submission required in Annex F of our earlier Rule 6 letter [\[PD-006\]](#).

Prior to formally revising the examination table, we would request all affected persons and interested parties to consider whether they wish to comment on the amended timetable set out in Annex A of this letter. We would request that any such comments should be made at the latest by 23.59 on **deadline 5 (D5) Friday 22 August 2025**.

## 2 Additional questions/ clarifications.

As a result of submission made at D3 and D4 the ExA have some questions/ clarifications that are required from the Applicant and other parties. These are set out in Annex C of this letter.

Responses are required at the latest by 23.59 on **Friday 22 August 2025 (D5)**.

## 3 Report on the implications for European sites (RIES)

Taking account of the applicant's submissions and those from statutory bodies we are satisfied that it is unlikely there will be any implications for any designated European sites. As a consequence, we will not be issuing a RIES.

Should any party wish to comment on this matter any submission should be made at the latest by 23.59 on **Friday 22 August 2025 (D5)**.

Yours sincerely,

*Neil Humphrey*

**Neil Humphrey**  
**Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.  
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

## Annex A - Revised examination timetable (after deadline 5)

Item	Matters	Date
1.	<b>Deadline 6 (D6)</b> For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Applicant's <b>final</b> updates. (see <b>Annex B</b>)</li><li>• Applicant's closing summary statement.</li><li>• Summary statements from parties regarding matters that they have previously raised during the examination and that have not been resolved to their satisfaction.</li><li>• Any other information submitted by the applicant.</li><li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (if requested).</li></ul>	<b>Tuesday 9 September 2025</b>
2.	<b>Deadline 7 (D7)</b> For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (if requested).</li></ul>	<b>Thursday 11 September 2025</b>
3.	Close of the examination	<b>Friday 12 September 2025</b>

## Annex B

### Applicant's final updates

The details required in the applicant's updates are set out in Annex F of our Rule 6 letter [\[PD-006\]](#). From that annex the following changes should be noted:

- Statements of common ground (SoCG) – final versions to be submitted by D6 unless signed versions already submitted into the examination at an earlier deadline.
- Statement of commonality of SoCG – final version submitted at D6.
- Navigation document – final version to be submitted by D6.
- Final updates to the draft development consent order (dDCO) and explanatory memorandum, to include:
  - The latest, fully up-to-date versions of the dDCO and Explanatory Memorandum.
  - Clean copies and copies showing tracked changes from the penultimate versions.
  - A clean (all tracking removed) standalone MS Word version of the dDCO, with no header or cover page. (*This will not be published, it is for our internal use*) **(at D6 only)**.
  - The email notification from <https://publishing.legislation.gov.uk/> confirming the dDCO has successfully passed validation. (This will be redacted and published) **(at D6 only)**.
  - The statutory instrument (SI) validation report – the PDF version available through the link in the email notification. (This will not be published) **(At D6 only)**
  - A table showing the amendments made to the dDCO in each update and the reasons for the changes made.

All other elements of the applicant's final updates to be as set out in Annex F of the Rule 6 letter, with the proviso that all final submissions are made by D6.

## Annex C

### Additional questions/ clarifications

Ref.	Question to:	Question:
R17.1	Applicant Coventry City Council Warwickshire County Council	<p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain – Maintenance of mitigation areas</b></p> <p>The Applicant: Provide details of the mitigation areas referred to in Table 3-1 of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Coventry City Council (page 35 of 63, <a href="#">[REP4-018]</a>).</p> <p>The Applicant, Coventry City Council, Warwickshire County Council: Provide an update which reflects the latest position regarding responsibilities for maintenance of these mitigation areas.</p>
R17.2	Applicant Coventry City Council	<p><b>Coombe Pool Breach Model – Sub-licence Agreement</b></p> <p>In the SoCG with Coventry County Council <a href="#">[REP4-018]</a> it is stated that a sub-licence agreement has been forwarded to National Highways to facilitate the use of the Coombe Pool Breach Model to understand better the risks to the A46.</p> <p>The Applicant: Confirm whether you will carry out an assessment of the Proposed Development using the Coombe Pool Breach Model? If not, can you explain why not?</p> <p>Coventry City Council, The Applicant: Provide an update which reflects the latest position regarding the assessment of residual risk associated with failure of Combe Pool reservoir?</p>
R17.3	Applicant	<p><b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and other consents and agreements</b></p> <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and Natural England <a href="#">[REP4-022]</a> indicates the status of the topic under Ref. 1 'Biodiversity - Coombe Pool Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) consent' is under discussion.</p> <p>Natural England, in response to submissions at deadline 3 (under the heading 'Works within Combe Pool SSSI' in <a href="#">[REP4-027]</a>), state that it requires additional information to demonstrate planned works within Coombe Pool SSSI can go ahead without impact to notified features.</p> <p>At this time are you able to provide additional information to Natural England on this issue such that it can be resolved and agreed before the close of the Examination?</p>

Ref.	Question to:	Question:
R17.4	Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report</b></p> <p>Natural England's submission at deadline 3 (reference BY.1.10 in <a href="#">[REP3-052]</a>) raises the matter of how the HRA report <a href="#">[APP-087]</a> should list all the qualifying features set out in page 2 of the River Mease SAC Citation, and any potential impacts to the site's Conservation Objectives.</p> <p>Is it your intention to update the HRA with a list of all such qualifying features along with details of any potential impacts?</p> <p>If not, can you explain why not?</p>
R17.5	Applicant	<p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>Natural England's comments on any further information/submissions received by deadline 3 <a href="#">[REP4-027]</a> restate its concern regarding vegetation clearance between the road and the potential to increase light disturbance impacts on the notified features of Combe Pool SSSI.</p> <p>Can you provide Natural England with additional information regarding lighting impacts and potential measures to mitigate impacts?</p> <p>If not, explain why it is not available or unnecessary to do so?</p>
R17.6	Applicant Coventry City Council	<p><b>Noise mitigation - acoustic barriers</b></p> <p>Coventry City Council:</p> <p>In the response to ExQ1 NV.1.8 <a href="#">[REP3-047]</a> it is suggested that consideration is given to the provision of acoustic barriers to protect the amenity of Hungerly Hall Farm.</p> <p>Clarify whether you are referring to temporary or permanent barriers?</p> <p>Can you also clarify whether you are suggesting a vegetated or non-vegetated design solution for the barriers?</p> <p>The Applicant:</p> <p>Explain why a permanent noise barrier was not considered as a possible embedded mitigation at this location?</p>
R17.7	Applicant	<p><b>Noise mitigation - operational phase</b></p> <p>Natural England, in its deadline 4 response <a href="#">[REP4-027]</a> under the heading 'Noise (Source 2.2.7 REP3-028).', has stated that a permanent noise barrier should be provided to mitigate for residual operational noise impacts on breeding and wintering birds in the Coombe Pool SSSI.</p>

Ref.	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Explain why a permanent noise barrier at the interface between the proposed realignment of the A46 and the Coombe Pool SSSI does not currently form part of the DCO.</p> <p>(ii) Given that the woodland immediately adjacent to the A46 carriageway was shown to support low numbers of common woodland and garden species (paragraph 2.1.24. <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a>) explain why a permanent noise barrier was not considered as a possible embedded mitigation?</p>
R17.8	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Soils and best and most versatile agricultural land</b></p> <p>In the latest iteration of the SoCG with Natural England, the Applicant commits (Ref. 17 in Table 3-1 of <a href="#">[REP4-022]</a>) to provide details regarding the monitoring and reporting of soil reinstatement and its return to agricultural use, which will be included in the Soil Handling Management Plan accompanying the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>Explain the aspects currently being worked through on this topic so that a clear position is available in the SoCG.</p>
R17.9	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Water pollution risk</b></p> <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and Natural England (in Table 3-1 of <a href="#">[REP4-022]</a>) indicates the status of the topic under Ref. 15 'Water pollution risk – risk of silt pollution from bund works and mitigation measures' remains under discussion. Furthermore, Natural England, in response to submissions at deadline 3 <a href="#">[REP4-027]</a>, state that no further information has been provided at deadline 3 regarding water quality impacts.</p> <p>The Applicant:</p> <p>Are you able to provide additional information to Natural England on water quality impacts such that it can be resolved and agreed before the close of the Examination?</p> <p>If not, explain why it is not available or unnecessary to do so?</p> <p>The Applicant, Natural England:</p> <p>Explain the aspects currently being worked through on the topic of water pollution risk so that a clear position is available in the SoCG.</p>
R17.10	Applicant Rugby Borough Council	<p><b>Public rights of way (PROW) provision.</b></p> <p>In the SoCG <a href="#">[REP4-019]</a> between the applicant and Rugby BC only one item remains under discussion (Item 5). From Rugby BC's position we understand that it is seeking funding from the applicant towards improvements to provide better connectivity between Coombe Abbey and Coventry.</p>

Ref.	Question to:	Question:
		<p>We would like to understand what progress is being made on the issue of Rugby BC securing any funding from the applicant towards improved connectivity.</p> <p>If no progress on the issue of funding is likely to be made we would also like to understand the parties' final positions on this matter.</p>