

Responses to the Examining Authority's Additional questions / clarifications – Annex C of the Rule 17 Letter

Ref.	Question to:	Question:	Response:
R17.1	Applicant Coventry City Council Warwickshire County Council	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain – Maintenance of mitigation areas</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, [REP4-018]).</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>	The Council are comfortable taking on the future maintenance responsibility for the area of land to be transferred from NH to CCC as part of the business-as-usual management of the Coombe Abbey Country Park.
R17.2	Applicant Coventry City Council	<p>Coombe Pool Breach Model – Sub-licence Agreement</p> <p>In the SoCG with Coventry County Council [REP4-018] 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>	Despite working in collaboration with National Highways, it is now accepted that NH have not been able to obtain a license directly or indirectly from the Environment Agency to use the Coombe Pool Breach Model, to better understand risk to the A46 and Coventry. With regard to the FRA, the statutory consultee responses of the Environment Agency are noted. Furthermore, the lesser reduction to the bund between the A46 and Coombe Pool was considered by the Council to be a more reasonable approach in the event of Coombe Pool Breach. On this basis, the works of the scheme are more acceptable to the Council and are now no longer subject to further discussion.

Ref.	Question to:	Question:	Response:
R17.6	Applicant Coventry City Council	<p>Noise mitigation - acoustic barriers</p> <p>Coventry City Council: In the response to ExQ1 NV.1.8 [REP3-047] 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: Explain why a permanent noise barrier was not considered as a possible embedded mitigation at this location?</p>	<p>The Council were referring to permanent barriers as it has been indicated already that there would be temporary measures installed during construction.</p> <p>As there is already proposed landscaping adjacent to the boundary with Hungerley Hall Farm, it was a suggestion as to whether non-vegetated design solution for barriers had been considered as necessary? The reasoning for this was that the new slip road would be closer than the existing A46 and at a more elevated level. The non-vegetated design would be more robust and screened by the proposed landscaping when matured and only visible by the occupiers of the farm to whom would be benefitting from the boundary treatment from a mitigation point of view.</p>