

A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Scheme Number: TR010066

8.27 Applicant's Comments on Submissions Received at Deadline 5

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

Planning Act 2008

Volume 8

September 2025

Deadline 6

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

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

**APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS
RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 5**

Rule Number	Rule 17(1)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010066
Application Document Reference	TR010066/EXAM/8.27
Author	A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	Sept 2025	Deadline 6

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	4
1.1.	Purpose of this document	4
2.	List of Submissions	5
3.	Applicant's responses to the Deadline 5 submissions.....	6

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1. The Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the A46 Coventry Junctions (Walsgrave) Scheme (the “Scheme”) was submitted by National Highways (the “Applicant”) to the Secretary of State for Transport via the Planning Inspectorate on 14 November 2024 and accepted for Examination on 12 December 2024.
- 1.1.2. This document has been prepared by the Applicant to set out its comments on submissions received at Deadline 5 issued on 27 August 2025. This document is submitted at Deadline 6 of the Examination (9 September 2025).

2. List of Submissions

Ref No.	Representation By:	Submission:
REP5-023	Warwickshire County Council	Responses to ExQ2 (if issued)
REP5-024	The Coal Authority	Comments on any further information/ submissions received by D4
REP5-025	Natural England	Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
REP5-026	Graham Smith	Comments on any further information/ submissions received by D4, accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
REP5-027	Nick Walton	Deadline 5 submission
REP5-028	Coventry City Council	Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

3. Applicant's responses to the Deadline 5 submissions

Warwickshire County Council [REP5-023](#)

Ref no.	Question to	ExA's Questions	Interested Party Response – Warwickshire County Council	Applicant's Response
Biodiversity Net Gain				
R17.1	Applicant Coventry City Council Warwickshire County Council	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain – Maintenance of mitigation areas</p> <p>The Applicant, Coventry City Council and Warwickshire County Council: Provide an update which reflects the latest position regarding responsibilities for maintenance of these mitigation areas.</p>	<p>The County Council would expect all mitigation areas which remain under the control of the applicant to be responsible for the management in accordance with the submitted and approved Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP) associated to these areas. Additionally, the County Council would expect that any mitigation areas passed onto another landowner will be done so under a legal agreement which would require that landowner to manage the mitigation areas in accordance with the prescribed HMMP for that mitigation area. Ideally, the transferred mitigation areas would be governed through a Conservation Covenant with a Responsible Body and be registered onto the Biodiversity Net Gain Register, managed by Natural England, for auditable transparency. The County Council would expect all HMMPs (or equivalent) to cover a minimum 30 years from the last day the prescribed habitats have been created.</p>	<p>The maintenance of the proposed landscaping that forms part of the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment will be detailed in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), which will be produced as part of the Second Iteration Environmental Management Plan, secured through requirement 4 of the draft DCO (REP3-005). The First Iteration EMP (REP4-010) includes Appendix B.4 Outline LEMP that has been updated and submitted at Deadline 6 to state that monitoring will be carried out for the whole of the 30-year establishment and maintenance period.</p>

The Coal Authority [REP5-024](#)

Ref	Representation recorded comments	Applicant's Response
General Topic		
1	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>We have reviewed the site location plan provided and can confirm that the site falls within the Coal Authority's defined Development Low Risk Area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.</p> <p>However, in the interest of public safety, it is requested that the Coal Authority's Standing Advice note is drawn to the applicant's attention, where relevant.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Natural England [REP5-025](#)

Ref no.	Question to	ExA's Questions	Interested Party Response – Natural England	Applicant's Response
Table A: Natural England's response to Examiner's Additional questions/ clarifications				
R17.3	Applicant	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and other consents and agreements The SoCG between the Applicant and Natural England [REP4-022] indicates the status of the topic under Ref. 1 'Biodiversity - Coombe Pool Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) consent' is under discussion. Natural England, in response to submissions at deadline 3 (under the heading 'Works within Coombe Pool SSSI' in [REP4-027]), state that it requires additional information to demonstrate planned works within Coombe Pool SSSI can go ahead without impact to notified features. 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>Although this is not a question for Natural England, we would like to take this opportunity to clarify that this matter remains under discussion. We have provided advice to the Applicant as follows with regard to assenting works within Coombe Pool SSSI:</p> <p>We currently require additional information in order to demonstrate the planned works can go ahead without impact to notified features, and in the absence of certainty regarding methodology we therefore are not able to advise that the project would not require assent once the DCO has been granted.</p> <p>This advice, as the Examining Authority has noted was included in REP4-027. The SoCG has not yet been amended to reflect Natural England's advice on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant has outlined in the Applicant's Comments on Submissions Received at Deadline 4 (REP5-020), response to Natural England Refs 1-4, that the Scheme is not impacting the notified features of the SSSI.</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with Natural England, and it is noted in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Natural England (REP5-017) that Article of 52 of the draft DCO (REP3-004) disapplies sections 28E and 28H of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, which are the obligations to get consent from Natural England to carry out operations in a SSSI. Therefore, the Applicant confirms that SSSI assents are not required.</p>
R17.8	Applicant Natural England	Soils and best and most versatile agricultural land In the latest iteration of the SoCG with Natural England, the Applicant commits (Ref. 17 in Table 3-1 of [REP4-022]) 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. Explain the aspects currently being worked through on this topic so that a clear position is available in the SoCG.	Ref 17, should now be agreed in the SoCG. The Applicant provided further information to Natural England in an email dated the 16 May 2025. We welcome this information which included outstanding information to be secured in the Soil Handling Plan. We confirmed in an email dated the 19 May 2025 that our soils specialist had confirmed that the details provided were acceptable. We have confirmed to the Applicant in a meeting on the 23 July 2025 that this matter has been agreed. We therefore consider this matter agreed and that no further information will be required on this matter	The Applicant notes this comment.
R17.9	Applicant	Water pollution risk The SoCG between the	We have previously explained to the	The Applicant has consulted with Natural

Ref no.	Question to	ExA's Questions	Interested Party Response – Natural England	Applicant's Response
	Natural England	<p>Applicant and Natural England (in Table 3-1 of [REP4-022]) 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.</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England, in response to submissions at deadline 3 [REP4-027], state that no further information has been provided at deadline 3 regarding water quality impacts. The Applicant: 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? If not, explain why it is not available or unnecessary to do so? The Applicant, Natural England: 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>	<p>Applicant through discussions that currently the information available lacks specific detail on methodology of mitigation, especially considering the proximity of the SSSI to the scheme, for Natural England to confidently advise on whether impacts can be ruled out or not.</p> <p>We have provided some further specific details on what information we require to the Applicant in an email on the 6 August 2025. We have asked the Applicant to provide details on what suitable measures would be used to prevent / control run off to prevent sediment, silt and pollution from entering any part of Combe Pool SSSI during construction and essentially during removal and construction of the environmental bund. The Applicant has today (13 August 2025) provided us with a draft note that summarises the methodology for working adjacent to the Combe Pool SSSI, Natural England is currently considering this information.</p>	<p>England and has addressed their queries through the amended Register of Environmental Actions (REAC) (REP5-006) commitments G5 and RD13. This has been resubmitted at Deadline 6. As a result of these changes, the issue Ref 16 is now marked as 'agreed' in the Statement of Common Ground with Natural England (REP5-012), resubmitted at Deadline 6.</p>

Graham Smith [REP5-026](#)

Ref	Representation recorded comments	Applicant's Response
Bridge		
1	<p>I have been interested in this and the previous bridge project at Binley woods expecting the solution for the Walsgrave junction to follow similar lines (a bridge) I'm absolutely astounded that the proposal put forward involves DIVERTING THE CURRENT TRAFFIC TO AND FROM CLIFFORD BRIDGE ROAD along what amounts to a diversion route of approximately 1 mile for Binley bound traffic!!!</p> <p>This will only encourage drivers currently using the existing island junction to In my opinion this will lead to traffic congestion up / down Clifford bridge road Well done to the decision makers on this project for giving the residents of the road even more filthy emissions never mind the noise too. &9p_</p> <p>Whoever put forward this solution needs to think again Ø>Ý</p>	<p>The existing Walsgrave junction is currently a bottleneck for traffic passing through the A46 corridor, with congestion regularly building up on the B4082 owing to the difficulty in accessing the roundabout during peak and even off-peak periods.</p> <p>By replacing the existing roundabout with a grade-separated junction, the Scheme would provide road users with significant journey time savings, even taking into consideration the slight increase in driving distances required to enter and exit the junction in its revised configuration.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (APP-134) explains the forecast impacts, both positive and negative, of the construction and operation of the Scheme on the performance of the road network. It includes a detailed assessment of the performance of the existing Walsgrave junction as well as a summary of the work to model the capacity, journey time and traffic flow changes brought about by the Scheme.</p>
2	<p>Please tell my why the obvious solution of another bridge has not been put forward as the lie of the land lends itself to this answer and of course would not require another junction further along the road!</p> <p>To be honest I'm totally baffled by the proposal and if the answer is COST that's just not acceptable as peoples health and the environment should be foremost in any decision.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing the final outcome of this project should it go ahead as planned and its effect on the local area especially Binley road Clifford bridge road and the hospital junction!</p> <p>Absolute mayhem will transpire especially during "rush hour" periods! Lives could / will be lost I'm sure &9p_</p>	<p>The Case for the Scheme (REP3-036) provides a summary of the traffic impacts reported in the Transport Assessment (APP-134), but also summarises its wider impacts, including the economic benefits it is predicted to deliver.</p> <p>The site of the relocated junction was chosen after an extensive process of identifying and testing a range of alternative options, which included a full public consultation in 2022 leading to the Preferred Route Announcement. The preferred route, which was developed and consulted on further at statutory consultation, was deemed to be the optimum solution to meet the objectives of the Scheme. It also provides an effective response to the existing physical constraints in the Walsgrave area including a flood plain, the Coombe Pool SSSI, overhead power lines and the Hungerley Hall Farm. These factors are addressed in detail in the Scheme Design Report (APP-135).</p>

Nick Walton [REP5-027](#)

Ref	Representation recorded comments	Applicant's Response
1	<p>I am contacting you as I am unable to access the letter that is referred to in your letter of 31 July. I cannot therefore make any response. Indeed the three week consultation period handily falls when most people are away on holiday.</p> <p>I would stress our concerns that the proposed junction changes will only add to the noise and environmental impact that has resulted from the A46 bridge installation at the Binley Woods junction. Once the proposed junction at Walsgrave is completed, the A46 will just be a racetrack with no speed controls in place along its entire stretch apart from the Toll Bar Island stretch where no one lives ! The noise pollution has already made our rear garden obsolete as you can't hear yourself think let alone talk to another person such is the level of sound. Even in this hot summer no one sits out in their garden. It would be a welcome surprise if the 'victims' of these schemes were considered and steps taken to alleviate the disturbance that has been forced on us without any concerns as to the impact on the local residents, particularly those living in Hepworth Road.</p>	<p>The Applicant has conducted an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to identify the significant environmental effects, both adverse and beneficial, of a proposed development. This assessment is a legislative requirement to support the DCO and is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) (REP3-015) reports no likely significant residual effects are predicted as a result of the Scheme. Part of the A46 will have a 50mph speed limit, as provided for in Part 5 of Schedule of the draft DCO (REP3-004).</p>

Coventry City Council [REP5-028](#)

Ref no.	Question to	ExA's Questions	Interested Party Response – Coventry City Council	Applicant's Response
Responses to the Examining Authority's Additional questions / clarifications – Annex C of the Rule 17 Letter				
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.	The Applicant welcomes Coventry City Council's position.
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. 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? 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.	The Applicant welcomes Coventry City Council's position in that they agree with the findings of the FRA (ES Appendix 13.1 (AS-012)).
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</p>	The Council were referring to permanent barriers as it has been indicated already that there would be temporary measures installed during construction.	As detailed in the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Letter 31 July 2025 (REP5-021), a permanent operational noise barrier is not

Ref no.	Question to	ExA's Questions	Interested Party Response – Coventry City Council	Applicant's Response
		<p>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>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>	<p>required as no significant effects are reported during operation in ES Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) (REP3-014).</p>