

Hi Bart,

As follow up requested by the inspectors at the hearing on October 1st, please find below comments and information for Deadline 6 from myself on behalf of Bickenhill Village:

Firstly, notwithstanding that the village does not support the road in any form, and does not wish the main compound to be sited right next to the village I would like to thank the work done by Skanska to look at our concerns and suggest ways to mitigate the impact if it goes ahead.

Secondly as agreed please see the attached document showing current taxi hotspots in the area and likely potential risks after works. I would like to make the following comments:

- The design of the new road should not allow space for taxis to park up, particularly at the identified hotspots and where the new road meets the old section in Bickenhill. Restrictions should be put in place and enforced.
- We are concerned that the north end of Church Lane, where new proposed footbridge across the A45 will be will be a potential risk spot for people looking to take the train/plane and avoid paying for on site parking, and would request that restrictions are put in place.

Thirdly as agreed we have investigated screening of the proposed main site compound from Bickenhill Village. Several villagers and I have walked the length of the village to identify hotspots where screening will be critical to avoid seeing right into the compound. We have drawn several conclusions based on marking 2m (the height of the topsoil stacks), and 3.6m (the maximum possible screening alluded to at the last hearing) on photographs at the Church Lane side at the top of the proposed compound field. Whilst this was not a rigorous scientific exercise it has allowed us to draw the following conclusions:

- Visual and acoustic screening will be required around the whole of the compound.
- There are areas where the 2m high topsoil stack might be sufficient- at the north end of Church Lane, depending on exactly how high up the slope the compound extends to.
- However at the view from Mr Cotterill and Mrs Burton's bedrooms 3.6m might not be sufficient, and certainly the view from the end of Pitt Lane would not be sufficient. The screening in this area will be most effective on the Church Lane side border of the main field-the further into the proposed main compound field the screening goes the less effective it will be due to the drop in elevation.
- We would also request further information from Highways England on what possible solutions might exist to address the pinchpoints where 3.6M might not be sufficient.

Fourthly I would like to support Mrs Burtons request to investigate an alternative route to the temporary road which is currently proposed as bordering her land.

Finally, and as already submitted I understand from discussions with Mark Sullivan at CPRE Warwickshire that he has requested an Issue Specific Hearing to look at changes which various interested parties wish to see-with regards to the overall design of the scheme and elements within it and I would like to support this.

Kind regards
Jon Horton
Bickenhill Resident and Parish Councillor

DISCLAIMER:

'This e-mail and files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately and delete the message. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council unless explicitly stated otherwise. Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council may monitor the contents of e-mail sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures'.

Plan of Current Taxi (& Airport Pickup) Parking Hotspots On or Adjacent To Catherine de Barnes Lane



Plan of Taxi (& Airport Pickup) Parking Hotspots On or Adjacent To Catherine de Barnes Lane Following M42 Jct 6A Works

