

ExQ	Question:	WCC Response
1.0.3.	<p><b>Covid-19 pandemic</b></p> <p>a) Does any party have any view as to whether the Covid-19 pandemic has had any material implication as to how the Proposed Development should be considered, particularly in relation to demand and trends in all aspects of the submission following the pandemic?</p> <p>b) If so, they should explain why they hold that view, evidenced where possible.</p> <p>Note: This is a separate matter to the question asked of the Applicant in the Rule 17 letter of 22 September 2022 [PD-007] which was responded at D2 [REP2-077] by the Applicant. The Applicant does not need to respond further, but other IPs may respond both to this question and the D2 response.</p>	<p>a) – D2 <a href="#">[REP2-077]</a> notes that “LCC NDI Modelling team response suggests an option that aligns with Option 3 of the TAG guidance would be the most appropriate method at this time. The timeline for the suggested work would be 3 to 5 weeks after acceptance by the Highway Authorities to the approach. A fully rebased model using 2023 flows (as per Dft Option 2) is not likely to be ready for general use until mid to late 2024.”</p> <p>With HNRFI we are looking at traffic impact, both in terms of reassignment in response to the new infrastructure as well as a direct consequence of new trips on the model network related to the development proposals</p> <p>If we assume that the changes in background traffic patterns in this area are similar to elsewhere in Warwickshire then it is likely that peak hour traffic volumes will be lower if the models were updated to account for Covid.</p> <p>The effects are also unlikely to be consistent as some areas will always be at capacity but other routes (which accommodate a lot of rat running trips) may perform significantly better due to traffic reassignment.</p> <p>WCC is concerned that application of Option 3 (i.e. globally adjusting the model results) would not be reflective of urban and rural parts of network. We would therefore request further clarification as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) How will the factors which will be used to inform the 'global adjustments' be calculated and applied to the model outputs?</li> <li>(ii) Will the adjustments be contained to specific model outputs?</li> <li>(iii) Depending upon the answer to the previous question, how traffic impact will be assessed in light of the application of global adjustments to the 'model results'?</li> </ul> <p>b) WCC has very limited post pandemic traffic count data for this part of the network – data collection was only recommended to be re-started in April 2023 by DfT. However of the limited data collected, there has generally been a trend of some peak hour reductions whilst the inter-peak flows have increased, however more data is required before any conclusions can be drawn.</p> <p>Overall, WCC consider the assessments carried out to date to identify the development percentage impacts may show lower percentages than would be the case with a post-pandemic dataset, so more links/junctions could fall into scope with an updated baseline.</p> <p>However, if the trends outlined within the report hold for all parts of the network, then the peak hour operational assessments that have been carried out with slightly higher forecast background traffic flows and this would provide for an element of robustness.</p>
1.0.4.	<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>Could all interested parties provide the Examination with their views as to how the Proposed Development would affect any person with any protected characteristics set out in section 4 of the Equality Act and whether it would (in line with s149 of this Act):</p>	No comment.

	<p>a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</p> <p>b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</p> <p>c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</p>	
1.0.13.	<p><b>Associated housing development</b>  A number of RRs, such as [RR-0025] and [RR-1022], reference the provision of housing associated with the application.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant confirm if the scheme includes the provision of housing?</p> <p>b) Could the Local Authorities advise whether any major development proposals have come forward or are planned in the vicinity of the application site?</p>	<p>b) The closest housing development sites within Nuneaton and Bedworth are approximately 10km from the site, and those in Rugby are approximately 22km from the site. These are all allocated housing sites in the current adopted Local Plans.</p>
1.0.16.	<p><b>Energy Generation</b></p> <p>a) All parties are offered the opportunity to make representations relating to the energy aspects of the Proposed Development following the publication by the Government of the suite of Energy NPSs in November 2023.</p> <p>b) The Applicant is asked for its comments in light of footnotes 80 and 92 of EN-3 and their implications for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>c) The Applicant is asked to signpost how the proposed photovoltaic arrays are to be secured and delivered (ie to ensure any effects of them are taken into account).</p> <p>d) The Applicant is also asked to estimate the current maximum energy generation that could be secured from the rooftop delivery of photovoltaic cells within the Proposed Development based on current technology (measured in alternating current (AC)). This answer should ignore any legislative restrictions on the amount of energy that could be produced.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>

1.2.2.	<p><b>ES Appendix 11.4: Arboriculture Impact Assessment [APP-194]</b> Please confirm or otherwise your comments on the Arboriculture Assessment and the loss of trees, particularly the loss of Category A specimens. In addition, please comment on the compensatory provisions proposed.</p>	<p>We would expect the detail of any arboricultural and landscape impacts for any highway works to be identified at the time of technical approval. WCC's current S278 process would include provision for commuted sums in lieu of any loss. If not included, we would like this provision to be included in the dDCO.</p>
1.4.2.	<p><b>Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023</b> Are there any implications for the proposed development on cultural heritage assets as a result of Section 102 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023? If you consider there are, please set out your analysis for consideration.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
1.4.4.	<p><b>Appendix 13.1 Archaeological Assessment [APP-201]</b> (a) Please confirm whether you agree with Archaeological Assessment and its conclusions, and in particular the suggestion at paragraph 1.78 that the Romano-British remains are of low to medium importance and do not require preservation in-situ. If not, could you please explain why you hold that view. b) In addition, paragraph 1.119 identifies a series of trial trench excavations, please advise if you consider the extent and coverage to be sufficient to properly inform the Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
1.4.5.	<p><b>Appendix 13.2 Heritage Assessment [APP-202]</b> a) Please confirm that you agree with Heritage Assessment and its conclusions, and in particular the suggestion at paragraph 1.91 that the Scheduled Monuments are not considered to be sensitive receptors, and your views on whether the settings of the seven listed buildings described in paragraph 1.7 and of the Aston Flamville Conservation Area will be significantly impacted by the proposal.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>

	b) Could you, in each case, set out whether you consider that the settings of each of the heritage assets would be preserved, or be subject to less than substantial harm or substantial harm, explaining why, in each case, you hold that view.	
1.4.8.	<b>Effect on remains</b> A number of RRs (for example [RR-0603] and [RR-1227]) suggest the proposal will erode the area's Roman Heritage, with one stating that the remains of a Roman Bath House and villa were found. Could all parties comment on this, discuss the significance, and if appropriate if any mitigation should be proposed.	No comment.
1.4.10.	<b>Interpretation and effect on remains</b> A number of RRs (for example [RR-0216] and [RR-0632]) have cited the area's significance in relation to Bronze Age archaeology, and cultural links to the Basset Family and the English Civil War. Could the parties comment on the significance of these events to the area and whether any proposed mitigation should be considered.	No comment.
1.5.15.	<b>Schedule 2, Part 1 – Requirement 12</b> Please advise whether you consider the drafting of this requirement is appropriate. If not, please provide any amendments you consider necessary to this requirement to make it detailed to specific parts of the site, rather than, as set out currently, referring to the Mitigation Strategy.	No comment.
1.6.1.	<b>Appendix 11.1 - Landscape Visualisation baseline report [APP-191]</b> Please comment on the economic value of the landscape and the impact on such as a result of the proposal	No comment.
1.7.11.	<b>Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment [REP3-036] – Industrial and Logistics demand</b> Page 7 of the Executive Summary states that previous employment studies have significantly underestimated Industrial and Logistics demand. Could Local Authorities comment on this and provide any data to support your statements.	No comment.

1.7.12.	<p><b>Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment [REP3-036] – Employment evidence base</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 1.1.5 and Table 4.2 indicate the Applicant has reviewed the employment evidence base of the 12 planning authorities. Given that some of the studies have been prepared a number of years ago, have any local authorities updated their evidence base or are in the process of doing so?</p> <p>b) If so, how does this relate to the methodology and the assessment made by the Applicant.</p> <p>c) In addition, if updated evidence bases have or are being prepared, do these acknowledge a future warehouse supply of 1,781,000m<sup>2</sup> in the LLEP area as cited by the Applicant at paragraph 7.75 of Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects statement [APP-116]? d) If not, what supply do they indicate? If appropriate, could an analysis of any difference be made</p>	No comment.
1.7.17.	<p><b>Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment [REP3-036] – Development completions</b></p> <p>The Applicant's report in paragraph 4.3.8 considers development completions not as an indicator of demand, but rather as a supply measure. Could Local Authorities comment on whether they consider this appropriate? If not, could they give justification for their reasoning.</p>	No comment.
1.7.25	<p><b>Overall Need</b></p> <p>An assertion is made in a number of the RRs (for example, [RR-0080], [RR-0550] and [RR-0745]) that the there is no need for a SRFI in this location and that other existing locations over a wider area should be considered so that these are used to full capacity before this project is considered. The parties are requested to comment and respond to this assertion. In addition, could the Applicant provide a written note commenting on the availability of all these suggested alternatives and their capacity/suitability to meet some or all of the identified need for SRFI capacity in the Region?</p>	No comment.
1.8.2.	<b>Ambient Noise Levels</b>	No comment.

	<p>a) Following discussions at ISH3, can the Applicant provide written clarification as to why noise collected at NMPs has not been attenuated for both distance and topography in order to decipher current ambient noise levels at NSRs and why assessments do not need to be altered to account for this.</p> <p>b) Could the local authorities please comment on this also.</p>	
1.9.16	<p><b>Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects – Housing employment land supply and relationship to Development Plan</b></p> <p>Para 7.263 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-116] Development Land, states the development land is not an existing or allocated employment site and therefore the magnitude of the proposed development will be negligible. It further states, “The sensitivity of the receptor is low, resulting in a neutral effect over the long term”.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please set out potential impacts on housing provision and supply, and employment provision and supply?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant also set out what effect the Proposed Development would have in relation to the working age population in the vicinity and, given the quantum of warehousing provided in the proposal, whether employment shortages would result in other employment sectors, assuming a reduced employment land supply.</p> <p>If the Development Plan is subject to review, please provide information of any sites within the vicinity, that should be assessed as part of the evidence base, and mitigation for this application.</p>	No comment.
1.9.17.	<p><b>Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects – Development Plan sites and housing</b></p> <p>a) If any sites referenced within the Planning Statement [REP3-034] within the vicinity are being promoted for development in Development Plan reviews, could the Applicant</p>	No comment.

	<p>confirm if these sites have been assessed for their cumulative impact, and consideration of appropriate mitigation proposals have been suggested as a result of this application.</p> <p>b) Could the Local Authorities indicate whether they agree with the Applicant's assertion in paragraph 3.188 that no proposals have been identified in the development plan or emerging development plans (noting the submission of Parker Strategic Land and others [REP3-143] and Barwood Development Securities Limited and Ms Jennifer Taylor [REP3-144], which would be precluded by the project. If not, could they set out information as necessary.</p>	
1.11.5.	<p><b>TA – Part 5 [APP-142] – Trip Distribution</b></p> <p>Table 3 uses the Census Occupational Categories and sets those 'in scope'. Do IPs consider that this is appropriate given that managerial staff, some of whom may work in the office elements, have been excluded?</p>	<p>The proportion of employees that would be Managers, directors and senior officials at the site would be relatively small in comparison to those carrying out other roles, so would therefore be unlikely to significantly alter the distribution applied. The distribution that was derived for commuting staff included locations both in the vicinity of the site and locations further afield but considered to be within a commuting distance.</p>
1.11.9.	<p><b>M69 Closure</b></p> <p>In the M69 Closure Plan submitted by the Applicant [REP3-043] the Applicant states “when the SRN is temporarily closed, the additional traffic movement from HNRFI will not have a significance to the frequency of such interruptions in the free flow of traffic, or the extent/duration of consequential inconvenience on the surrounding LRN”.</p> <p>Do the NH, LCC and WCC concur with this view. If not, could they explain why they hold a differing view and what this may have on the effects of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>WCC disagree with paragraph 9 (REP3-043)</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging that with closures of the SRN and signed diversion routes directing all traffic to use the LRN, the volume of traffic generated by this site are likely to be a relatively small proportion, the volume of traffic forecast to be generated by the site are not insignificant at circa 1400-1800 two-way trips in the peak hours, and over 25,000 two-way trips each weekday. Typical link capacity for single lanes is around 2000 vehicles an hour, therefore the existing</p>



		<p>background LRN flows with the SRN diverted flows would exceed link capacity, the additional HNRFI traffic would further exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>Dependent upon where the closure takes place, if it were on the M69 north of junction 2, the provision of the new northbound slip road would provide a new route for the diverted traffic to use and this would impact upon the LRN in this area.</p> <p>Typically closures on the SRN can last many hours, therefore a significant proportion of the daily trips would be forced to use the LRN should a closure occur on a part of the SRN in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>The site access strategy is dependent on the delivery of the M69 jct 2 slip roads (new), and being located close to the SRN. If access to the SRN is not permitted due to a closure elsewhere, there will not be any mechanism to prevent the development traffic using the LRN. In such circumstances a closure to the north of M69 jct 2 could result in additional impacts to the villages east of the M69, and the A47, a closure to the south of M69 jct 2 could result in additional impacts to the villages south-east of M69 and the A47. Similarly closures of the A5 to the east or west of M69 jct 1 would have similar impacts.</p> <p>In such circumstances drivers (light vehicles and HGVs) rely on satnavs to find an alternative route to avoid congestion, this is likely to result in traffic using unsuitable roads that impact on sensitive receptors eg. residential areas, schools, and other local amenities.</p>
1.11.11.	<b>Hazardous Substance Zones of Influence</b>	No comment.

	Are there any Hazardous Substances Zones of Influence which potentially could impact on the M1 (between junctions 19 and 22), M69 (whole length) and A5 (between the A4303 junction and the M42 junction), and could result in closure of the motorways/ A5?	
1.11.13.	<p><b>HGV Routing</b></p> <p>a) How would the Applicant, NH, LCC and WCC respond to a proposition that there should be either no development or no occupations until the proposed lowering of the height of the carriageway on the A5 under the railway bridge has been completed?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant, if necessary on a without prejudice basis, provide a draft Requirement to this effect?</p>	This would be the preferred situation, as high-sided HGV's would remain on the SRN. However, the HGV Management Plan and Route Strategy have identified the A47 (north of Dodwells) as a suitable advisory route, therefore cannot answer this until the results of the VISSIM modelling for A5 Longshoot-Dodwells has been submitted.
1.11.31.	<p><b>Non-Car mode enhancements</b></p> <p>Revision 5 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan [REP3-022] sets out several proposals and options for enhancement to non-car facilities and modes. While appreciating that further work is to be done on the proposals:</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant confirm how the committed proposals are to be secured?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant explain how the potential proposals for post decision would be evaluated and, where appropriate, how they would be secured.</p> <p>c) Could the Applicant please undertake an analysis on the operation of the A47/ B4668 roundabout in relation to the introduction of a Toucan crossing as shown (Enhancement 1) and what effect it would have on capacity and queuing.</p> <p>d) Could IPs comment on the weight that should be given to these elements, particularly in relation to elements that are not definitely secured?</p>	<p>Part (d) – WCC acknowledge that the proposals have been updated to reflect improved public transport connections to Nuneaton, but are concerned that options for bus access and/or bespoke pre-bookable transport services for potential HNRFI employees living in Rugby do not appear to have been considered in the revised Sustainable Transport Strategy. We would like to see a commitment from the Applicant to fund and promote sustainable travel options given that there will be a significant expansion in Rugby's resident population with major housing allocations identified in the adopted Rugby Local Plan (June 2019). Sites at Houlton (6,200 homes) and Gateway Rugby (1,300 homes) are partially built out and there are also major allocations at South West Rugby (5,000 homes) and Coton Park East (800 homes). Rugby is identified as a potential employment draw in Figures 8 and 9 of <a href="#">[App-142]</a>.</p> <p>Elements that are not demonstrated as definitely secured and deliverable should not be afforded any weight.</p>