

**A45/A46 TOLLBAR END IMPROVEMENTS
PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT**

White Young Green
Executive Park
Avalon Way
Anstey
Leicester
LE1 1RB

Tel No: 0116 2348000

Fax No: 0116 2348001

Project No: A007544

Report No. RT7544/14

ISSUE No.	1					
DATE	05/03/02					
PREPARED BY	LM					
APPROVED BY						

A45/A46 TOLLBAR END IMPROVEMENTS

PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT

DRAFT

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS	4
3.0	RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION	8

A45/A46 TOLLBAR END IMPROVEMENTS

PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT

DRAFT

FIGURES, TABLES, APPENDICES

FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location

TABLES

Table 1 Local Respondents

Table 2 Non-Local Respondents

APPENDICES

Appendix A Steering Group and Value Management Team Members

Appendix B Public Consultation Brochure

Appendix C Public Consultation Questionnaire

Appendix D Press Notice of Exhibition

Appendix E Public Notice

Appendix F List of Attendees for Preview

Appendix G Exhibition Display Boards

Appendix H Analysis of Questionnaire Results

Appendix I Summary of Comments on Questionnaire

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1. Report Objectives

This Report is about the Public Consultation process for the scheme to provide an improvement to the A45/A46 Tollbar junction. It describes the nature of the choice offered to the public, documents the manner in which the details of the alternative schemes were presented, and records and interprets the response received. The objective of the Report is to summarise the responses received as to the public preference regarding the improvement. The site location is shown on Figure 1.

1.2. Options Report No. 2

1.2.1. An Options Report No. 2 for the scheme was presented in November 2001. Seven options were evaluated in the report. All options have been discussed with the Steering Group and with the Value Management Team (details of membership of these is shown in Appendix A).

1.2.2. Options 1 to 3 were rejected primarily because they failed to meet the traffic capacity criteria. Option 4 was rejected because it was the worst in terms of both traffic capacity and had the greatest detrimental environmental impact.

1.2.3. The Options Report No. 2 proposed that 3 improvement options should be taken to Public Consultation. These were Option 5 assessed as being the cheapest scheme and being the easiest to construct. Options 6 and 7 were assessed as having the highest traffic capacity and the best schemes in environmental terms.

1.3. Options Offered at Public Consultation

1.3.1. The options are shown and described in the Public Consultation brochure, included as Appendix B of this Report. The Options (5, 6 and 7) offered for public consultation, were referred to in the brochure as the Yellow, Green and Purple Options respectively. The public were invited to complete and return an accompanying Questionnaire (Appendix C) on the three options presented.

1.3.2. *Yellow Option ('Loop' of Local Roads)*

This option would involve constructing new sections of road from the B4110 London Road, via the retail park, to the A46 Coventry Eastern Bypass, a new link between the A46 and A45 and to Middlemarch Business Park, and a link road from Rowley Road to London Road passing under the existing A45 Stonebridge Highway. This

option requires the widening of part of the A45/A46 Stonebridge Highway to three lanes and partial widening and traffic signalisation of Stivichall interchange.

1.3.3. Green Option (Underpass at Tollbar End from A46 Coventry Bypass to A45 Stonebridge Highway plus a new A45/A46 Link)

In this option, Tollbar End junction would be reconstructed, and an underpass connecting between the A46 and the A45 Stonebridge Highway would be constructed. The roundabout would encroach on to land adjacent to the B4110 London Road, including the retail park, and on land adjacent to Rowley Road. The new link road would have traffic signal controlled junctions where it connects with the A45 and A46. This new link would be extended into Middlemarch Business Park with a roundabout connection on Siskin Drive. This option requires the widening of the A45 Stonebridge Highway to three lanes, and the partial widening and traffic signalisation of the Stivichall interchange.

1.3.4. Purple Option (Underpass at Tollbar End from A45 London Road to A45 Stonebridge Highway plus a new A45/A46 Link)

Tollbar End junction would be reconstructed, and an underpass connecting between the A45 and the A45/A46 Stonebridge Highway would be constructed. The roundabout would encroach on to property either side of the A45 London Road, east of Tollbar junction. The new link road would have traffic signal controlled junctions where it connects with the A45 and A46. This new link would be extended into the Middlemarch business park with a roundabout connection on Siskin Drive. This option requires the widening of the A45 Stonebridge Highway to three lanes, and the partial widening and traffic signalisation of the Stivichall interchange.

1.3.5. Rejected Options

Four other options were considered. These were:

- Underpass at Tollbar End from A46 Coventry Bypass to A45 Stonebridge Highway without a new A45/A46 Link.
- Underpass at Tollbar End from A45 London Road to A45 Stonebridge Highway without a new A45/A46 Link.
- New link Road from A45 to A46.
- Separate A46 link from A46 south of Stivichall interchange to Tollbar junction plus A45 underpass at Tollbar junction (Original 1992 proposal).

All these options were rejected at an early stage because they do not provide sufficient traffic relief to Tollbar junction. The fourth option was also rejected because of the additional issue of substantial environmental impact on the area.

1.4. Further Consultation on Option 8

- 1.4.1 As a result of the Public Consultation it was evident that there was public concern over the proposed link road between the A45 London Road and the A46 Coventry Eastern Bypass. As a result of this concern, it was agreed that a further option (Option 8) would be reviewed, which removed the link between the A45 and A46, but retained the link between the A45 and Siskin Drive. This option is described in detail in a separate report (7544/15), and includes the consultation response on that option.

2.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

2.1. Consultation Arrangements

2.1.1 *Press Notice*

A press notice number EM (Appendix D) was released on 12 November 2001 giving brief details of the scheme and inviting the public to give their views on the proposals. The notice advised that copies of the Consultation Document would be delivered to properties in the proximity of the scheme. Details of the arrangements for the Public Exhibition and the press review were also given in the notice.

2.1.2 *Public Notice*

A public notice (Appendix E) was inserted in the Coventry Evening Telegraph on the week of the exhibition and advertising posters were erected in prominent locations in the vicinity of the Tollbar area for a period of a week prior to the Public Exhibition. The notices and posters advised that leaflets explaining the proposals were being distributed in the area and gave details of offices where the leaflets would be available, as well as advising the venue, dates and times of the Public Exhibition.

2.1.3 *Consultation Document*

The Consultation Document composed a Brochure (Appendix B) and a Questionnaire (Appendix C). The brochure advertised that the Public Exhibition was to be held and encouraged members of the public to attend, ask questions and offer their views. At the same time a full description of the scheme proposals, with diagrammatic plans, allowed the public to form an opinion and express this by completing and returning the Questionnaire, whether or not they attended the Public Exhibition.

2.1.4 Approximately 2,100 copies of the Consultation Document were distributed to residents in the area around A56/A46 Tollbar End on 7 November 2001. The closing date for responses was Friday, 15 February 2002.

2.1.5 Copies of the Consultation document were currently deposited, to be made available for the public, at the following locations:

Coventry City Council	Rugby Borough Council
Tower Block	Town Hall
Much Park Street	Evreux Way
Coventry	Rugby
CV1 2PY	CV21 2DT
Warwick District Council	Warwickshire County Council
Town Hall Parade	Shire Hall
Leamington Spa	Warwick
CV32 4AT	CV34 3SX
Willenhall Library	Highways Agency
192 Remembrance Road	Room C8
Willenhall	5 Broadway
Coventry	Broad Street
CV3 3DN	Birmingham, B15 1BL

2.1.6 *Public Exhibition*

The Exhibition was held at the Chace Hotel, London Road, Coventry, and was open to the public on:

Thursday, 15 November 2001 (3.00 pm - 9.00 pm)

Friday, 16 November 2001 (10.00 am - 8.00 pm)

A preview for Local Authority members, officers and other stakeholders was held at 11.00 am on Thursday, 15 November. A list of attendees is shown in Appendix F.

2.1.7 The Exhibition display featured a total of 15 boards. These are shown in Appendix G of this Report and were as follows:

Board 1 - Introduction

A board of text providing background to Tollbar, junction and broad details of the scheme.

Board 2 - Improvement Exhibition

A board of text describing the purpose of the exhibition and encouraging the public to make their views known.

Board 3 - The Problem

A board of text giving description of existing traffic flows and congestion, a predicted future traffic flows with commitments and future congestion.

Board 4 - Tollbar Map

A board of 1:50,000 scale mapping showing the road network in the vicinity of Tollbar junction, in relation to Coventry.

Board 5 - Proposed Options

A board of text introducing the 3 options.

Boards 7,8 and 9 - Detailed Plan

Boards 7, 8 and 9 providing a detailed engineering plan of the proposals for the Green, Purple and Yellow Options respectively on 1:2500 scale mapping. Embankments and cuttings were indicated.

Board 10 - Rejected Options

Board showing plans and brief description of the four rejected options.

Board 11 - Traffic

A board showing a diagrammatic network of the area with the “before” and “after” average traffic flows for each option in vehicles per day, all on the basis of present (2000) and future (2020) traffic volume.

Board 12 - Environmental Constraints

A board of 1:10,000 scale mapping showing the conservation areas, listed buildings, other buildings of local interest, and sites of archaeological and ecological interest.

Board 13 - Environmental Impact

A board of text describing the impact of each option in terms of noise, air quality, heritage, journey ambience, landscape, townscape, ecology and water quality.

Board 14 - What Happens Next?

A board of text explaining that the views of the public were needed to assess the public support for the proposals and to assist in the determination of the Preferred route.

- 2.1.8 The numbers of members of the public attending the Exhibition was recorded. Additional copies of the Consultation document were available.

2.1.9 Attendance at Exhibition

Exhibition Preview

Authorities were invited to an Exhibition preview on 15 November 2001. A total of 25 representatives from invited authorities attended the Exhibition preview (see Appendix F). These included Baginton Police Constabulary (2), Rugby Borough Council (2), Coventry City Council (5), Warwick District Council (1), Warwickshire County Council (2), GOWM (2), Wolsten Police Constabulary (1), Ryton Police Constabulary (1), Peugeot (1), Warwickshire Police (1), Brandon Police Constabulary (1), (6 attendees did not specify their authority). The Member of Parliament (MP) and the Member of European Parliament were also invited but did not attend.

3.0 **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1 146 questionnaires and 14 separate letter/submissions were received before the closing date of 15 February 2002. These responses were divided into local and non-local, on the basis of the postcode since the fewest number of responses remained unclassified, by this approach.
- 3.1.2 Local respondents were those with either a CV3 or CV8 postcode, as these are the two postal areas in which the proposals fall and therefore represent those likely to be most significantly affected by the scheme options. The results of the analysis are shown in Appendix H.
- 3.1.3 83% of the responses received were from “local” respondents. This figure includes Parish Councils, resident associations and local interest groups (Warwickshire Wildlife trust) with the remaining 17% from “non-local” respondents including Warwickshire County Council and Warwickshire Police.
- 3.1.4 Table 1 below shows the distribution of local respondents while Table 2 shows the distribution of non-local respondents.

Table 1 - Local Respondents

Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents
CV3	3 Business	CV3 4BT	1 Res	CV3 5NH	1 Res
CV3 2BG	1 Res	CV3 4DL	1 Res	CV3 5NN	1 Res
CV3 2DE	1 Res	CV3 4DN	1 Res	CV3 5NY	1 Res
CV3 2EF	1 Res	CV3 4DQ	1 Res	CV3 6DX	1 Business
CV3 2JT	1 Res, 1 Busi	CV3 4DR	2 Res	CV3 6EJ	1 Res
CV3 2PH	1 Res	CV3 4DS	1 Res	CV3 6HS	1 Res
CV3 2UR	1 Res	CV3 4DU	1 Res	CV3 6JG	1 Res
CV3 3DY	2 Res	CV3 4DZ	2 Res	CV3 6LA	1 Res
CV3 3DZ	4 Res	CV3 4EA	1 Res	CV3 6LQ	2 Res
CV3 3EE	2 Res	CV3 4EB	1 Res	CV3 6PB	1 Res
CV3 3EF	4 Res	CV3 4EF	1 Res	CV3 6PN	1 Res
CV3 3EG	5 Res	CV3 4EN	1 Res	CV3 6PP	1 Res
CV3 3EH	2 Res	CV3 4ES	3 Res	CV3 6QB	1 Res
CV3 3EJ	5 Res	CV3 4EU	1 Res	CV3 6RB	3 Res
CV3 3EL	2 Res	CV3 4EX	4 Res	CV3 6RE	1 Res
CV3 3EP	4 Res	CV3 4FJ	1 Res	CV8 2GJ	1 Res
CV3 3EQ	5 Res	CV3 4FS	2 Res	CV8 3AG	1 Res

Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents
CV3 3ER	1 Res	CV3 4FW	1 Res	CV8 3AR	1 Res
CV3 3GB	1 Res	CV3 5AE	1 Res	CV8 3FF	1 Res
CV3 3GD	1 Res	CV3 5AF	3 Res	CV8 3FN	1 Res
CV3 3GE	1 Res	CV3 5AG	1 Res	CV8 3HA	1 Res
CV3 3GU	6 Res	CV3 5AJ	1 Res	CV8 3JZ	1 Res
CV3 3GW	2 Res, 1 Busi	CV3 5DQ	1 Res	CV8 3PE	1 Res
CV3 3HG	1 Res	CV3 5JH	1 Res	CV8 3QB	1 Res
CV3 4AU	1 Res	CV8 3AZ	1 Res		
CV3 4GE	2 Res	CV8 3ET	3 Res	Total	

Table 2 - Non-Local Respondents

Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents	Post Code	No. of Respondents
BS10 7TU	1 RHA	CV5 8AL	1 Res	KT16 8AT	1 Business
B46 1DJ	2 police	CV7 9EJ	3 Res	HP9 1HH	1 Res
B28 9HH	1 Business	CV10 8AA	1 Business	IP2 3RH	1 Res
CR9 1PJ	1 Business	CV21 1DN	1 Res	LE9 9HN	1 Res
CV1 5RY	1 Business	CV23 0SV	1 Res	NN7 3NN	1 Res
CV2 2EL	1 Res	CV23 9QS	1 Res	RG14 5SJ	1 Business
CV2 5NJ	1 Res	CV31 1NZ	1 Res	SE1 0SW	1 RPS
CV4 9HR	1 Res	CV34 5RA	1 Res	Blank	4 Res
CV5 6EP	1 Res	CV37 9UP	1 Business		
CV5 7BB	1 Res	DY2 9JX	1 Res	Total	

3.2 Local Questionnaire Response

127 of the responses received were local. The following sets out the views expressed by local respondents:

Question 1

- a) Do you consider there will be a worsening traffic problem?

Analysis of the questionnaires received from local respondents 91% thought that there would be a worsening of the traffic problem at this location in future years.

- b) Do you consider the junction improvement scheme necessary?

92% of the questionnaires returned by local respondents they felt thought that a junction improvement scheme was necessary at Tollbar Roundabout.

Question 2

Bearing in mind the needs of the community/business/commercial interests as a whole, which of the following factors do you consider of particular importance in choosing the preferred option?

It is evident from the response shown in Appendix H that, whilst all the issues were important, there were some that were more important than others. The tables below show the issues in the order they were ranked by local respondents.

	Rank
Improving safety, for vehicular traffic, pedestrians, cyclists	1
Minimising delays to main trunk road traffic on A45/A46	2
Reduction of congestion/delay for local traffic	2
Maintaining and improving access to Residential/ Commercial/ Business Areas/Coventry Airport	4
Minimising severance between local community and work place	5

Taking into account the environmental issues as a whole:

	Rank
Minimising traffic noise and pollution near housing	1
Minimising land take and environmental damage/effects	2
Avoiding the demolition of houses	5
Concealing the route from view and effects of visual change	3
Minimising disruption during construction	4

Question 3

Which option do you consider provides the best solution?

The table below summarises the preference for each option (in percent):

Option	Percent
Green	61
Purple	31
Yellow	8

3.3 Non-Local Questionnaire Response

34 of the responses received were non-local. The following sets out the views expressed by non-local respondents:

Question 1

- c) Do you consider there will be a worsening traffic problem?

Analysis of the questionnaires received from non-local respondents 92% thought that there would be a worsening of the traffic problem at this location in future years.

- d) Do you consider the junction improvement scheme necessary?

90% of the questionnaires returned by non-local respondents they felt thought that a junction improvement scheme was necessary at Tollbar Roundabout.

Question 2

Bearing in mind the needs of the community/business/commercial interests as a whole, which of the following factors do you consider of particular importance in choosing the preferred option?

It is evident from the data in Appendix H that respondents felt that, whilst all the issues were important, there were some that were more important than others. The tables below show the issues in the order they were ranked by non-local respondents.

	Rank
Improving safety, for vehicular traffic, pedestrians, cyclists	1
Minimising delays to main trunk road traffic on A45/A46	2
Reduction of congestion/delay for local traffic	3
Maintaining and improving access to Residential/ Commercial/ Business Areas/Coventry Airport	4
Minimising severance between local community and work place	5

Taking into account the environmental issues as a whole:

	Rank
Minimising traffic noise and pollution near housing	1
Minimising land take and environmental damage/effects	2
Avoiding the demolition of houses	5
Concealing the route from view and effects of visual change	3
Minimising disruption during construction	4

Question 3

Which option do you consider provides the best solution?

The table below summarises the preference for each (in percent):

Option	Percent
Green	73
Purple	18
Yellow	9

3.4 Written Comments on Questionnaires

The following represent the most frequently made comments. The full list of comments can be found in Appendix I.

Question 3 (Reason given if no preferred option stated)	Number of Responses
Prefer a combination of green and purple with an island at the new A46/A45 junction. Transfer traffic lights to top of new roundabout.	3
Yellow Option is cheapest but this will generate high levels of green house gases and is therefore not environmentally friendly.	2
As resident of Brandon Lane strongly object to these proposals. All options result in my home being encircled by major roads with consequence of increased noise, pollution and destruction of existing views and access to countryside.	2
All three options have one of major roads linked to roundabout, mixing with local traffic. Need to separate main road from local traffic.	2

Question 6 (Other Comments)	Number of Responses
Brandon Lane is for access to a number of properties many of which have section 106 agreements in place requiring access from the A45. The proposed link road should be further down and built so as no to sever Brandon Lane.	22
The Yellow Option does not provide a solution as it would not ease the long term traffic problems and the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution and access are unacceptable.	19
It is vital that the impact of any scheme on the area are taken into account, e.g. light & noise pollution, flood Plain, local conservation areas.	10
Improvement to traffic system within the area is needed as soon as possible.	7
Although this is the most expensive option the Green Option is the best as it has the best provision both in the short and long term.	6
Such a major junction merits an underpass to avoid conflict between local and through traffic allowing the A45 to flow freely.	6
The needs of local residents and local traffic are the most important.	5
Improvements at Tollbar will only succeed in moving the traffic problems further down the A45/A46 as congestion will continue to be a problem in the future.	5
The recent traffic lights have improved the situation so there are no real problems.	4
The introduction of signalised junctions on the A45 will cause congestion in the future, the introduction of a roundabout should be investigated.	4
Residents should be compensated for the increased disruption they will experience and for the loss of access and environmental impact on their properties.	4

3.5 Written Responses

3.5.1 In addition to the questionnaires, there were 14 letters submitted. Some of these were included above but there were 10 detailed letters that received an individual response from the Highways Agency. The following list includes the consultees and the major points raised:

3.5.2 *Warwickshire County Council*

The recommendations from offices to County Council members is broadly as follows:-

- Indicate a preference for the Green Option, subject to issues raised by Brandon P.C.
- Further consideration be given to severance and heavy goods vehicle routes issues in connection with the proposed A46/A45 link road.
- Further consideration be given to the signalised junction and the A45 London Road and the safety concerns raised by Warwickshire Police.

3.5.3 *Coventry CC*

The recommendations from the Cabinet Member (Environmental Services) meeting 24 January 2002 were as follows:

- The Green Option should be developed further for implementation.
- Further investigation into improvement of pedestrian and cycle facilities at Tollbar End Roundabout. To improve access to sites such as Middlemarch Business Park.
- The Council believes that a more radical solution may be required once the Traffic Impact of the future expansion of Coventry Airport of the development potential of land around the airport have been fully considered.

3.5.4 *Brandon and Bretford Parish Council*

In favour of the Green Option, but feel that link road from A45 to A46 should be omitted from scheme. Concerns about the impact on local housing on Brandon Lane, and concerns regarding diversion of heavy goods vehicles through Brandon, if Brandon Lane is closed off.

Further concerns that the triangle of land enclosed by link road would be developed, and reduce the Green Belt between Coventry and Brandon.

The Council submitted a wildlife survey with their representation.

3.5.5 *Baginton PC*

The Council discussed the options at its January 2002 meeting, the conclusion was that the Green Option provided the best solution to the traffic problems at Tollbar End Roundabout.

3.5.6 *Rugby BC*

The Council's views are as follows:-

- Recognises the strategic importance of the junction.
- Preference should be given to the Green Option.
- Tollbar roundabout should be improved to handle land-use proposals.

- Concerned that Brandon Lane is served in all options. Current uses of Brandon Lane should not be disadvantaged. Future development uses along A46 corridor should not be disadvantaged.

3.5.7 *Warwick District Council*

No comments.

3.5.8 *Wolston Parish Council*

Delighted that an improvement is carried out, but concerned about the impact of the link road on Brandon Lane, and urge that this is redesigned out of the scheme.

3.5.9 *Styvechale and District Residents Association*

We find it difficult to believe that the amount of traffic routed via the new A45/A46 Link will be as much as 20%. Therefore making the expenses of environmental repercussions unjustifiable.

3.5.10 *Earl Craven Divisional Panel*

Delighted that progress is being made on developing proposals, but concerns over the impact on Brandon Lane.

3.5.11 *Warwickshire Wildlife Trust*

Four key issues of concern:

- There are a number of wildlife site/sites of nature conservation importance (WS/SINC) which could be affected by the proposals. These include Stonebridge Meadows, Bagington Fields, Willenhall Wood and Meadow and the rivers Avon, Sowe and Sherbourne.
- The proposed widening of the A45 could have a damaging impact on a number of WC/SINCs. The option of leaving Stonebridge Highway as a two lane dual carriageway needs to be considered.
- The proposed new link from the A45 to Siskin Drive runs alongside the river Avon and its construction will have an impact on the river, its flood plain and associated wildlife.
- Access into Brandon Lane will be affected which could be detrimental to the running of Brandon Marsh Nature Centre, which attracts school groups who

access the site by coach. Unrestricted access at the western end of Brandon Lane is essential if large vehicles are to be routed away from the narrow streets of Brandon Village.

Trust feels it would be premature to select a preferred option prior to the completion of a full Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.5.12 *Denis Wilson Partnership (on behalf of Mondial Investment Limited)*

Client has land between A46 Coventry Eastern Bypass and Brandon Lane. This is severed by the proposed A45/A46 link road. It would appear that there will be no access via Brandon Lane from Tollbar End.

If this is the case there will need to be alternative provision made. If this is not done then will object to all three options on the grounds that access to land has not been maintained. Also, the new link road makes agricultural use of land unviable.

Client also has land to north of Coventry Eastern Bypass, affected by all three options. Although this appears to be less for Green and Purple options, request more details of these schemes to allow further assessment.

Yellow Option includes possible link from A46 Coventry Eastern Bypass to B4110, which incorporates a new roundabout on client land. This will affect future redevelopment of this land, so wish to object to Yellow Option on these grounds.

3.5.10 *RPS (on behalf of Legal and General, owners of Orchard Retail Park)*

RPS raised the following concerns:-

- Disturbance During Construction - Affect of construction traffic and general affects of mud and dust on Orchard Retail Park.
- Maintenance of Access – Concern that access to retail park would be adversely affected during construction. Concerned that construction delays may put people off travelling to the area.
- Signage – keen to maintain and enhance signage to the Orchard Retail Park as part of the proposed improvements.
 - 1) want to ensure signage maintained during construction. Also concerned that without such provision potential customers will not be aware of the retail parks proximity to Tollbar End.

- 2) keen to enhance signage after completion of improvements to enable potential clients to access the facility safely.
- Loss of Potential Development – concerned that all options result in loss of land from retail park, especially for Green Option. Will oppose schemes that hinder potential for development of land to east of B4110.

In light of the above support Yellow option as it has minimum commercial impact on clients land.

3.5.11 *Tyler Parkes Partnership (on behalf of client)*

Client Land between A45 London Road, Siskin Drive, Tollbar End and Rowley Road. Purple Option has most impact on clients land. Would support Green or Yellow Options if do not require clients land for construction or associated works
Purple Option most objectionable as it requires largest land take and affects existing buildings, and will cause maximum disruption to business function. Also concerned with effects of diverted traffic during construction. Demolition of residential and commercial properties could have damaging effect on dynamics of local community. Please discount this option.

Both Yellow and Green Options appear most appropriate. Will still have an impact in terms of land take and disruption during construction and permanent routing of traffic. Yellow Option has least impact on passing traffic as A45/A46 traffic use new road and would not pass site. The restricted access on to A45/A46 from B4110 appears unnecessary and has implications for access to clients site and level of passing trade.

Still concerns associated with Green Option, disruption during construction, possible land take, loss of trade due to reduced traffic between A45 and A46. However, displacement likely to be less than with Yellow Option.

Given all above, providing it is confirmed that Yellow and Green Options will not incorporate clients land, and adequate compensation will be given for disruption to business, would support Green Option whilst totally opposing the Purple Option.

3.5.12 *Wood Frampton (on behalf of Severn Trent Water)*

Consideration should be to strategic development issues and the influence they will have on the operation of Tollbar End junction when evaluating the options. Key to this is the need to consider the impact of the expansion of Coventry Airport.

3.5.13 [REDACTED] (*Brandon Lane resident*)

Severing of Brandon Lane would adversely affect home, family and property value, it would not be safe for children to play in the garden. Closure would force concrete lorries to use Wolston and Brandon Villages. Proposal to lift Brandon Lane over new road would increase noise levels, be visually intrusive and quite unacceptable.

Link would be better sited further down Lane past Bryants Bungalow.

3.5.14 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] had some criticisms of the scheme options in general, based on the design and method of construction, and proposed an alternative scheme incorporating a flyover from the A46 to Stonebridge Highway, but passing over B4110 London Road.

3.5.15 *Environment Agency (EA)*

The EA did not express a preference for any of the proposed options. They did however, make the following comments:-

- If floodplain compensation works can be undertaken to show that there would be no loss of floodplain storage then the EA have no objection.
- Consideration needs to be given to the design of any new bridge crossings or extensions to existing bridges.
- The EA have no objections to the use of the River Sowe and River Avon flood models to check the bridge requirements.
- Consideration should be given to mammal passes and other conservation enhancement features.
- Recommend an early meeting to discuss matters.

A meeting has been held with the EA and they are generally satisfied that their requirements can be met with the improvements proposed.

3.5.16 *Countryside Agency (CA)*

The CA did not show any preference, or indeed pass any comment (favourable or otherwise) about the 3 options.

3.5.17 *English Nature (EN)*

EN confirmed that there were no statutory conservation sites affected by the proposals, but they would be interested in details of the impact on protected species.

3.5.18 *English Heritage (EH)*

EH could not confirm whether there were any scheduled ancient monuments that require their involvement. The EH thought it unlikely that any objection would be raised.

3.5.19 *Road Haulage Association (RHA)*

The RHA support the Green Option, although they would rather see a grade separated junction where the A45/A46 link meets the A45.

3.6 Additional Consultee Response on Option 8

Given the response to the link road between the A45 London Road and A46 Coventry Road a further option (Option 8) removing this link has been considered. This is the subject of a separate report (7544/15). The consultation exercise and response to this option is included in that report.

