**Item X**

**Cabinet**

**12 November 2015**

**Getting West Nuneaton Moving: Bermuda Connection**

**Recommendation(s)**

1. That the Strategic Director for Communities be authorised to undertake the detailed design of the scheme in accordance with Option 1 or to pursue Option 2 as described in paragraph 4.1 of this report.

**1.0 Background Information**

1.1 The proposed scheme forms part of the Nuneaton A444 Growth Corridor Improvement Programme and would produce the following range of benefits for the local community in the wider West Nuneaton area:

* Creating additional highway capacity by means of an additional link between West Nuneaton and Griff Roundabout via Bermuda Bridge;
* Reducing congestion in parts of the town centre thus improving links onto the A444 in Nuneaton for residents in other parts of the town;
* Improving journey times for local residents on a number of routes in the West Nuneaton area;
* Supporting economic growth in Nuneaton by enhancing access to existing and future local jobs, e.g. proposed expansion of Bermuda Park major employment site;
* Supporting the objectives of the NUCKLE major rail initiative in terms of substantially enhancing access to Bermuda Park rail station;
* Supporting the movement of goods and people along the A444 growth corridor;
* Supporting projected future growth in Nuneaton in terms of population and housing;
* Complementing the proposed Coventry – Nuneaton Cycle Scheme in terms of enhancing shared pedestrian and cycle links onto Griff Roundabout, Coventry Canal, Hill Top – Nuneaton Town Centre link, George Eliot Hospital, EPIC, Bermuda Village and Ensor’s Pool; and
* Contributing towards fulfilling the wider economic aspirations highlighted in Priority 3 – A444 North – South Corridor in the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP) Strategic Economic Plan, in respect to enhancing connectivity to a priority cluster of major employment at Bermuda Park in order to enable future proposed development to maximise its potential in respect to job creation.

1.2 The Business Case for Getting West Nuneaton Moving: Bermuda Connection emphasises that the potential scheme would yield a substantial level of benefits, an example of which is presented below:

 Summary of Key Quantified Benefits taken from Business Case for Getting West Nuneaton Moving: Bermuda Connection WCC Growth Fund:

Present Value of Benefits:

* The scheme is projected to generate transport journey time benefits of over £60m over a 60 year scheme life because it creates a new route and contributes towards relieving congestion on existing routes; and
* The 60 year benefit assessment excluded any benefits associated with employment growth, i.e. agglomeration benefits, and therefore, the effect of the main highway packages, such as the Bermuda Connection Project, could be to contribute towards supporting an additional £110 million Gross Value Added (GVA) by 2021 or around 1,600 additional new jobs over and above projections, with 565 of these new additional jobs being created along the A444 corridor in Nuneaton.

The initial scheme had an estimated capital cost of £3.702 million, and a Benefit Cost Ratio of 5.9:1 and on the basis of the strength of the business case, at its meeting on 28 October 2014, the County Council approved the allocation of £3.202 million of the WCC Capital Growth Fund to part fund the proposed scheme. The Council's resolution included the following requirements:

"(3) Agree that the Capital Growth Fund allocation to the project should be reduced on a £ for £ basis if alternative sources of funding (over the £500,000 from the Growing Places Fund needed to fully fund the project) become available.

(4) Support the provision that any additional funding above £3.702 million required to meet additional costs, is found from within the Transport and Highways Capital Programme."

Council was informed that the next steps would include the further development of the preliminary design proposals associated with the scheme and undertaking a consultation with local communities, interest groups and those affected by the proposals. Council was also informed that Cabinet would consider the consultation response and take the decision on the future of the scheme.

1.3 In December 2014, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council successfully bid for a £500,000 Growing Places Fund Grant contribution towards the cost of the proposed scheme from the CWLEP. A legal agreement between NBBC and WCC has been completed, which authorises the transfer of the £500,000 contribution to the County Council.

1.4 The two sources of funding highlighted in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 comprise the £3.702 million capital funding currently allocated to the scheme.

1.5 In February 2015, the County Council commissioned work to progress further development of the proposed scheme, including preliminary design, which was to be presented to the local community. At a Decision Making meeting held in June 2015, the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approved the arrangements for consultation including the preliminary design proposals which would form the basis of the consultation.

1.6 The preliminary design proposals presented to the local community included additional components to the initial scheme presented to Council in October 2014, which are aimed at reducing the impact of the scheme on affected local residents whose properties or businesses are adjacent to the roads included in the proposed link route. Further details about the additional components are detailed in Table 1 at Appendix A of this report.

1.7 Because of these improvements, the consultation version of the scheme has an increased projected capital cost of £5.939 million and as a result a reduced Benefit Cost Ratio of 5.0:1 which, according to the Department for Transport’s Value for Money Assessment Note, still represents very high value for money. However, the Business Case for the Getting West Nuneaton Moving: Bermuda Connection at the initial capital cost of £3.702 million (as measured against the criteria for the WCC Capital Growth Fund) was, at 57.5%, the lowest of any scheme taken forward to date. This would reduce further if the cost of the scheme increases.

1.8 As the Highway Authority, the County Council has responsibilities to manage and develop the local highway network in ways which promote the free, safe and convenient flow of traffic. The County Council also has wider responsibilities under both legislation and national and local policies to promote sustainability (including all of its social, economic and environmental elements). Whilst the interests and views of the closest residents are a very important consideration, either the original or the consultation version of the scheme offers significant benefits to the wider West Nuneaton community and to the environment.

**2.0 Key Outcomes of the Consultation**

2.1 The consultation was held during an 8 week period (Friday 14 August 2015 - Friday 9 October 2015). County Council officers sought to engage widely with local residents in and around West Nuneaton, who were given an opportunity to participate in the consultation through the measures detailed at Appendix B and Appendix C in this report.

2.2 In respect to the online element of the consultation, our Survey Monkey application only allows one response to be issued per device. Survey Monkey also records IP addresses to enable officers to monitor if multiple devices are being used from one IP address.  A total of 35% of the overall responses forms were submitted online.

2.3 At the Local Consultation Events, the Bermuda Bridge Action Group (a group comprising local residents who are strongly opposed to the scheme) was allowed to display its literature in order to increase public awareness of the issues and was also allowed to engage with visitors.

2.4 The intention was for visitors to complete and submit a response form at the actual Local Consultation Events. However, some visitors expressed strong objections towards the proposed scheme and requested to be allowed to take away multiple copies of the response form in order to hand out to their neighbours. This was permitted in order to avoid confrontation and also accusations that the County Council was preventing people from participating in the consultation. However, this increased the possibility of some local residents who are opposed to the scheme submitting more than one response. A total of 65% of the overall response forms were submitted on paper based response forms.

2.5 In response to requests for additional information to be made available to the public as part of the consultation, further information was made available on the online consultation web page. The only requests for further information which were not met concerned information classified as either commercially sensitive or relating to the estimated cost of the consultation version of the scheme. Estimated cost is dynamic as the scheme evolves and the consultation was focused on the design and impacts of the scheme rather than on value for money. Therefore, it was intended that information on costs would be made available to the public in due course in conjunction with this report.

2.6 During the consultation period common suggestions for additional elements to be included in the proposed scheme were raised by respondents. These potential revisions to the proposed scheme are listed in Table 3 at Appendix D of this report.

2.7 The following items were submitted during the consultation:-

* 567 response forms;
* 12 letters of objection towards the proposed scheme;
* One of the letters of objection was submitted by the owner of a prospective development site of which a small section is required for the scheme;
* 1 letter of support for the proposed scheme;
* A Petition against the proposed scheme with 451 signatures presented by the Bermuda Bridge Action Group; and
* 2 documents containing material objecting to the proposed scheme produced by the Bermuda Bridge Action Group.

2.8 The consultation allowed those local residents who are opposed to the scheme to express their views and concerns. The common themes they expressed are detailed in Table 4 at Appendix E of this report.

2.9 The key outcomes of the consultation were as follows:

* 55% of the respondents agreed that traffic congestion in West Nuneaton caused problems in their day to day activities (detailed in Chart 1 at Appendix F of this report); and
* Support was expressed for the scheme in all residential areas including Camp Hill, Chapel End, Galley Common and Hartshill, whilst there was a strong level of objection in the residential areas of Bermuda and Stockingford (where there was also a significant level of respondents who supported the scheme), all detailed in Chart 2 at Appendix F of this report.

2.10 Detailed submissions were received from the Bermuda Bridge Action Group ("BBAG") and these are also addressed in Appendix E.

**3.0 Land Acquisition**

3.1 Sections of private land will be required in order to deliver elements of the proposed scheme if it is progressed. The Valuation Office Agency has undertaken a market value assessment of each section of land required as part of the scheme. Details of the land requirements, and the total estimated land values, for the consultation version of the scheme are detailed in Table 5 at Appendix G of this report. The original scheme would require less land and this would mean a modest reduction (in the region of £15,000) in the total value.

**4.0 Options**

4.1 The following Options for continuing the scheme or not have been considered:

Option 1:

The current capital funding allocated to the scheme enabled the development of preliminary design proposals. In response to concerns raised by local residents affected by the proposed scheme, a number of additional components were included in the preliminary design proposals used for public consultation. These additional components (detailed in Table 1 at Appendix A of this report) were included for the purpose of reducing the impact of the scheme on affected local residents, e.g. realigning a section of Bermuda Road away from residential properties. The inclusion of the additional components in the preliminary design proposals used for public consultation was supported by local County Councillors.

Due to the inclusion of the additional components, the projected capital cost of the consultation version of the scheme has increased to an estimated £5.939 million. Option 1 would include the additional components and the estimated cost of £5.939 million includes the total land cost estimate in Table 5 at Appendix G of this report.

Option 1 would also include the design and costing of potential revisions to the scheme as an outcome of the consultation detailed in Table 3 at Appendix E of this report, which could potentially add an estimated £800k of further costs to the scheme. For example, a potential revision concerns the provision of a car park on a site off Tenlons Road, which would incur further land costs on the scheme budget.

It is important to emphasise that further cost certainty will be provided when the detailed design is completed, the environmental implications are assessed and the mitigation is agreed.

If this Option is approved, officers will develop the scheme to detailed design stage and report back to Cabinet with:

(1) confirmation of the detailed design and extent of the scheme;

(2) details of the updated cost estimate for the scheme (with the cost of the potential revisions in Table 3 of Appendix D separately identified);

(3) the reasons for the increased cost for the scheme;

(4) identification of any further external funding obtained;

(5) a reconciliation of the funding implications with the requirements of Council (as detailed in paragraph 1.2 of this report);

(6) proposals for funding any additional amount required from Council resources; and

(7) the outcome of land negotiations.

Cabinet will then be asked to decide whether or not to refer the progression of the scheme to Council with recommendations.

Option 2:

The extent of Option 2 is confined to the existing £3.702 million capital budget.

On this basis, officers would revert to a scheme in accordance with the Business Case, which would involve improving Bermuda Bridge, connecting the bridge to the highway and permitting access for two-way vehicle flow, relevant junction improvements, shared pedestrian/cycling improvements and the provision of an off-street car park for Bermuda Park Rail Station at the preferred site. This version of the scheme delivers similar benefits for the highway network as Option 1 but has less mitigation for local impacts along the route.

Public consultation has not yet been carried out on this version of the scheme. Therefore, if this Option is preferred, further engagement with the local community would be necessary.

Option 3:

Option 3 is not to progress the scheme further.

**5.0 Financial Risks and Mitigation**

5.1 The capital cost estimate for Option 1 is £5.939 million. This may increase further, by an estimated £800,000, if any of the potential revisions to the scheme, as an outcome of the consultation detailed in Table 3 at Appendix D of this report, are included in the scheme following further investigation.

5.2 At this point in time there is no secured funding for the £2.237 million shortfall on the cost of the Option 1 Scheme, nor for the £800,000 associated with the additional costs.  A bid has been made to the CWLEP Growth Fund for £2.237 million and opportunities for other funding are also being explored.  Should these bids be unsuccessful then the balance would need to be underwritten by the Transport and Highways Business Unit.  In practice this would mean a call on other existing capital budgets such as the Highways Maintenance Programme.

5.3 If Option 1 is progressed the additional estimated cost of the detailed design phase would be in the region of £480,000, which cost is included in the £5.939 million capital cost estimate. This would include the undertaking of necessary surveys. In the event that Cabinet decides, following the detailed design phase, to reduce the proposed scheme or scale it back to the original proposal (i.e. Option 2), the bulk of this expenditure would not have been wasted as it would also be necessary for Option 2.

5.4 If Option 3 is chosen as the most appropriate way forward now, or if the scheme does not proceed to delivery after the detailed design work is completed, the capital costs incurred to that point, estimated at £253,000 (now) or £733,000 (after detailed design work), would be deemed abortive and would need to be funded from the revenue budget of the sponsoring Business Unit, in this case Transport and Highways.

**6.0 Estimated Timescales associated with the decision and next steps**

6.1 If Cabinet endorses the progression of Option 1, officers will undertake the following stages of further development work:

1. Investigate capital funding option(s) to cover the additional costs associated with Option1 (November 2015 – May 2016)
2. Undertake Voluntary Land Negotiations (November 2015 – May 2016)
3. Undertake further environmental and other surveys and assessments to inform both Detailed Design and possible Planning Application (November 2015 – May 2016)
4. Develop the Detailed Design of the scheme and update the capital cost estimate (January 2016 – May 2016)
5. Report back to Cabinet (May 2016 – July 2016)
6. Report back to County Council (June 2016 – August 2016)

**Background papers**

1. Preliminary Design Proposals

* Drawing No. 5131052-ATK-BCP-DR-100-10-E; and
* Drawing No. 5131052-ATK-BCP-DR-100-11-E

2. Breakdown of the Updated Capital Cost of the Scheme (Option 1) – Excluding Potential Revisions as an Outcome of the Consultation

3. Consultation Report and Appendices (Produced by Warwickshire Observatory)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Contact Information** |
| Report Author | Nigel Whyte | nigelwhyte@warwickshire.gov.uk Tel: 01926 412179 |
| Head of Service | Graeme Fitton | graemefitton@warwickshire.gov.uk Tel: 01926 412046 |
| Strategic Director | Monica Fogarty | monicafogarty@warwickshire.gov.uk Tel: 01926 412514 |
| Portfolio Holder | Cllr Peter Butlin | cllrbutlin@warwickshire.gov.ukTel: 01788 816488 |

**Appendix A**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1: Proposed Additional Components to the Scheme Included**  **in the Consultation** |
| Location | Details of the Additional Component(s)  |
| Bermuda Road and The Bridleway | * Realigning a large section of the southern part of the highway on Bermuda Road further away from residential properties in order to reduce the impact of the scheme;
* Extent of new highway has increased from approximately 30m to 250m; and
* An existing attenuation pond off Bermuda Road to be relocated.
 |
| St Georges Way | Provision of a new Toucan crossing on St Georges Way to enhance pedestrian connectivity between the proposed off-street car park and Bermuda Park rail station. |
| Shared Pedestrian and Cycle Crossings | Additional crossings provided on Bermuda Road, The Bridleway and St Georges Way to enhance safety and connectivity. |
| Bermuda Road  | * Provision of a mini-roundabout at the junction with Tenlons Road; and
* Provision of a series of off-road parking bays and a single elongated off-road parking bay for local residents / visitors.
 |
| Tenlons Road  | Provision of 5 car parking bays for commercial property to placate local businesses. |
| Street Lighting | Complete renewal of street lighting across the site (82 no. lighting columns). |

**Appendix B**

**Details of Consultation Measures**

Online

 Consultation information presented on scheme web page including a link to the Ask Warwickshire portal allowing participants to complete and submit a response form.

Post

 Consultation Information Pamphlets distributed to a large number of households in West Nuneaton, the document included a response form which participants could post back via freepost.

Local Consultation Events

A programme of Local Consultation Events (exhibitions) was undertaken, which allowed local residents, businesses and stakeholders to engage with project officers and also consultants working on the scheme. The number of visits to the Local Consultation Events is detailed in Table 2 at Appendix C of this report.

Nuneaton Library

After the completion of the Local Consultation Events, exhibition material and response forms were placed on display at Nuneaton Library until the end of the consultation period.

**Appendix C**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2: Number of Visits to the Local Consultation Events** |
| Date of Event | Residential Area (Venue) |
| 04/09/15 | Bermuda (EPIC) |
| 05/09/15 | Whittleford  (Community of Christ Hall) |
| 07/09/15 | Stockingford(The Pavilion Club) |
| 08/09/15 | Camp Hill(CHESS) |
| 08/09/15 | Horeston Grange / Weddington(Etone College) |
| 09/09/15 | Heath End(Glendale Infant School) |
| 10/09/15 | Nuneaton Town Centre(Nuneaton United Reformed Church) |
| 10/09/15 | Hill Top(Middlemarch School) |
| 11/09/15 | Hartshill / Chapel End(Hartshill Community Centre) |
| 14/09/15 | Ansley Common(Nursery Hill Primary School) |
| 15/09/15 | Nuneaton Town Centre(Rope Walk Shopping Centre) |
| 15/09/15 | Galley Common(Haunchwood Sports and Social Club) |
| 16/09/15 | Bedworth Town CentreBedworth Civic Hall |
| Total Number of Visits | 471 |

**Appendix D**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3: Potential Revisions to the Scheme as an Outcome of the Consultation** |
| Proposal | Purpose |
| Introduction of traffic calming measures on Shillingstone Drive, Cornish Crescent, Radley Drive and Orkney Close | Deter rat-running onto the proposed link route over Bermuda Bridge. |
| An additional crossing is put in place at the northern section of Bermuda Road between junctions with Tenlons Road and Shillingstone Drive | Provide pedestrian connectivity towards George Eliot Hospital, a nearby bus stop and an existing walking route for vulnerable road users, e.g. school children and mobility impaired. |
| A car park is created potentially on a site adjacent to Tenlons Road | Provide a facility for parking in consideration of the parking restrictions associated with the proposed link route. This would provide safe parking for parents taking children to school and would also deter parking being displaced from Tenlons Road into Shillingstone Drive. |
| All 6 no. proposed shared pedestrian/cycle crossings on Bermuda Road, The Bridleway and St Georges Way presented in the Consultation drawings as being uncontrolled crossings are to be upgraded to signal controlled | Further enhance road safety for pedestrians. |
| Expand the extent of scheme to also include the enhancement of the following junctions:* Arbury Road / Heath End Road;
* Arbury Road / Westbury Road; and
* Arbury Road / Church Road.
 | Holistic approach to ensure that traffic flow runs smoothly onto Heath End Road prior to using the proposed link route. |
| Expand the extent of scheme to also include Tomkinson Road, Northumberland Avenue and The Raywoods | Introduce measures to deter rat-running onto the proposed link route on these roads. |
| Access enhancements to the existing pedestrian/cycle route between Hill Top and St Georges Way  | Improve connectivity particularly for the elderly and mobility impaired. |
| Utilise further wide sections of footway on Bermuda Road to create parking spaces | Provide additional car parking capacity for local residents / visitors. |

**Appendix E**

**Part 1: General Consultation Responses**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 4: Common Themes Expressed by Respondents Opposing the Scheme during the Consultation** |
| Theme  | County Council Officer Response | The Way Forward |
| 1) The proposed scheme would run through a quiet residential area and destroy an attractive part of the town – where people have purposefully settled to avoid being near busy roads. It was claimed that some of the local residents were informed during the process of buying their homes that the Bermuda Bridge would never be opened up to traffic. | This is a highway capacity enhancement scheme that would directly benefit a wide area of West Nuneaton, including the Bermuda residents themselves according to the results of testing the outcomes of the proposed scheme in the WCC Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Wide Area Paramics Traffic Model – Opening Year 2018.From a wider West Nuneaton community perspective, the benefits of this scheme should not be ignored or downgraded because of the opposition primarily from local residents in Bermuda affected by the proposed scheme.  | Mitigation measures aimed at reducing the impact of the proposed scheme on affected local residents were included in the preliminary design proposals.As an outcome of the consultation, potential revisions to the scheme which would contribute towards further reducing the impact on affected local residents will also be considered, if Option 1 is progressed. |
| 2) The other initiatives on the A444 Corridor Improvements programme should be implemented  before the Bermuda Connection scheme is even considered | The Bermuda Connection scheme is required to support the other elements of the Programme of A444 Corridor Improvements.In terms of the Programme of A444 Corridor Improvements, only the Coton Arches Roundabout and Bermuda Connection scheme have received funding. There is no guarantee the other elements of the programme will ever receive funding to secure delivery.  | No action taken. |
| 3) The proposed scheme would exacerbate the potential for rat-running on Shillingstone Drive, Cornish Crescent, Radley Drive and Orkney Close | As presented in Table 3, potential mitigation measures in respect to rat-running along these roads will be considered during detailed design phase, should the County Council Cabinet decide to proceed with Option 1 detailed in the ‘Option’ section of this report.  | Potential measures to combat rat-running will be considered for inclusion in the scheme, if Option 1 is progressed.  |
| 4) The proposed scheme will worsen the local environment in the Bermuda residential area in terms of air quality, noise pollution, vibration on properties adjacent to the proposed route, wildlife and the nearby Ensor’s Pool. | Preliminary environmental surveys have been carried out by Atkins. Based on their findings, it is anticipated that the proposed scheme is unlikely to have significant impacts on the local environment or nearby properties.  | If the scheme is progressed, detailed design and construction method would include mitigating any potentially significant impact of noise on nearby properties. In addition, further detailed environmental work will also be undertaken. This will include collaboration with officers from the Local Planning Authority and with Environmental Health Officers at Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council. |
| 5) The proposed scheme involves the narrowing of pavements to improve junctions, particularly on Heath End Road. This would have implications for pedestrians, particularly people taking children to nearby Glendale Infant School. | The concerns of local residents are understood.  | If the scheme is progressed, the issue of narrowed footways will be considered during detailed design, including the provision of pedestrian safety measures. Detailed design will be subject to a Road Safety Audit (Stage 2). |
| 6) The proposed scheme would be detrimental to the road safety of local residents due to the increase in the volume of traffic.  | The concerns of local residents are understood.  | As presented in Table 1, mitigation measures were already included in the preliminary design proposals, e.g. shared pedestrian / cycle crossings. As presented in Table 3, further measures will be considered during detailed design phase aimed at enhancing safety.  |
| 7) The proposed link route through the Arbury Estate should be considered in preference to this scheme. | Even if the whole of the WCC funding for the Bermuda Connectivity Scheme were transferred to the Link Road, it would fall very far short of the amount needed to build the Link Road.The primary objective of the proposed Link Road is to support any major strategic development on the Arbury Estate land carried forward by a Developer. The proposed Link Road cannot happen without Developer funding.The Link Road has been suggested for a number of years. In that period, no Developer has come forward to progress the proposal. It is highly likely this will remain the case for some time. Whereas, the County Council wishes to act now to address traffic congestion issues in the West Nuneaton area.If the Link Road is eventually implemented, it will provide relief to the wider area as well as the development it would serve. However, those wider benefits are heavily dependent on the Bermuda Connectivity Scheme having been carried out. By contrast, the Connectivity Scheme will deliver its calculated BCR even if the Link Road is not built.Therefore, the Arbury Estate Link Road is not a viable alternative to the Getting West Nuneaton Moving: Bermuda Connection scheme. | No action taken. |
| 8) Bermuda Bridge is not fit for purpose in terms of the proposed scheme | The bridge was designed to accommodate two-way traffic, and the structure passed a 40 tonne assessment in 1994.  | If the scheme is progressed, detailed design would include improvement and refurbishment work to Bermuda Bridge, in order to ensure that it complies with current Highway standards. |
| 9) Implementing a scheme of traffic alleviation that channels A-road traffic through a residential area is unprecedented. The Rugby Western Relief Road is furnished as an example of successful traffic alleviation. The question is raised – does not Nuneaton warrant the same? | The predicted volume of traffic utilising the link route would be well below the levels using the A444 according to the WCC Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Wide Area Paramics Traffic Model – Opening Year 2018.For example, the Traffic Model predicts that only 16.5% (around 525 vehicles) of the traffic along the A444 would divert to use the additional link over the bridge during the AM Peak and only 14.5% during the PM peak (around 340 vehicles). The potential Arbury Estate Link Road will provide Nuneaton with a form of Western Relief Road should it be progressed and funded by a Developer.However, the Bermuda Connection scheme can be delivered without the need for developer contribution and would provide a substantial level of benefits for the wider community. | No action taken. |
| 10) Insufficient space at key junctions to enable large vehicles to undertake turning manoeuvres safely, e.g. Heath End Road / Bermuda Road  | Preliminary design included widening the carriageway at key junctions and setting back stop lines in order to accommodate HGV movements.HGV movements were tested on the preliminary layout of the junction improvements using software.  | If the scheme is progressed, detailed design would include Topographical Surveys to further steer the design of the junction improvements.Further vehicle swept path analysis testing will also be undertaken.  |

**Part 2: Submissions by Bermuda Bridge Action Group**

The submissions run to 117 pages, accompanied by 43 technical drawings, but are summarised on the Response Form:

* stop the scheme
* invest in the A444 upgrade instead
* save public money being wasted.

The detailed submissions will be made available to Members. They review the design and safety of individual elements of the scheme and assess their impacts. The cost of the consultation version of the scheme is estimated by the BBAG at £6,451,491 to which they add an "optimism bias" of 44%. The "Essential Objections" set out in the submissions are reproduced below.

The BBAG submissions also criticise the adequacy and accuracy of information and analysis used in the business case and provided to the public for the purpose of consultation. A member of the BBAG (with expertise in transport planning) has also corresponded with officers regarding perceived shortcomings in the evidence and analysis. Examples of the points made are that:

* alternative schemes have not been assessed
* traffic modelling should be undertaken for later years
* traffic modelling is based on the original and not the consultation scheme despite changes in junction designs
* the cost estimate is based on the original scheme
* the assessments of environmental impacts (such as noise and air pollution) are too high level
* impacts such as rat running in neighbouring areas have not been properly assessed.

Your officers have assessed these submissions and do not accept that the business case or consultation process has been flawed. A number of criticisms are thought to be misinformed or incorrect. Many others come down to a difference of opinion as to what level and kind of evidence is required at this stage of a multi-stage process. The decision was made to give the public the opportunity to have their say whilst the proposals were still at a formative stage and that inevitably means that some of the evidence will be high level or approximate or subject to change when detailed designs are prepared. Your officers believe that the evidence relied upon is robust and valid for both the original scheme and the consultation version of the scheme and forms a sufficient basis for the decision now to be made by Cabinet, i.e. whether to proceed to the detailed design stage. Very many of the matters raised by the BBAG can only satisfactorily be addressed at that detailed design stage. For example, in response to safety auditing, design changes have been made from the original scheme at junctions and these potentially affect traffic movements and timings. However, only at the detailed design stage will it become clear what mitigation measures can be put in place and only then can any impacts on the traffic modelling be calculated. The likely scale of any impacts is not such as to have a material bearing on the business case or the decision to be made at this point by Cabinet.

Similarly, the detailed design criticisms made in the BBAG's submissions can be taken into account at the detailed design stage. Your officers do not at this point see any criticisms which would prevent the production of a satisfactory detailed scheme or alter the justification for or value for money of the scheme in any significant respect.

The BBAG indicate that "There are a wide range of formal objections that [we] will be pursuing if the scheme proceeds and ultimately we believe that these will be up for challenge during a judicial review process." This looks ahead to the point at which a planning application would be submitted, at which point there will be public consultation on a detailed scheme with scope for formal objections. In the meantime, your officers will (if approval is given to proceed to the next stage) seek to work with representatives of the BBAG to take into account their views on design, costs and impact assessment and, where agreement cannot be reached, at least ensure that there is a common understanding of the facts and the reasons for the disagreement.

A copy of the “Essential Objections” detailed in Pages 22-23 of the 117 page submission is provided below in order to illustrate the nature and scope of the objections being made:



****

**Appendix F**

**Chart 1: Analysis of Response Forms: Total Number of Responses to Question 1 - Traffic Congestion in West Nuneaton causes problems in my day to day activities**

Source: Consultation Report (Warwickshire Observatory)

**Chart 2:** **Analysis of Response Forms: Total Number of Responses to Question 2 – Do you support the proposed new highway link across Bermuda Bridge**

Source: Consultation Report (Warwickshire Observatory)

**Appendix G**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 5: Sections of Land Required to Deliver Option 1 and the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) Opinion of Total Market Value** |
| Section of Land | Land Registry No |
| Land Required for off-street car park for Bermuda Park Rail Station (80 no. spaces) | WK253980 |
| Land adjoining St Georges Way and A444, Nuneaton (Embankment Land on Eastern Side of Bermuda Bridge) | WK322449 |
| Land adjoining St Georges Way (adjacent to Embankment Land on Eastern Side of Bermuda Bridge) | WK258979 |
| Land to the northern side of The Bridleway – (Screening Area required from forthcoming Deeley / Holland and Barrett Ltd Development) | WK459710 |
| Land adjoining St George’s Way (Univar Site) | WK309949 |
| \*Land adjoining The Bridleway (Embankment Land on Western Side of Bermuda Bridge) | WK322449 |
| Land within the site of the Bermuda Phoenix Centre | WK322449 |
| Land adjoining The Bridleway, (Holland and Barrett Ltd Land) | WK454357 |
| Land at Hare & Hounds PH, off Heath End Road | WK379487 |
| Land forming part of the Roadway at the junction of Sargasso Lane with Bermuda Road, part of the southern footway, and an area of landscaping | WK463529 |
| Land forming part of The Bridleway and Templar Drive | WK434425 |
| Land to the front of the Bermuda Phoenix Centre | Unregistered Land 1 |
| Land on the northern side of The Bridleway slightly to the east of where Templar Drive meets The Bridleway | Unregistered Land 2 |
| Land forming part of the Roadway at Hare & Hounds Lane, off Heath End Road | Unregistered Land 3 |
| VOA Opinion on the Total Market Value of the Sections of Land Required  | £333,688 |

\* The value of this particular section of land may change depending on the amount of land required to enable the relocation of an existing attenuation pond and other mitigation.

**Appendix H**

**Bermuda Bridge Action Group – Bermuda Connection Project Scheme Objections and Accompanying Public Consultation Response Drawings**

This information is available online and also hard copies have been placed on display in the Group Rooms.