

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [M42 Junction 6](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: M42 J6 Improvement Scheme  
**Date:** 02 June 2019 18:29:40

---

Dear Inspector

I'd like to reiterate a few points that I've previously made in response to consultation in the light changes to circumstances that may impact on the need for the M42 J6 scheme.

The first relates to the change in use at JLR Solihull and the move of LR Discovery production overseas. How does the reduction in incoming parts, outgoing vehicles and the change in staff to a R&D centre impact the need for the scheme? I understand that the Damson Parkway schemes is on hold partly due the changing situation at JLR - how much does this also undermine the need for M42 J6 scheme.

The second point relates to Highways England emerging guidance for the Expressway Standards which is designed to raise operational performance of A-roads to motorway standard through use of technology. This guidance will include a minimum recommended distance for junction spacing. It seems contradictory for Highways England to be promoting a scheme which will breach this requirement. The response to my email below said that the example on the M6 at Knutsford would be considered - my particular concern is that the much needed improvement to the M42 corridor, including all lane running including through junction running will be prejudiced by this schemes (and further so with the MSA adding the north facing slip roads).

In addition to these points there is uncertainty with the airport growth being achieved (another airline failed last year) and with UK Central which has a very long build-out horizon and for which we are a long way from knowing if it will achieve or greatly exceed its sustainable transport targets particularly in the fast emerging world of future mobility. When I set this out with the Programme Delivery Partner (PDP) in the context of HS2 the initial response was that it makes sense to delay this scheme. The local Highways England team is measured on its delivery and did not accept this, as you would expect.

In terms of process at arriving at a scheme I do not think Highways England has considered a low cost options with appropriate rigour. At Stage 1 I was presented with a scheme that at one cross-section had a total of 18 parallel running lanes. It has been a process of working down from there rather than looking at a solution that tackles a problem. I suggest one way to look at a low cost option in my email below based on what SMBC has already implemented in the westbound direction.

The traffic reduction on the A45 between Clock Interchange and M42 J6 is forecast at around 12,000 vehicles a day by 2028. This does not warrant building a road with a capacity of 60,000 or more. This is further reinforced by the link connecting to the new junction attracting less that 25,000 vehicles per day in 2038.

I think the DCO is a great opportunity to recast the problem. I worked on PCF Stage 1 and 2 as the Traffic and Economics lead and provided the modelling to Highways England's Stage 3 consultant. I am happy to discuss this further with you if you wish. I am on

Yours faithfully

Rehan Mian

---

**From:** M42 Junction 6 <M42Junction6@highwaysengland.co.uk>

**Sent:** 12 March 2018 11:17

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** M42 Junction 6

**Subject:** FW: M42 J6 Improvement Scheme

Dear Sir/Madam

**HE Ref: DCO316**

Thank you for your email of 9<sup>th</sup> March regarding the M42 Junction 6 proposals. Your comments have been forwarded to our Project team and design consultants for their consideration and to provide a full response to the questions raised in due course.

Thank you again for contacting us. If there is anything else we can help you with please contact the Project team using the details below.

Kind regards

**Jason Stanton** on behalf of the M42 Junction 6 Project Team  
Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN

Tel: 0300 123 5000

Email: [m42junction6@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:m42junction6@highwaysengland.co.uk)

Web: [www.highways.gov.uk/m42-j6](http://www.highways.gov.uk/m42-j6)

---

**From:** Rehan Mian [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 09 March 2018 20:07

**To:** M42 Junction 6

**Subject:** M42 J6 Improvement Scheme

Hi Jonathon

Thanks for the consultation - I had a look in Hampton and noted a few points:

The consultation material asked if the respondent tho is there is a problem at M42 J6. The answer is "Yes" from my perspective, but from my experience only as a result of flows on the M42 or discrete events at major generators such as the NEC. The junction

itself performs well - I use it 3-5 times a week.

The future year forecast volumes at the new connecting junction are very low. These are significantly below the 48,000 threshold for good LOS and up to 60,000 for D2AP that are used as a design benchmark. What BCR is the scheme returning for unadjusted and adjusted values, and what is the VfM. Sorry if I missed this in the material.

As these flows are relatively modest, what work has been done to test how well a low cost option of improving the A45 would work. SMBC has successfully implemented 4 lanes westbound. How much of the problems at this location would be resolved by making this symmetrical (together with committed HS2 improvements at the junction itself, anticipated realignment of Birmingham International station access, and possible relocating the hotel accesses etc to the current station access off the A45). The relocation of existing accesses to Trinity Park would greatly improve eastbound conditions once the station access is moved. What is the VfM and affordability of such an option? Could this combined with improvements at the Clock Junction to negate the need for a new link and the creation of a new junction relatively close to the existing one?

I note the objection to the MSA has been withdrawn. The material states that the new junction will not prejudice / will facilitate the MSA. This makes the MSA a distinct possibility. What work has been done to show that the ultimate arrangement will work - particularly with the forecast flows you are predicting on the M42, i.e. the long term operation of the network, not the short term horizon that the MSA developer works to.

My experience of the M6 at J19 and Knutsford MSA suggests that we would be creating a new problem where one does not exist and prejudicing the performance of the M42 including any RIS2 or future programmes. What work has been done to test this as RIS2 is more mature now?

My overall impression of the scheme from the material was that we create a large footprint but the busiest part of the road is down to a transfer of traffic from the B4438 which serves the traffic well at present.

It is not entirely clear what problem the scheme addresses.

Thanks again for the opportunity to provide feedback on the consultation material.

Regards

Rehan [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

*This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.*

**Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000**

***|National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park,  
Birmingham B32 1AF | [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-  
england](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england) | [info@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk)***

*Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House,  
1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ*

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.