

# M42 Junction 6 Development Consent Order

**Scheme Number TR010027**

## **8.8(a) Statement of Common Ground with Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council**

Planning Act 2008

Rule 8 (1)(e)

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 8

July 2019

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

**M42 Junction 6**

Development Consent Order 202[ ]

---

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND  
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council**

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Regulation Number</b>                      | Rule 8(1)(e)   |
| <b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b> | TR010027   |
| <b>Document Reference</b>                     | 8.8(a)   |
| <b>Author</b>                                 | Highways England and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council |

| <b>Version</b> | <b>Date</b>  | <b>Status of Version</b>               |
|----------------|--------------|--|
| 1              | 15 July 2019 | Version 2 Updated Draft for Deadline 3 |

### STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.**

Signed.....

Chris Harris

Project Manager

on behalf of Highways England

Date: [DATE]

Signed.....

[NAME]

[POSITION]

on behalf of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council

Date: [DATE]

DRAFT

## Table of contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Table of contents</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.1 Purpose of this document</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.3 Terminology</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>2 RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3 ISSUES</b>  | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>3.1 Issues Raised</b>   | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>[INSERT RELEVANT DOCUMENTS NOT FORMING PART OF THE APPLICATION THAT ARE REFERENCED IN THE SOCG E.G. EMAILS/MEETING NOTES/DATA].</b> | <b>20</b> |

DRAFT

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the proposed M42 Junction 6 Development Consent Order ("the Application") made by Highways England Company Limited ("Highways England") to the Secretary of State for Transport ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order ("the Order") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2 The order, if granted, would authorise Highways England to carry out the following works:
- a. a new dumbbell junction approximately 1.8km south of the existing Junction 6 on the M42;
  - b. construction of a new 2.4km dual carriageway link road between the new junction and Clock Interchange (an existing junction on the A45);
  - c. modifications to the existing Clock Interchange junction;
  - d. upgrades to the existing Junction 6; and
  - e. realignments and improvements to local roads to the west of the existing M42 in proximity to the proposed bypass.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.4 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

## 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC).
- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of Highways England, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 SMBC is defined as one of two host local authorities as the majority of the Scheme is located within its administrative boundary. SMBCs role in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) process derives from Section 42(1)(b) of the PA 2008.
- 1.2.4 Collectively Highways England and SMBC are referred to as 'the parties'.

### 1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 In the table in the Issues chapter of this SoCG:

- a. “Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- b. “Not Agreed” indicates a final position, and
- c. “Under discussion” where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.

1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to SMBC’s representation and therefore have not been considered in this document. It is recognised however that engagement between both parties will need to continue due to their joint vested interest in the area of the Scheme

DRAFT

## 2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation since the beginning of the proposed development. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and SMBC in relation to the Application is outlined in **Table 2-1**.

**Table 2-1 - Record of Engagement**

| Date       | Form of correspondence   | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)   |
|------------|--------------------------|--|
| 14.04.16   | Meeting                  | Early engagement to present details of the scheme to date and to listen to thoughts and concerns for developing the options further.   |
| 21.11.16   | Meeting                  | Meeting to discuss Highways England's proposals.   |
| 29.11.2016 | Pre-consultation Meeting | Meetings to share further progress on the options and to listen to any thoughts or concerns prior to presenting the options at Public Consultation.  |
| 08.12.16   | Email correspondence     | SMBC request for information from Highways England regarding which local stakeholders were consulted and if the consultation document that was used was the same that which was shared with SMBC.  |
|            |                          | Email with attached list of all the stakeholders Highways England has consulted with up until the end of November 2016. Confirmation that the presentation that was used was the same one given to SMBC.   |
| 26.01.17   | Letter                   | SMBC response to the scheme options consultation.  |
| 27.06.17   | Email correspondence     | Confirming that the land occupied by the WGAA is not common land.  |
| 19.07.17   | Email                    | To Highways England regarding SMBC's response to Julian Knight MP to address his comments on the scheme proposals.   |
| 09.10.17   | Meeting                  | Discussion of alternative locations within the authority boundary of SMBC for the WGAA, update on the Extra and Applegreen MSA proposals with particular reference to Natural England's objection to the Extra MSA on the grounds of harm to the Ancient Woodland. |

| Date     | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)   |
|----------|------------------------|--|
| 10.10.17 | Email                  | Details of the site search carried out by SMBC in relation to the potential relocation of the WGAA.  |
| 12.10.17 | Letter                 | Preparation of a draft SoCC  |
| 13.10.17 | Email                  | Email from Highways England containing plans for Clock Interchange, the access into the NEC/UGC/East Way and options for J5A, if the MSA doesn't proceed.  |
| 10.11.17 | Letter                 | Notification of development letter to SMBC   |
| 13.11.17 | Meeting                | Discussion of the SoCC   |
| 15.11.17 | Letter                 | Response from Solihull MBC on the SoCC   |
| 17.11.17 | Email correspondence   | Regarding some concerns that SMBC have regarding the proposed Scheme, particularly in relation to reviewing the highway designs in line with SMBC's Cabinet making comments.   |
|          |                        | Highways England's response outlines that some of the information regarding the design does not exist at present as the preliminary design is still being shaped. This will be produced following consultation with stakeholders in the coming months. |
| 22.11.17 | Email correspondence   | Comments by SMBC on the joint Highways England and SMBC position paper.  |
| 23.11.17 | Email                  | Highways England email to SMBC with final Joint Position Paper, subject to agreement from SMBC.  |
| 27.11.17 | Meeting                | Discussed 6-7 concerns raised by SMBC  |
| 09.01.18 | Meeting                | Design review with SMBC  |
| 18.01.18 | Email correspondence   | Request by SMBC that Highways England attend a Tourism Forum hosted by SMBC to give an update on the scheme and the current consultation on the preferred option.  |
|          |                        | Highways England was unable to attend, however, supplied a supply of scheme brochures and a link to a 3D fly-through for the meeting.  |
| 20.02.18 | Letter                 | Statutory Consultation Response  |



| Date                             | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 19.03.18<br>Email correspondence |                        | Regarding the possibility of reviewing the extent of the trunk road flowing from the construction of a new D2AP link road from the SRN to Clock Interchange.   |
|                                  |                        | Highways England is willing to entertain, with the DfT, the possibility of trunking a short length of the A45 and associated lengths of highway.   |
| 17.05.18                         | Meeting                | Highways England/SMBC Quarterly Meeting  |
| 15.06.18                         | Meeting                | To discuss signage strategy for primary and local destinations.  |
| 23.08.18<br>Email correspondence |                        | Regarding update on consultation for the scheme. Request for briefing note regarding the letters to land owners for the additional consultation, and the revised plans.  |
|                                  |                        | Highways England responded by providing a copy of the consultation letter, draft plan and Appendix 1 which provides the definitive list of the changes proposed.   |
| 30.08.18<br>Email correspondence |                        | Derek Lawlor wishes Highways England to advise SMBC on the comments regarding Appendix 1. Request that Highways England send SMBC the latest General Arrangement plans ahead of the DCO meeting on the 4 September.  |
| 31.08.18                         |                        | Highways England confirmed that the further consultation will commence on Tuesday 4 September and run until 2 October. The general arrangement plans and engineering drawings are not able to be shared at this time, however, it may be possible to share them next week on an in-confidence basis. |
|                                  |                        | SMBC raise the issue of the bus stop relocation.   |
|                                  |                        | Highways England will speak with the designers to see what can be stated on the plans with regards the bus stop, to retain some flexibility. This could be something to address at the meeting on Tuesday 4 September.   |

| Date     | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)  |
|----------|------------------------|---|
| 04.08.18 | Email                  | Bus stop issue was not resolved at meeting on 4 September as there were no attendees from Highways England. Request that the land plans are sent to SMBC as shape files in order to load them into the mapping system and identify the areas in SMBC's ownership which overlap the highway.   |
| 17.09.18 | Email                  | SMBC requires advise on who will lead on the 'Greening the grey' landscape proposals from Highways England.   |
| 27.09.18 | Meeting                | Review of proposed departures with SMBC   |
| 27.09.18 | Email correspondence   | Query as to how Highways England require feedback from the further consultation.  |
| 28.09.18 |                        | Highways England note SMBC's comment regarding the NMM access, however, with the scheme in place, there is no justification for it; even including HS2's traffic in the modelling, now that they are a committed development. Therefore the Access has been withdrawn from our proposals. The NMM are happy with this course of events. |
|          |                        | SMBC request that the NMM rear access is discussed further.   |
| 15.10.18 | Meeting                | Overview of the DCO process.  |
| 16.10.18 | Meeting                | Highways England/SMBC Quarterly Meeting   |
| 16.10.18 | Email                  | To SMBC regarding the maintenance programme and Catherine-de-Barnes classification.   |
| 18.10.18 | Email                  | Provision of the plans for a secondary access for Haven Caravan Park, and the plan for an alternative access arrangement from Catherine-de-Barnes Lane to Four Winds.   |
|          |                        | SMBC supports the proposals for the WGAA/Four Winds accesses. SMBC has concern over the suggested revised access.   |
| 30.10.18 | Email correspondence   | SMBC requiring confirmation of the status of the DCO submission.  |
| 25.10.18 | Meeting                | To discuss traffic signs strategy   |

| Date     | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)  |
|----------|------------------------|---|
| 18.12.18 | Meeting                | Traffic assessment meeting. The meeting was arranged as a result of an outstanding action from the previous Traffic Signs Strategy meeting, where both Solihull Council (SMBC) and Highways England's Operations Directorate required an additional meeting to discuss the development of the traffic model and the subsequent decisions that were influenced by the traffic model. |
| 24.01.19 | Meeting                | Overview of roles and responsibilities pre and post submission of the DCO, the role of local planning authority's role and a detailed overview of the submitted Environmental Statement.  |
| 28.02.19 | Email                  | Updated signage strategy report and proposed sign drawings provided by Highways England for comments and review by SMBC, following the Traffic Signs Strategy meeting held on 24 October 2018.  |
| 02.04.19 | Meeting                | Meeting to discuss DCO powers and outstanding highways issues regarding signage strategy, design and departures.  |
| 17.04.19 | Meeting                | Signage Strategy Meeting.   |
| 07.05.19 | Meeting                | Meeting to discuss queries regarding the Local Impact Report and remaining issues.  |
| 10.06.19 | Meeting                | DCO Process and SoCG  |

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Highways England and (2) SMBC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

Both parties have agreed that engagement to date has been positive and collaborative and that this engagement will need to continue throughout the DCO process, detailed design and construction stage and beyond. SMBC has confirmed to both Highways England and the Examining Authority that it supports the Scheme as it will bring benefits to the area and support future growth aspirations. The issues and matters highlighted in **Table 3-1** summarise the key issues that have been in discussion between the two parties over the last two years. These issues generally fall into two categories: 1) those substantive issues which have been formally been raised by SMBC during the formal DCO consultation and representation stages, and 2) lesser issues and matters where further information has been requested of the applicant by SMBC to assist with its understanding about the localised impacts of the Scheme.

## 3 Issues

### 3.1 Issues Raised

| Sub-topic          | SMBC Comment  | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement  |
|--------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| Local Impacts      |   |   |                   |
| <b>Green Belt</b>  | <p>The Examining Authority have requested a statement on Green Belt to be included in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</p> <p>SMBC has reviewed Paragraphs 5.3.56 - 5.3.61 of the Planning Statement in relation to Green Belt and concurs with the applicant on this matter.</p> | <i>Noted</i>  | Agreed            |
| <b>Air quality</b> | <p>SMBC queried whether there is going to be an air quality impact on the A45 towards Birmingham, as they thought that there was not enough information within the existing DCO, although the DCO reports that there is no significant adverse effect as a result of the Scheme.</p>    | <p><i>Highways England has confirmed to SMBC that the Scheme will neither give rise to new significant air quality effects, nor will it substantially worsen air quality in Air Quality Management Areas. Highways England and its advisors have agreed to meet with SMBC to discuss this matter further to establish if further information is needed following this discussion. Highways England has agreed to provide SMBC with information from the assessment which support this position.</i></p> | Under Discussion. |

| Sub-topic                | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions  | Status/Agreement  |
|--------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| <b>Cultural heritage</b> | SMBC note that the ES is inconsistent in its conclusions towards heritage assets when Landscape and Heritage Assets chapters are compared.   | <i>Highways England is awaiting further information from SMBC, which clarifies where perceived anomalies are within the ES. Discussions on these matters are ongoing.</i>  | Under Discussion. |
| <b>Ancient woodland</b>  | SMBC agree with Natural England that the compensation ratio proposed in the DCO is not enough to reflect the loss of Ancient Woodland. SMBC has discussed compensation ratios with Woodlands Trust, which advised SMBC that it considers the ratio should be 30:1. SMBC has yet to confirm to Highways England what it considers to be an appropriate ratio.   | <i>Highways England is having ongoing discussions with Natural England about the ratio of ancient woodland compensation planting proposed within the DCO Scheme. Highways England is however currently of the view that the ratio of replanting proposed within the DCO is proportionate and appropriate - Highways England proposed ratio is 3:1 – any diseased or dying trees would be replaced as part of the 5-year management plan.</i>   | Under Discussion. |
| <b>Construction</b>      | SMBC confirm that in our Borough, we would not normally permit work to commence on proposed works until 8am in the morning – weekdays & Saturdays. We would not normally permit working after 6pm. We would not normally permit any deliveries and/or arrivals on site before 7am – weekdays & Saturdays. We would expect to receive any applications for work outside of these hours inc Sundays and Bank Holidays for specific work and to seek our agreement. | <i>The working hours proposed within the DCO are standard hours of working by Highways England on schemes across its national programme, which strike a balance between impacts on local amenity and the timely delivery of nationally significant infrastructure. Where working hours are restricted on schemes of this scale the total duration of works can increase which can often be worse for amenity overall. In discussions on this matter, Highways England has confirmed to SMBC that the environmental assessment has taken into account the working hours proposed. Highways England has asked SMBC to set out any specific concerns to understand why they consider restricted hours</i> | Under Discussion. |

| Sub-topic | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement  |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------|
|           |  | <i>to be appropriate. Highways England agreed that it would also consider the wording used in SMBC contracts to control contractor working hours.</i>   |                   |
|           | SMBC seeks clarification on what mitigation will be used during both the operational and construction periods.   | <i>The ES reports no significant change in the noise environment, and it even reports an improvement along some parts of Catherine-de-Barnes Lane. It is therefore not within the current design to have operational noise barriers within the Scheme. However, during construction, if there is a requirement for temporary noise barriers this will be considered on a case-by-case basis as set out in the OEMP.</i> | Under Discussion. |
|           | SMBC have also sought a commitment to no loss of traffic capacity at peak periods  | <i>Highways England has asked SMBC for further clarity on what is being sought.</i>   | Under Discussion. |
|           | Construction Compounds – SMBC requests that a meeting is held with Highways England to discuss the approach to construction, in particular the location and rationale for construction compounds. This meeting is needed to understand construction methods and the necessary mitigation measures for compounds. | <i>Highways England agrees that such a meeting would be beneficial.<br/><br/>Highways England would like to draw SMBC's attention to the Outline Environmental Management Plan which includes extensive measures to control environmental effects during construction</i>   | Under Discussion. |

| Sub-topic          | SMBC Comment  | Highways England Response/Actions  | Status/Agreement  |
|--------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| <b>SSSI</b>        | SMBC query whether the new solution for mitigating the impact on the SSSI would sufficiently reflect what has been lost, as well as how this solution would work. SMBC also query the wider implications that this alternative solution may have on the surrounding environment. SMBC have not been able to review the proposed mitigation but will be happy to review before next deadline | <p><i>Highways England's advisors met with SMBC's Ecology Advisor on the 15<sup>th</sup> May to discuss this issue.</i></p> <p><i>It was agreed that Highways England would issue the updated version (Version 9) SSSI Technical Note, when produced. The SSSI technical should provide adequate response to SMBC's queries. It is intended that this Technical Note will be produced shortly.</i></p>   | Under Discussion. |
| <b>Archaeology</b> | SMBC are satisfied with Highways England's engagement regarding archaeology throughout the DCO process. SMBC query the potential that there is unidentified archaeology within the Order Limits, as just under 50% of trial trenching has not yet occurred. SMBC request an update on progress regarding gaining access to land to carry out surveys.                                       | <p><i>At the meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> May, Highways England's advisors confirmed to SMBC that due to the inconclusive nature of the geophysical survey undertaken as part of the EIA a precautionary approach to the way effects had been reported was adopted within the ES; resulting in the Scheme being reported to have a significant adverse effect on underlying archaeology. Highways England has now begun archaeological trial trenching across the site in locations agreed with SMBC's archaeological advisor. To date, due to issues with landowners approximately 50% of the trial trenching is now complete. Issues with securing access to the remaining land has meant that it has not been possible to-date to survey the remaining land.</i></p> | Under Discussion. |

| Sub-topic                       | SMBC Comment  | Highways England Response/Actions  | Status/Agreement         |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
|                                 |   | <p><i>UPDATE: Archaeological trial trenching commenced mid to late June 2018 and is ongoing during July 2019.</i></p>  |                          |
| <b>Traffic and transport</b>    |   |  |                          |
| <p><b>Traffic Modelling</b></p> | <p>Modelling to-date does not seem to replicate current conditions, particularly at peak periods and does not seem to have been validated.</p> <p>SMBC has advised Highways England that during peak periods, in particular in the evenings, that a Resilience Plan is put into action when there are shows and exhibitions at the NEC. Effectively, if M42 J6 is at capacity then the NEC direct traffic out of Northway even though their destination may be M42 S. Once the new junction and new dual carriageway are in operation, there will be less traffic exiting from M42 Northbound but the NEC will take up this capacity by directing more traffic on to Southway and up to Junction 6.</p> | <p><i>Models and associated modelling runs are compliant with DMRB/ WebTAG and has been signed off by Highways England's specialists. The traffic forecasts have been prepared using traffic models representing all significant roads and junctions in the area. The models have been calibrated and validated against DMRB/ WebTAG criteria to represent existing traffic count and journey time data in the morning, interpeak and evening peak hours. Future year forecasts were developed from the base model using standard forecasting methods and assumptions.</i></p> <p><i>However, recognising that SMBC were concerned that the junction will not cope with exceptional peaks due to events at NEC and Birmingham Airport, Highways England undertook further sensitivity tests and presented the findings in various meetings – this facilitated agreement with SMBC of a scheme base case that realistically reflected the current conditions. This formed the basis for revised traffic forecasts into the future design year, which confirmed the Scheme's compliance with DMRB capacity requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England will continue to engage with</i></p> | <p>Under Discussion.</p> |



| Sub-topic             | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement         |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
|                       |  | <p><i>key stakeholders to further develop their traffic management plans to accommodate exceptional events with the Scheme in place.</i></p> <p><i>Further network resilience has been provided through retention of the M42 to A45 west bound slip road for emergency use – subject to safe operating protocols being developed during detailed design.</i></p>  |                          |
| <p><b>Signage</b></p> | <p>Solihull MBC has requested a signing strategy be agreed with themselves and other major stakeholders before the DCO. SMBC support variable signing to allow traffic to be switched to alternative routes for network resilience, details, discussion and responsibility for management need to be discussed with Solihull MBC and the Combined Authority and HS2, NEC and BAL. SMBC request provision of a variable message sign (VMS) network through the Scheme to help facilitate traffic movements through Junction 5A and Junction 6 during peak traffic period and major events periods. SMBC awaiting strategy from Highways England to review</p> | <p><i>Highways England has developed a signage strategy in collaboration with SMBC and Highways England's Operations Directorate. This is an ongoing activity and currently the strategy is being refined following feedback from SMBC and other stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England remains committed to developing a VMS strategy and will seek the support of those interested Stakeholders to deliver the VMS infrastructure through the detailed design and construction phase of the Scheme.</i></p> | <p>Under Discussion.</p> |
|                       | <p>Would be useful to see signage and carriageway marking details of the approach to the proposed A45 Eastbound free running link on to the M42 North and traffic modelling.</p>   | <p><i>Highways England will continue to engage with SMBC to deliver a safe solution for the road design on approach to the A45 eastbound free running link on to the M42 north bound motorway.</i></p>  |                          |

| Sub-topic   | SMBC Comment  | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement         |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| <b>Design</b>                                     |   |   |                          |
| <p><b>Haven Caravan Park secondary access</b></p> | <p>A secondary access is welcomed and would be supported by SMBC, there would clear highway benefits if this were to be made permanent.</p> <p>SMBC has concern regarding the suggested revised access as it is on a bend and there will presumably be TM in place as well with the proposed bridgeworks. We discussed another option of an approach via Old Clock Lane but this is likely to raise an objection from the two properties nearby in Old Clock Lane. SMBC has highlighted Catherine-de-Barnes Lane in red on the plan that Highways England sent to SMBC and wondered if Highways England could consider a temporary access over the land shown in yellow – part of this will also be the PMA in the final scheme. SMBC has also requested a one way system through the caravan park for safety reasons and would like to see this as a permanent system - Highways England will share a plan with SMBC – SMBC can provide response to CH on safety issue if not made permanent</p> | <p><i>Highways England has confirmed that a temporary secondary access to the site during construction would be beneficial.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England will consider whether there is potential for this access to be made permanent.</i></p> | <p>Under Discussion.</p> |

| Sub-topic                   | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions  | Status/Agreement  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| <b>Construction Impacts</b> |  |  |                   |
| <b>Traffic</b>              | <p>SMBC believes that collaborative working is needed to ensure efficient and effective traffic management during construction.</p> <p>SMBC have requested a similar commitment that other developers provided on previous schemes in the area that at peak periods there will be no reduction in traffic capacity on the road network</p> | <p><i>Highways England recognise the need to work closely with customers, businesses and promoters of all projects to ensure the effective coordination of works to minimise disruption having regard to the fact the scheme involves works on the highway. In accordance with Requirement 10 of the dDCO. Highways England will produce a Traffic Management Plan in consultation with SMBC.</i></p>                | Under Discussion. |
|                             | <p>Concern over construction congestion, especially at Clock due to the scheme which interfaces at the same time at Birmingham International Station. Options to combine works should be explored.</p>   | <p><i>This is noted. Highways England recognise the need to work closely with customers, businesses and promoters of all projects to ensure the effective coordination of works to minimise disruption having regard to the fact the scheme involves works on the highway. In accordance with Requirement 10 of the dDCO. Highways England will produce a Traffic Management Plan in consultation with SMBC.</i></p> | Under Discussion. |

| Sub-topic                                     | SMBC Comment  | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement                |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| <b>Matters resolved 2017 to December 2018</b> |   |   |                                 |
| <b>Design</b>                                 |   |   |                                 |
| <b>WGAA</b>                                   | <p>Adequate re provision for WGAA agreed in principle. SMBC have not had sight of the proposed and detailed mitigation but will be happy to review and comment as and when it's received.</p> | <p><i>Highways England has discussed the impact of the Scheme on the WGAA with SMBC over the last two years. Highways England has shared its options for reconfiguration proposals for the club on land adjoining the existing club facilities that now form part of the DCO Scheme. SMBC has confirmed its support for the proposals in the DCO Scheme.</i></p>  | <p>Agreed subject to detail</p> |
|   | <p>An alternative access is welcomed.<br/>Is there an alternative access to the WGAA, off Catherine-de-Barnes Lane, that would avoid a link past Four Winds?</p>                              | <p><i>Highways England has developed a proposal for an alternative access for the WGAA within the Order Limits that has been discussed with SMBC. It was noted that this proposal is preferable to SMBC.</i><br/><br/><i>Highways England will be putting this forward to the ExA as part of the more detailed proposals for the WGAA reconfiguration.</i></p>  | <p>Agreed</p>                   |
| <b>Slip roads</b>                             | <p>The exclusion of north-facing slips at the new Junction 5A does not seem to cater for future growth.</p>   | <p><i>This is noted. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north-facing slips at Junction 5A.</i><br/><br/><i>Highways England continues to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. The possibility of north-facing slips has not been precluded by the design of the</i></p> | <p>Agreed</p>                   |

| Sub-topic | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions  | Status/Agreement |
|-----------|--|--|------------------|
|           |  | <i>Scheme subject to wider improvements of the SRN in the area – such as widening of the M42 or use of All Lane Running.</i>   |                  |
|           | <p>Should you look at increasing the number of lanes available on the M42 J6 north slip road for Coventry bound traffic?</p> <p>At the existing Northbound off slip, SMBC have observed that there is only one right lane from M42 N for Coventry and this could be improved with two lanes for vehicles turning right</p> | <p><i>Increasing the number of running lanes over Clock Interchange from 2 to 3 lanes is one of the key aspects of providing capacity improvements at Clock Interchange, along with traffic signalisation. The M42 Project Team has worked closely with both SMBC and Warwickshire County Council structures specialist to agree the assessment and approval of the design. Similarly, Highways England will be developing a local model to determine if these proposals will address the traffic growth in this area taking into account sensitivities in traffic flows particularly in the evening peak period.</i></p> <p><i>The segregated lane from M42 northbound slip onto the A45W has been removed and the geometric design has been modified (i.e. increased) to incorporate four lanes at the stop line, this will help Coventry-bound traffic as two lanes will be signed to Coventry.</i></p> | Agreed           |
|           | A free running lane should be considered onto the A45W at the Clock Interchange.   | <i>As a consequence of consultation with SMBC a free flow link has been added to Clock Interchange from the mainline link road to the A45 westbound.</i>   | Agreed           |

| Sub-topic                       | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement |
|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
|                                 | <p>SMBC requests that Highways England trunk the section of the A45 between Clock Interchange and Junction 6 of the M42.</p> <p>DfT having met with Highways England at a national level wrote to SMBC on 13/2/19 and advised “As far as trunking the A45 from the M42 to the Clock Interchange is concerned, at our meeting Highways England accepted that the principle for trunking looked sound, but expressed an initial preference to defer trunking activity until after the DCO for the RIS 1 M42 Junction 6 improvements has been concluded.”</p> | <p><i>The DCO Scheme does not include proposals to trunk the section of the A45 at Clock Interchange to Junction 6 of the M42. Highways England has however acknowledged that, subject to the outcome of a detailed review, this could be an area of road that is trunked at a later stage.</i></p>   | <p>Agreed</p>    |
| <p><b>Free running lane</b></p> | <p>SMBC request that the M42 northbound to A45 westbound free-flow link road is kept open for resilience, especially during periods of peak traffic, or when Junction 5A is closed to traffic.</p>   | <p><i>The free flow link was removed from the proposed scheme as part of the modifications to Option 1 at PRA. Further work on the link design showed that there were significant challenges with the horizontal and vertical alignment of the link, impacts on the current access arrangements to adjacent businesses and prohibitively high construction costs compared to potential benefits.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England presented a technical justification for removing the free flow link road based on traffic use and operational safety for road users and operators. It was agreed with SMBC that this link road will not be required but Highways England would maximise the</i></p> | <p>Agreed</p>    |

| Sub-topic          | SMBC Comment   | Highways England Response/Actions   | Status/Agreement |
|--------------------|--|---|------------------|
|                    |  | <i>capacity of the northbound off slip by considering a 5-lane junction at the signals subject to the possibility of a safe design being implemented.</i>   |                  |
| <b>Rear egress</b> | <p>An alternative access from the NMM would be beneficial as it would provide an alternative to the current exit on M42 Junction 6 where traffic can block the roundabout when traffic from major events leaves the NMM at the uncontrolled exit.</p> <p>HS2 advise that they are expecting Highways England to deliver the exit from the NMM which HS2 are to fund.</p> | <p><i>This is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the commitment by HS2 Ltd to provide a rear egress to the NMM, Highways England assessed whether the Scheme would justify the provision of a rear egress. The study identified that there was no significant safety or capacity problems associated with the current access/egress arrangements for the NMM. The traffic modelling indicates that there are no capacity issues in the design year, supporting the conclusion that the existing arrangements will continue to be satisfactory.</i></p> <p><i>Following discussions with the NMM, Highways England confirmed that a new rear egress would not be included as part of the Scheme.</i></p> | Agreed           |
| <b>Bus stop</b>    | SMBC prefers the location of the bus stop shown on consultation plan to the proposal to move it nearer to Church Lane.   | <p><i>This is noted. The precise location of the bus stop will be subject to discussion with SMBC and Transport for West Midlands.</i></p> <p>Highways England has agreed to move the proposed bus-stop on the A45 westbound near the A45 Footway overbridge to the Airport Way Connector Road, to the requested location as is outlined in the current DCO documents.</p>  | Agreed           |

**Need to add comments on Planning issues – Green Belt and other Rule 6 and 8 questions**

## **APPENDICES**

**[INSERT RELEVANT DOCUMENTS NOT FORMING PART OF THE APPLICATION THAT ARE REFERENCED IN THE SOCG E.G. EMAILS/MEETING NOTES/DATA].**

