004_PB_ NationalInfrastructurePlanning_BIR.4229_020919

2 September 2019

National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN

Your Ref: TR010027

Dear Sir,

Planning Act 2008 – Section 88 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M42 Junction 6 Improvement
Deadline 4: Extra's Response to the DCO Panel's Questions

On behalf of the Extra MSA Group (Extra), we are pleased to attach representations made in response to the DCO Panel's questions.

Furthermore, Extra and Highways England have met to progress a Statement of Common Ground and we expect this to be concluded and submitted to the DCO Panel either later today or by Deadline 5 (11 September 2019).

Extra reserves the right to make further submissions once the Deadline 4 responses have been published.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

PAUL BEDWELL
BA (Hons) Dip TRP MRTPI
Senior Director
paul.bedwell@pegasusgroup.co.uk

Enc. Extra's Responses to the DCO Panel's Questions for Deadline 4

Extra MSA Group's (Extra's) Responses to the DCO Panel's Questions for Deadline 4 (2nd September 2019)

Question 2.1.4 **MSA and junction 5a** **It is evident from DMRB TD 22/06 figure 5/2 that the dumb-bell arrangement proposed would normally offer connections to 2-directional slip roads (in this case, N and S facing slips). How many junctions on English motorways are laid out in a dumb-bell arrangement but only with uni-directional slip roads?**
Extra's Response This requires Highways England's (HE's) response. Nonetheless, Extra reserve the right to make further submissions to the DCO Panel once HE's response has been published.

Question 2.1.5 **MSA and junction 5a** **Please revisit and reassess the advantages claimed for the proposed dumbbell design for junction 5a in the answer to ExQ1.0.10 in relation to the freeflow design suggested by Applegreen in their Technical Note appended to REP3-024. Since a consequence of the proposed design necessitates the** **widening of the western roundabout and a section of the link road in order to accommodate MSA traffic, please include all those alterations in the reassessment (particularly, the additional lanes and the additional span of Solihull Road Bridge required). In the light of that reassessment, does the published layout in the dDCO provide the optimum junction arrangement and** **meet the scheme objectives as defined in the Planning Statement?**
Extra's Response This requires Highways England's (HE's) response. Nonetheless, Extra reserve the right to make further submissions to the DCO Panel once HE's response has been published.

Question 2.1.7

MSA and junction 5a

In answer to ExQ1.0.4, it is indicated that an agreed mitigation measure to off-set the operational impacts of north facing slip roads at the proposed junction 5a is the upgrade of the M42 'smart motorway' to an 'all lanes running' regime from the 'dynamic hard shoulder running regime' currently in place. Can this agreement be confirmed? Who will finance that work? And, will it be implemented only if the MSA materialises or is it anticipated as part of a planned programme to accommodate other elements of future growth?

Extra's Response

The conversion of the M42 to All Lane Running is required in conjunction with the provision of the north facing slip roads due to the short length of hard shoulder that would remain between Junction 5a and Junction 6. This conversion forms part of the planning application for the Extra MSA and would be funded by the developer.

Question 2.9.3

Traffic variability

It may well be that the promised explanation of how the various traffic models relate to each other will also provide the answer to this question. However, at first glance from the answer given to ExQ1.11.8, it would appear that the OM accommodates much of the traffic at the upper limit of the variations envisaged in the LAM, the flows in South Way being some 19% higher in the OM than those in the LAM during the AM peak and some 54% higher in the OM than those in the LAM during the PM peak. Please explain how the situations being modelled can be taken to be comparable.

Moreover, if the absence of queues in the OM at 2041 (as shown in Figure 7.8, APP-174) encompasses the variation evident in the LAM, how does the OM address the inherent variability of the traffic at junction 6 on the M42?

Extra's Response

This requires Highways England's (HE's) response. Nonetheless, Extra reserve the right to make further submissions to the DCO Panel once HE's response has been published.