

POSITION STATEMENT:
Response to Examining Authority's written
Questions and Requests for Information (ExQ2).
2nd September 2019

Planning Inspectorate Ref:	TR010027
Warwickshire CC Ref:	NIP1910027
Site Location:	M42 Junction 6
Scheme Description:	Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M42 Junction 6
Highway Officer:	Ben Simm – Senior Development Management Officer

Warwickshire County Council has prepared this position statement in response to the questions identified in the Examining Authority's written questions and requested for information published on the 5th August 2019.

2.1 – General and Cross-topic Questions:

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?

This is a matter to be agreed between the application, Solihull MBC, Extra MSA Solihull Ltd and Applegreen plc. Warwickshire County Council has no response to this question.

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?

This is a matter to be agreed between the application, Solihull MBC, Extra MSA Solihull Ltd and Applegreen plc. Warwickshire County Council has no response to this question.

Question 2.1.6: 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?

This is a matter to be agreed between the application, Solihull MBC, Extra MSA Solihull Ltd and Applegreen plc. Warwickshire County Council has no response to this question.

2.2 – Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 7:**Question 2.2.1: Archaeology**

It is understood that the trial trenching has now been completed and that a period of about 4 weeks should see the completion of the written report. Please submit this report by Deadline 4 (2 September 2019). That will help to define the extent and importance of any archaeological remains present and provide information essential for avoiding damage or devising appropriate mitigation measures when there is still time to discuss such matters in the course of the Examination. If that Deadline cannot be met, please indicate when the written report of the archaeological investigation will be available.

The Archaeology matters relate to land which is overseen by Solihull MBC, who utilise the Archaeological Services of Warwickshire County Council. Warwickshire County Council defer on this matter to Solihull MBC.

2.8 – Assessment of Cumulative Effects – ES Chapter 16:**Question 2.8.1:**

Does the Short List of Developments in Appendix 16.3 [APP–16.3] contain all that it should?

Warwickshire County Council has reviewed the list provided and is satisfied as there are no relevant developments in Warwickshire's administrative boundary which need to be considered as part of this assessment.

2.9 – The Relationship to other Projects and the Robustness of the Traffic Modelling:**Question 2.9.1: The growth gap**

The Panel welcome the promise to explain the relationship between the LAM, OM, PRISM and NTEM at Deadline 4 (2 September 2019). However, whatever the nature of those relationships, the Panel need to know how the growth anticipated by 2041 is to be accommodated on the road network because all the evidence currently available suggests that the current scheme will be insufficient on its own. We understand that discussions between SMBC and the Applicants held on 16 July 2019 have addressed that conundrum. In the light of those discussions, please explain what new roads, road schemes or road improvements are envisaged to accommodate the growth anticipated up to 2041 and indicate how the current scheme might integrate with those further developments. Please take account of the works to accommodate HS2, the 'people mover' to Birmingham International Airport and the extension of the Midlands Metro to both the Airport and the HS2 interchange station all anticipated by 2026.

Warwickshire County Council, in its capacity, would defer to the applicants and Solihull MBC on this matter. Based on our assessment the Authority is satisfied that the implementation of the scheme has a negligible impact upon the operation of Warwickshire's Highway Network

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?

Warwickshire County Council, in its capacity, would defer to the applicants and Solihull MBC on this matter. Based on our assessment the Authority is satisfied that the implementation of the scheme has a negligible impact upon the operation of Warwickshire's Highway Network, with the mitigation of the impact of the development through the mitigation processes to be agreed in accordance with the emerging Statement of Common Ground with the applicants.

Question 2.9.4: Effects of the 'high growth' scenario

From the answers given to ExQ1.11.8 and ExQ1.11.11, the traffic accommodated by the OM appears to encompass the 'high growth' scenario set out in the LAM. Does it follow that, although several links at junction 6 and the Clock Interchange have $V/C > 1$ (up to about 1.6 sometimes) (Appendix B and Figures 2A-3B [REP2-007]) additional road works will not be required because the OM generally accommodates the flows predicted? Or, is it the case that the reference to the restriction of 'any increase in user benefits when compared with the core scenario' (answer to ExQ1.11.11) implies the existence of 'hidden' queues throughout the network?

Warwickshire County Council, in its capacity, would defer to the applicants and Solihull MBC on this matter. Based on our assessment the Authority is satisfied that the implementation of the scheme has a negligible impact upon the operation of Warwickshire's Highway Network, with the mitigation of the impact of the development through the mitigation processes to be agreed in accordance with the emerging Statement of Common Ground with the applicants.