

**From:** [Nick Roberts](#)  
**To:** [M42 Junction 6](#)  
**Cc:** [Eugene Moore](#)  
**Subject:** RE: M42 Junction 6 Improvement - Applegreen plc Deadline 5 Submission  
**Date:** 16 September 2019 14:45:57  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[Applegreen DL5 Submission - Comments on DL4 Submissions - final.pdf](#)

---

Dear Case Team

We write on behalf of Applegreen plc pursuant to Deadline 5 for the examination of the above project. Our registration identification number is 20022311.

Please find attached a short document with our comments on responses received at Deadline 4.

We trust that is all in order and would be grateful for confirmation of receipt of this email.

Regards,

**Nick Roberts**  
Director



[nickroberts@axisped.co.uk](mailto:nickroberts@axisped.co.uk)

T: 0844 8700 007\* | [REDACTED] | F: 01244 661 432

Camellia House, 76 Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5BB



---

Visit our updated website [www.axisped.co.uk](http://www.axisped.co.uk) to see the projects we've been working on.

---



Disclaimer: Axis shall not be liable for any loss caused from reliance on the contents, or due to any errors, bugs viruses or malicious code. Any enclosure with this content should be checked for viruses before it is opened. The company cannot be held responsible for any failure by the recipient to test for viruses before opening any enclosures. This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any unauthorised review, use, re-transmission, dissemination, copying, disclosure or other use of, or taking of an action in reliance upon, this content is strictly prohibited. \*Calls to this 0844 number are charged at 5p per minute, plus your telephone provider's access charge. Alternatively, please dial 01244 555001 from mobiles and landlines. Axis is the trading name of Axis P.E.D. LTD. Registered Office: Well House Barns, Bretton, Chester CH4 0DH. Registered in England and Wales Company No. 3872453.

# **APPLEGREEN PLC**

**DEADLINE 5 SUBMISSION**

relating to

**M42 Junction 6  
Development Consent Order Application**

**COMMENTS ON RESPONSES RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 4 (RELATING TO THE  
EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS)**

**16<sup>th</sup> September 2019**

Applegreen provides the following comments on responses received at Deadline 4 to two of the Examining Authority's second set of Written Questions :

ExQ2 ref:	Question to:	Question:	Applegreen plc Response
2.1.4.	The Applicant, SMBC, WCC, Extra MSA Solihull Ltd and Applegreen plc	<p><b>MSA and junction 5a</b>            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?</p>	<p>In response to this question, the Applicant has identified nine existing junctions and one new junction. Three of the existing junctions and the new junction identified are not on motorways and, therefore, do not respond to this question. All of the six existing motorway junctions identified provide connections to the local road network on both sides of the motorway. As identified in Applegreen's response to 2.1.4 of the second written questions, the proposed Junction 5a only provides connection on one side of the motorway allowing the provision of a free-flow junction. The Applicant has not identified any junctions on the English motorway network which have uni-directional slip roads and connect to the local road network to one side of the motorway, that are built as dumb-bell junctions. In Applegreen's response to 1.0.10 it was identified that all junctions currently on the English motorway network which have uni-directional slip roads and connect to the local road network to one side of the motorway take the form of free-flow junctions.</p> <p>The Applicant goes on to quote from section 2.2 of TD 22/06. In the view of Applegreen this quote is irrelevant to the question being posed by the ExA.</p>
2.1.5.	The Applicant, SMBC, WCC, Extra MSA Solihull Ltd and Applegreen plc	<p><b>MSA and junction 5a</b>            Please revisit and reassess the advantages claimed for the proposed dumb-bell design for junction 5a in the answer to ExQ1.0.10 in relation to the free-flow 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</p>	<p>In response to this question, the Applicant states that they have prepared a free-flow layout that complies with DMRB which they have used to compare a free-flow layout with a dumb-bell. As the Applicant has not provided a drawing of their free-flow layout, the Applegreen comments that follow have not benefitted from reviewing it.</p> <p>The Applicant states that their free-flow layout would require 12% more land than the dumb-bell scheme. They note that the increase does not include the additional land that would be required to install attenuation features north-west of the junction. It is not clear if the Applicant has considered whether the attenuation features could be accommodate on land within the land take of the free-flow junction. It would be expected that the size of these attenuation features would be smaller with a free-flow layout than a dumb-bell as the total carriageway area would be smaller.</p>

		<p>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?</p>	<p>It is interesting to note that the Applicant accepts that the impact on the ancient woodland would be less with the free-flow proposal. The Applicant has identified the reduction as 800 sqm when compared to the dDCO scheme. Without a layout plan it is not possible to see if their assessment of the free-flow scheme has allowed for the potential revision to the horizontal and vertical alignment of Solihull road that would further reduce the impact on the ancient woodland.</p> <p>The Applicant suggests that the free-flow scheme would have a greater adverse impact on operational safety due to higher traffic speeds. This comment appears to ignore the safety benefit of the removal of the speed changes, braking and vehicular conflicts associated with the dumb-bell layout.</p> <p>The Applicant states that a free-flow layout precludes any opportunities to connect additional road infrastructure with Junction 5A in the future. Applegreen assume that this means that it does not provide for an MSA or a connection to the local road network east of the M42. Neither of these considerations are identified as scheme objectives.</p>
--	--	--	--