From: D Cuthbert

Sent: 27 October 2019 12:35

To: M42 Junction 6

Cc:

Subject: Submission and responses to various submissions for Deadline 7 - Catherine de Barnes

Residents Association (CdeBRA)

Attachments: deadline 7 response 261019.docx

Please find attached the submission for and on behalf of Catherine de Barnes Residents Association . We would be grateful if you would record that Hampton in Arden Parish Council support and endorse this response .

David Cuthbert -Chair CdeBRA Cllr Hampton in Arden Parish Council

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



www.catney.co.uk

3/18 Eagle Wing
M42J6 Project Team
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN
For the attention Case Team



26th October 2019

Dear Sirs,

RE:- Deadline 6 Submissions and Responses M42 Jct 6

This document details our responses to various submissions for Deadline 6 and would be grateful if you would confirm its acceptance into the EA's records.

1) Highways England

<u>Deadline 6 Submission - 8.8(c) Statement of Common Ground with</u> <u>Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council</u>

Construction Page 14: Reference is made in HE's response to a Traffic Management Plan. We confirm our verbal submission for Parish Councils(Hampton in Arden (HiA) and Marston Green & Bickenhill Parish Council (MGBPC) to be involved in any discussions and or consultations involving construction traffic routing and to be given at least 7 days notice of any highway closures affecting these Parishes.

Noise: At the recent hearing we requested that noise monitoring equipment should be available at an agreed location in the main compound, to be capable of measuring noise against the limits that will be set out in the relevant management plan so as to enable a timely response to any noise complaints arising from a particular event and that there is an authorised member of the contractor's team available or at least contactable who has the authority to shut down/change a particular operation if found to exceed the limits in the relevant management plan. Physical records should be kept by the Contractor of reported incidents of noise levels being breached..

Traffic Modelling: we refer to HE's response and in particular to the last Paragraph. The paragraph states".....engage with key stakeholders....." Accordingly we request a firm commitment from the Applicant and SMBC to ensure that the Parish Councils referred to above are involved in this process.

Signage: We refer to HE's response where it states" strategy is being refined following feed back from SMBC and other stakeholders". The Parish



www.catney.co.uk

Councils referred to above have not been involved /consulted in any way during this process and would request we are, where signage falls within the relevant Parish.

Traffic: We refer to HE's response where they state they will produce a Traffic Management Plan in consultation with SMBC. We requested at the last hearing that this 'consultation' include the two Parish Councils, HinA and MGBPC, both of whom were represented at the hearing, and whose Parishes this project falls within .

We would point out to the Examiners that there is a Parish/Town Council Charter in place with SMBC. There is an undertaking for SMBC to ask Parish and Town Councils to comment on issues affecting their community. At no time have we have we been approached or made aware of an opportunity of discussing any of the matters mentioned above with SMBC or HE.

2) Metropolitan Borough of Solihill Council (SMBC)

<u>Deadline 6 Submission - Responses to the Panel's Third Written</u>

<u>Questions and Response to Action Points arising from Hearings on 1-3</u>

<u>October 2019</u>

Noise and Vibration - ES Chapter 12 Para 3.7 and 3.7.1

We would request that any method of 'measuring noise/disturbance that is decided upon by the Applicant and SMBC is easily quantifiable and measured in order that complaints/concerns raised by residents or any other interested parties can be resolved quickly. We understand this might fall under the remit of any Community Liaison Officer appointed by the Contractor/Applicant.It is important that they have the ability and tools to resolve matters quickly, preferably immediately, rather than have a scenario where, in the case of Saturday working, complainants are waiting maybe 2 days to raise the matter before a resolution is even considered

Para: 3.7.2 We endorse and support the statement made by SMBC in this paragraph and await with interest HE's confirmation of its agreement.

Para: 3.7.3 We endorse and support the statement made by SMBC in this paragraph and await with interest HE's confirmation of its agreement .

Para: 3.7.4 We endorse and support the statement made by SMBC in this paragraph and await with interest HE's confirmation of its agreement .

Transport Assessment Report (APP-174)



www.catney.co.uk

Para; 3.9 Page 13 Phase 4

Information we have going back some time relating to new link roads between jct 5A and Jct 6 of the M42 would suggest that they would compromise weaving distances going north towards Jct 6 ,especially if northern slips are deemed a requirement of Jct 5a but more to the point any development of this nature do not necessitate the building of a dumbbell arrangement at Jct 5a. A free flow arrangement could be designed to meet this longer term requirement.

In their response on page 13 SMBC refer to the fact that it has shared the proposals of UK-Central Hub proposals (we presume with the Applicant) but we would point out that these have **not** been shared with the Parish Councils who are likely to be affected/involved contrary to the Charter agreement between SMBC and local Parish/Town Councils..

3) Highways England

<u>Deadline 6 Submission - 8.72 Applicant's Responses to Actions in respect of ISH on dDCO on 21 August 2019</u>

Schedule 1 – Authorised development Action No. 10

East and West Satellite Compounds The applicant makes specific reference to "No construction vehicles would be permitted through Hampton in Arden".

Confirming our request at the open hearing on the 23rd October we would wish to see this statement amended to read "No construction vehicles would be permitted through Hampton in Arden, the village of Catherine de Barnes or Bickenhill". Our concerns are that Hampton Lane in Catherine de Barnes is already a busy highway particularly at peak times and on the frequent occasions when the M42 is heavily congested and or stopped. Traffic is also has to cross a narrow humpback bridge which often results in traffic form one direction having to stop and let HGV's large vans and coaches proceed .

We feel that construction traffic egressing **any** of the satellite compounds should be directed **not** to go through both Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes. As we are not aware what routes are envisaged to be used by contractors vehicles it might be appropriate to say that the route for all construction traffic is along Catherine de Barnes lane to the jct 5a site on Solihull Road and vice versa. This will enable access to all satellite compounds. Any vehicle wishing to access the M42 should do so via Catherine de Barnes Lane to the A45

With specific reference to the various compounds around the site. Much discussion and references have been made regarding the development of various 'plans' eg Management being developed for the Main Compound. As all



www.catney.co.uk

the satellite compounds are likely to be in continual use throughout the construction of the scheme we suggest and request that any plans developed relate and apply to all compounds around the site not just the Main Compound.

4) <u>DCO 3 Issue Specific Hearing Action Points</u> <u>Agenda for Hearing on Wednesday 23rd October Item 2 Requirement 5 - landscaping – involvement of the Parish Councils</u>

We confirm our request that both Parish Councils (Hampton in Arden and Marston Green and Bickenhill PC's) are included in all discussions/consultations regarding any landscaping that affect their respective parishes. We understand that this request was accepted by both the Applicant and SMBC.

Applicants Response to Actions in respect of !SH on Living Conditions on 1st October 2019

Ref No 18 Barbers Coppice Roundabout Lighting

.

Following the verbal submission by Mr Philip O'Reilly concerning the data used to calculate BCR which were used to establish whether lighting of the roundabout was justified. It was agreed at the hearing that HE would investigate the discrepancy in Mr O'Reilly's and HE's calculations and conclusions based on the calculations and look forward to viewing them in a future HE submission. The question is :Does Barbers Coppice Roundabout and the **approach** roads to it need lighting?

Following Mr O'Reilly's submission it is our belief that the speed limits on Catherine de Barnes Lane approaching and egressing Barbers Coppice Roundabout will be reviewed by HE and SMBC, as will the speed on the slip from the Link Road to Bickenhill Roundabout currently shown as 70mph (which we believe is an error) as we assume this to be a single carriageway slip but may be mistaken. There may well be an opportunity for standardising the speed limits on all roads entering and departing the Barbers Coppice say to 40mph. We suggest the link road from Barbers Coppice to the new dual carriageway should, on safety grounds, be no more than 40mph.

In Summary

So as to ensure that there is no future misinterpretation/possible misunderstanding regarding the involvement of the 2 Parish Councils(Hampton in Arden and Marston Green and Bickenhill PC's) in discussions relating to Traffic Management and Landscaping, we request that the DCO is worded to reflect these agreements that were made at the hearings of 22nd & 23rd October



www.catney.co.uk

2019.In addition we request that "Signage" is also bought into the scope of this arrangement.

David Cuthbert(Cllr)

For and on behalf of Catherine de Barnes Residents Association and Hampton in Arden Parish Council

26th October 2019