

Response to Highways England Deadline 9 Document 8.93(a):

8.93(a) Actions Arising out of ISH on Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession on 22 October for Deadline 8

(TR010027-000890-AS Highways England M42J6_8.93(a)_Actions_Arising_out_of_ISH_on_Compulsory_Aquisition_and_Temporary_Possession_on_22_Oct_for_Deadline)

8.93(a) Actions Arising out of ISH on Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession on 22 October for Deadline 8

(TR010027-000890-AS Highways England M42J6_8.93(a)_Actions_Arising_out_of_ISH_on_Compulsory_Aquisition_and_Temporary_Possession_on_22_Oct_for_Deadline)

2. The Applicant's Responses to Actions Arising from ISH on Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession		
ExA Ref No	Party	Action/Response
2	The Applicant	<p>Action: The Applicant is to provide further information, including justification, as to why options to relocate WGAA have not been pursued.</p>
<p>Applicant Response:</p> <p>The Applicant has attached the Document entitled 'Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Associate [sic] Relocation Site Assessment Technical Note May 2018' (the Technical Note) as Appendix 1 to this report. This document was originally produced in May 2018 as an internal Technical Note (which is why it retains the draft watermark) but contains options that were shared with the WGAA in Autumn 2018 for discussion. This document is unaltered since this time but contains redacted information where this is deemed sensitive for publication.</p> <p>As set out in the Technical Note, a number of relocation options were considered but were later discounted. The Technical Note explains why the preferred options were taken forward. These preferred options were then developed further for environmental assessment [APP-069/Volume 6.2] and refined into the Applicant's final reconfiguration proposal as presented in Volume 8.21 [REP2-019].</p>		
<p>POR Comments:</p> <p>The Document entitled '<i>Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Associate [sic] Relocation Site Assessment Technical Note May 2018' (the Technical Note)</i> which should have been submitted at Deadline 8 on 5th November 2019 was not submitted with the original Deadline 8 submission. Instead this document has been submitted by Highways England on 20th November, a matter of hours before Deadline 10.</p> <p>I have said throughout the consultation period that Highways England have not been transparent in the way they have dealt with the WGAA and the impact any reconfiguration of the WGAA site will have on my property. The late submission of this document only strengthens my belief that Highways England have done all they can throughout the consultation period to obstruct the proper scrutiny of their proposals for the WGAA site and I sincerely hope the ExA have duly noted this unacceptable and unprofessional behaviour.</p> <p>I note, HE document '<i>Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Associate [sic] Relocation Site Assessment Technical Note May 2018' (the Technical Note)</i> does not include any of the 5 options submitted in the DCO application.</p> <p>Comments on HE document '<i>Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Associate [sic] Relocation Site Assessment Technical Note May 2018' (the Technical Note):</i></p> <p>Please see attached minutes from meeting with Highways England and AECOM on 25th January 2019 (see Appendix A).</p> <p>Highways England have maintained throughout the consultation period that my property has never been considered as an option for the reconfiguration / relocation of the WGAA. The minutes clearly record the following interaction I had with Lydia Barnstable (AECOM):</p>		

- POR asked if a WGAA option which included Four Winds had been discussed with HE.
- LB informed him that it had not.
- POR asked if this was something that should have been discussed with the WGAA as an option and whether the WGAA had suggested this as an option?
- LB confirmed it had not been discussed as an option and the WGAA had not suggested it as an option.
- POR stated that he had suggested this option during discussions with JP at the Fentham Hall consultation event (19/01/2018) and asked why it had not been explored as an option.
- LB advised that she would find out why it had not been explored as an option.
- POR asked whether it could be discussed as an option with the WGAA as it seemed to be an obvious solution that would satisfy all parties - It would not create further development in the green belt so would likely be more acceptable to SMBC, it moved the WGAA away from the new road thereby removing air quality/pollution concerns due to proximity to pitches and it removed POR and his parents from the current situation.
- LB confirmed that she would discuss this suggestion with HE.

HE document 'Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Associate [sic] Relocation Site Assessment Technical Note May 2018' (the Technical Note) is dated May 2018.

This document includes 12 options for the reconfiguration / relocation of the WGAA, and given the interaction with Lydia Barnstable on 25th January 2019, it is surprising to find that Option 3A is a "contiguous but full relocation" of the WGAA, to a site south of their current location requiring the acquisition of my property i.e. a WGAA option which included Four Winds.

3 Alternative Sites to be Assessed

3.1 This Technical Note assesses five alternative sites for relocation, with a number of sub options for each based on alternative configurations. For the purposes of assessment the distinction is made between a *relocation* site, which relocate the entire GAA facility to an alternative location and *reconfiguration* which supplements the existing site through acquisition of a contiguous plot.

Contrary to item 3.1, 'The Technical Note' has assessed one option requiring the acquisition of my property and has not assessed a sub option.

It is clear to see that HE have not fully considered the option that involves the acquisition of my property.

3.4 Option 1 Relocation Site South West

3.4.1 Option 1 alternatives are shown on drawings HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0001 and 0002 contained in **Appendix B**. Two alternative options are shown based on plots 340/345/350/355/360 and 365 shown in **Figure 4**.

Option 1 would allow the WGAA to use their existing site until the new site was completed.

However, it would have a considerable impact on my property due to noise, traffic movements, loss of privacy and the loss of views across open land.

3.4.2 Option 1A locates the pitches to the eastern side of the plots with car parking located to the west, providing a buffer between the playing area and the adjacent farm and Solihull Music school premises.

It would also have a detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt.

3.4.3 Option 1B locates the pitches to the western side of the plots with car parking located to the east, This provides a shorter access to the GAA from Catherine de Barnes Lane and provides a buffer between the playing area and the adjacent residential property 'Four Winds' (plot 390).

It would also have a considerable impact on Woodhouse Farm.

3.4.4 All the plots required for Option 1A and Option 1B are within the current red line boundary.

This option would not use land contiguous with the existing site.

3.5 Option 2 Relocation Site South West

3.5.1 Option 2 alternatives are shown on drawings HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0003 and 0004 contained in **Appendix B**. Two alternative options are shown based on plots 350/355/360/370 and 385 shown in **Figure 4**.

3.5.2 Option 2A locates car parking and club house facilities to the east while Option 2B locates car parking and club house to the west of the plots with slightly increased access from Option 2A. Option 2A is as GAA proposal shown in **Figure 3**.

3.5.3 All the plots required for Option 2A and Option 2B are within the current red line boundary.

3.6 Option 3 Relocation Site South

3.6.1 Option 3 alternatives are shown on drawings HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0005 and 0006 contained in **Appendix B**. Two alternative layouts are shown.

3.6.2 Option 3A is based on plots 200/210/375/380 and 390. Option 3B is based on 200/210/375 and 380 avoiding direct impact on Four Winds (plot 390). Impact on Four Winds excludes any assessments of blight or requests for discretionary purchase.

3.6.3 Both options reuse the existing GAA site-plot 200. All the plots required for Option 3A and Option 3B are within the current red line boundary.

Option 2 would allow the WGAA to use their existing site until the new site was completed.

However, it would have a considerable impact on my property, due to noise, traffic movements, loss of privacy and the loss of views across open land.

It would also have a detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt.

The impact would be greater than Option 1.

The impact on Woodhouse Farm would be less than Option 1.

This option would not use land contiguous with the existing site.

Option 3A requires the acquisition of my property and has the potential to be an ideal location for the WGAA.

It would allow the WGAA to use two of the pitches on their existing site, before switching to using two new pitches before the final pitch was completed.

It would not create further development in the green belt as the house would be replaced with the clubhouse, so would likely be more acceptable to SMBC.

It would use land contiguous with the existing site.

It moves the WGAA away from the new road thereby removing air quality/pollution concerns due to proximity to pitches.

It removes my family from the impact of the Scheme and the impact of the reconfiguration of the WGAA site.

However, HE have given little thought to how the facilities could be arranged on the land to maximise the site and appear to have instead proposed an option with the sole objective of being able to dismiss it as an option e.g. pitch 3 is located over the pipeline despite a large area of land being available to move the pitch eastwards, and for some reason the car park access had to be via the existing entrance to my property making it difficult to configure the site.

Option 3B encroaches on my property and would render two pitches unusable during construction. It again appears to have no other purpose other than to discount an option.

Note 3.6.2 acknowledges the potential for blight and discretionary purchase due to the impact on my property.

Note 3.6.3 confirms that my property was within the red line boundary.

3.7 Option 4 Reconfiguration Site West

- 3.7.1 Option 4 alternatives are shown on drawings HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0007 and 0010 contained in **Appendix B**. Four alternative layouts are shown.
- 3.7.2 Options 4A and 4B are based on plots 200/335/375 and 380 and based maximising the reuse of the existing GAA facility. Option 4A includes a new club house whereas Option 4B would reuse and refurbish the existing club house.
- 3.7.3 Options 4C and 4D are also based on plots 200/335/375 and 380 again maximising the reuse of the existing GAA facility. The configuration of the pitches has been revised with pitch 3 being oriented east west as the existing facility. Option 4C includes a new club house whereas Option 4D would reuse and refurbish the existing club house.
- 3.7.4 Both options reuse the existing GAA site-plot 200. Plot 335 used in all four alternatives for Option 4 is outside the current redline boundary and would therefore require a period a consultation.

All of the Option 4 options utilise the land to the west of the existing WGAA (plot 3/1d) which was previously an unregulated tip.

Highways England have themselves confirmed that due to contamination of the plot they would not be interested in acquiring the plot for environmental mitigation.

This option was never going to be acceptable or indeed viable.

3.8 Option 5 Reconfiguration Site North and West

- 3.8.1 Option 5 alternatives are shown on drawings HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-ZH-0011 and 0012 contained in **Appendix B**. Two alternative layouts are shown.
- 3.8.2 Option 5A is based on plots 200/335/375 and 380. It would also use the residual area of plots 150 and 195 to the north of the existing GAA site and which are also directly impacted on by the proposed scheme.
- 3.8.3 Option 5B is based on plots 200 and 335. It would also utilise the residual area of plots 150 and 195. In this option all 3 pitches would be orientated east-west
- 3.8.4 Both options reuse the existing GAA site-plot 200. Plot 335 used in both alternatives for Option 5 is outside the current redline boundary and would therefore require a period a consultation. Both options include a new clubhouse however the existing club house could be retained and refurbished in either option
- 3.9 The sub alternatives presented above does not represent and an exhaustive list of the potential layouts and configurations which are available. Further, the footprint could be reduced further in option 5 by retaining the 2 non impacted pitches

All of the Option 5 options utilise the land to the west of the existing WGAA (plot 3/1d) which was previously an unregulated tip.

Highways England have themselves confirmed that due to contamination of the plot they would not be interested in acquiring the plot for environmental mitigation.

These options are all within the Birmingham Airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces area, which would see constraints being imposed on the use of the land.

This option was never going to be acceptable or indeed viable.

5.3 With assessment scoring applied for following ranking is given. Highest scoring option is considered most beneficial.

Rank	Option	Assessment Score
1=	Option 4B	20
1=	Option 4D	20
3	Option 3B	19
4=	Option 1B	18
4=	Option 2A	18
6=	Option 2B	17
6=	Option 3A	17
6=	Option 5A	17
9=	Option 1A	16
9=	Option 4A	16
9=	Option 4C	16
12	Option 5B	14

All of the Option 4 and Option 5 options utilise the land to the west of the existing WGAA (plot 3/1d) which was previously an unregulated tip so can be discounted as they are never going to be acceptable or indeed viable.

Option 3B encroaches on my property and would render two pitches unusable during construction. It would not be acceptable or indeed viable.

This leaves the following options:

- option 1B, which is not contiguous with the existing site and as it requires a full relocation would be difficult to justify.
- option 2A, which is not contiguous with the existing site and as it requires a full relocation would be difficult to justify.
- option 2B, which is not contiguous with the existing site and as it requires a full relocation would be difficult to justify.
- **option 3A, which is contiguous with the existing site and would be relatively straightforward to justify.**
- option 1A, which is not contiguous with the existing site and as it requires a full relocation would be difficult to justify.

Option 3A would potentially result in intermittent impacts on Woodhouse Farm, marked impacts on Birmingham Dogs Home, and no impact on Four Winds (as this property would be demolished to facilitate construction of the GAA facility).

Comparison of Options

Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment

Noise:

It is worth noting that HE are concerned that Option 3A will have a marked impact on Birmingham Dog's Home despite it being further from the Option 3A pitches than my property will be from either the 8.21 DCO Scheme or the WGAA 'Legacy Scheme' they are pursuing with the WGAA.

		Option 3A
Drawing Ref: HE551485-ACM-GEN-ZZ_SW_ZZ_ZZ		-DH-ZH-0005
Category	Item	
Description		Four Winds Site
Type		Contiguous Reconfiguration
Location	Overall Assessment	3
Safety	Overall Assessment	3
Cost	Overall Assessment	2
Environment	Overall Assessment	4
Statutory	Overall Assessment	1
Programme	Overall Assessment	4
Overall Assessment	Total Score	17

The table confirms that Option 3A has the highest score for:

- Programme 4 (4 is the highest)

The table confirms that Option 3A has the second highest score for:

- Location 3 (4 is the highest)
- Safety 3 (6 is the highest)
- Cost 2 (3 is the highest)
- Environment 4 (5 is the highest)

The table confirms that Option 3A has the lowest score for:

- Statutory 1 (3 is the highest)

However, Option 3A is a contiguous reconfiguration and has been given the same score as Options 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D which are full relocations. As such, this is likely to be a mistake and the correct score should be 2.

I would suggest it is clear from the above that Option 3A was a viable option that would satisfy all parties affected by the Scheme. Unfortunately, Highways England did not give it the consideration it required and it was dismissed without a full and proper assessment being carried out.

Again, please note that none of the 5 options submitted in the DCO application were included in this assessment. Highways England should therefore carry out a full assessment of the 5 DCO options as well as carrying out a full and proper assessment of Option 3A, including an alternative option that also involves my property.

In June 2019 I submitted an alternative WGAA reconfiguration proposal to Jonathan Pizzey (HE) which he agreed to cost and assess as an option. However, I was told by Lydia Barnstable (AECOM) today that Highways England did not consider it worth spending any time on and they have not bothered to cost it. For the consideration of the ExA I have included this drawing in Appendix B.

Appendix A:

Minutes from Meeting with Highways England and AECOM on 25th January 2019

Minutes

<p>Meeting name Stakeholder Meeting Mr O'Reilly (Four Winds)</p> <p>Meeting Date 25/01/2019</p> <p>Location Hampton in Arden Parish Council Offices</p> <p>Project number HE514485</p> <p>Prepared by James Hemingway</p>	<p>Subject Meeting with Mr O'Reilly to discuss the scheme</p> <p>Time 10:30-12:00</p> <p>Project name M42 J6 Improvement</p> <p>AECOM project number 60543032</p>	<p>Attendees AECOM James Hemingway (JCH) Lydia Barnstable (LB) Highways England Chris Harris (CH) Stakeholders Phillip O'Reilly (PR) Hampton in Arden Parish Council Dave Cuthbert (DC) Ken Blanch (KB)</p>	<p>Circulation list AECOM James Hemingway (JCH) Lydia Barnstable (LB) Ian Bamforth (IB) Phil King (PK) Highways England Chris Harris (CH) Jonathon Pizzey (JP) Stakeholders Phillip O'Reilly (PR) Hampton in Arden Parish Council Dave Cuthbert (DC) Ken Blanch (KB)</p>	<p>Apologies Jonathon Pizzey (JP)</p>
--	---	--	---	--

Topic	Discussion
Introductions	<p>DC welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.</p> <p>CH apologised for JP's absence from the meeting and assured PR that JP remains involved but unfortunately could not attend due to another urgent commitment.</p>
Overview of Previous Communication	<p>DC stated that previous communication had been very poor and needs to improve moving forwards.</p> <p>PR provided a timeline of previous discussions and reiterated that he has had to apply pressure to Highways England in order to receive any response to his requests.</p> <p style="color: red;">POR advised that despite previous assurances, including at the last meeting, that communication would improve it has not and he has not had a full response to the points he raised at the previous meeting.</p> <p>LB and CH noted this and made a commitment to ensure communication is improved.</p>
Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Issued (WGAA)	<p>PR raised his dissatisfaction that he has not been able to see any of the proposals being discussed with the WGAA, despite receiving assurances he would be sent the information. LB outlined that until discussions with the WGAA had reached a point whereby a form of layout could be agreed, it was not practicable to provide option drawings as these may not reflect potential or practical reconfiguration arrangements, which remain the subject of ongoing discussion.</p> <p style="color: red;">POR asked why the options were not being discussed with him as his property would be impacted?</p> <p style="color: red;">POR asked at what point he could object to any proposal and have that objection acted upon if it wasn't before it was agreed with the WGAA?</p> <p>LB outlined that Highways England shall be meeting with the WGAA in the next couple of weeks and that this is likely to be followed by a project team meeting with the WGAA shortly after that.</p> <p>DC and PR challenged why no layout has been agreed despite the duration of time this has been an issue.</p> <p>LB provided a timeline of the WGAA proposals, stating that during Statutory Consultation, a potential relocation location was consulted on. However, following further legal advice, the project team had been advised that a complete relocation would be challenging to implement within the legal powers of a Development Consent Order. Therefore the attention has focused on a localised reconfiguration of the WGAA facility using land parcels adjacent to the existing facility. This approach was then communicated as part of the Further Consultation held between September and October of 2018.</p> <p>Since this consultation period, the project team has met with the WGAA to identify a proposal that would properly mitigate the impact of the scheme on the WGAA and meet the legal constraints of the Development Consent Order. A number of reconfiguration options have been presented to the WGAA, however these discussions are still continuing. Until a time when there are more firm proposals for the mitigation, it is challenging to advise PR on the impacts to his property.</p> <p>PR challenged that the redline boundary is shown right up to his property boundary and could mean that a pitch is placed very close to his home. He asked how the effects of this could be mitigated. LB responded to this query by stating that the redline boundary shown on the plan is not just for the reconfiguration of the pitch but would also incorporate any required mitigation measures.</p>

Topic	Discussion
	<p>LB advised that it was possible that the WGAA site could come right up to the redline boundary to Four Winds.</p> <p>POR asked if this was the case how could HE mitigate the impact?</p> <p>PR explained that he has been contacted by the WGAA on a number of occasions in relation to proposed options. LB reconfirmed that the discussions were ongoing and that no conclusions have yet been reached by Highways England. LB confirmed that once a form of reconfiguration layout was developed, this information would be shared in person with PR in order to review any potential impacts and to understand his views.</p> <p>POR again asked at what point he could object to any proposal and have that objection acted upon if it wasn't before it was agreed with the WGAA?</p> <p>PR asked if Highways England would pay for him to engage professional advice to support him in this matter. LB stated that she would take this request to Highways England.</p>
Development Consent Order	<p>LB stated that the project submitted its Development Consent Order Application on the 2nd January 2019. Following submission, the Planning Inspectorate has a 28 day period to 30 January 2019 to review the application and either accept or decline.</p> <p>Following confirmation of acceptance, which should be sometime during the next week, the project team shall issue a Section 56 notice to all those affected (including PR and the Hampton in Arden Parish Council). This notice will invite all those affected to submit their representation to the Planning Inspectorate as an interested party.</p> <p>LB offered to send PR a USB stick of the Development Consent Order Application for his review following Acceptance.</p> <p>POR accepted the offer and LB advised that the USB stick would be sent out the following week.</p> <p>PR noted that the current drawings do not include the Four Winds property within the DCO application and asked if Highways England could pursue the option to purchase his property and subsequently relocate the WGAA here. LB stated that the DCO requires Highways England to mitigate their impact in a proportionate manner and relocation to Four Winds may not meet that test. Such a move may also raise separate planning issues for Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council. CH stated that he would report PR's suggestion back to Highways England for their consideration.</p> <p>Correction: POR asked if a WGAA option which included Four Winds had been discussed with HE.</p> <p>Correction: LB informed him that it had not.</p> <p>Correction: POR asked if this was something that should have been discussed with the WGAA as an option and whether the WGAA had suggested this as an option?</p> <p>Correction: LB confirmed it had not been discussed as an option and the WGAA had not suggested it as an option.</p> <p>Correction: POR stated that he had suggested this option during discussions with JP at the Fentham Hall consultation event (19/01/2018) and asked why it had not been explored as an option.</p> <p>Correction: LB advised that she would find out why it had not been explored as an option.</p> <p>Correction: POR asked whether it could be discussed as an option with the WGAA as it seemed to be an obvious solution that would satisfy all parties - It would not create further development in the green belt so would likely be more acceptable to SMBC, it moved the WGAA away from the new road thereby removing air quality/pollution concerns due to proximity to pitches and it removed POR and his parents from the current situation.</p> <p>Correction: LB confirmed that she would discuss this suggestion with HE.</p> <p>Post meeting note: on 30 January 2019, the Planning Inspectorate accepted the Development Consent order applications and can be view at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/west-midlands/m42-junction-6-improvement/</p>
Other scheme matters	<p>PR does not like how the rear access to his property has been increased in width and length and states that this proposal would make this area attractive for airport taxi parking and antisocial behaviour. JHC noted his concerns and stated that he would take PR's concerns to the highways design team to see if this could be addressed.</p> <p>Correction: POR asked why his rear entrance was being lengthened and widened as it had nothing to do with the scheme?</p> <p>Correction: POR stated that problems previously advised, with regard to taxis, hgv's, anti-social behaviour, etc, were still applicable and more so now that this area was the closest location to the bypass / going to the airport</p> <p>PR challenged the inclusion of the underground storage tank location and access. JCH explained this was due to a requirement to separate Highways England and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council surface water drainage. PR queried if there would be any noise pollution from this asset, JCH clarified that the drainage system would be gravity fed and would have minimal</p>

Topic	Discussion
	<p>maintenance requirements and should therefore not create any noise pollution issues to Four Winds. PR further challenged that the rear access appears to have been widened to accommodate the maintenance requirements of this asset. JCH states that this was not the original design intent and how this asset will be maintained is still to be clarified.</p> <p>POR asked why it was being located adjacent to his rear entrance; could it not be located elsewhere?</p> <p>POR asked why was his rear entrance being lengthened and widened if it was not to accommodate maintenance vehicles?</p> <p>POR requested details of the maintenance regime for these tanks?</p> <p>PR stated that with the introduction of a new roundabout in the vicinity of his property vehicles braking and accelerating during the negotiation of this roundabout would introduced increased air and noise pollution and wanted to understand if this had been factored into the projects assessments. JCH stated that any air and noise assessments were conducted in accordance with the latest requirements; however JCH would confirm whether the conclusions of these assessments had factored this variable into account.</p> <p>Correction: POR stated it was his understanding that noise calculations are based on volume of traffic, speed of traffic and materials used in road construction and therefore noise related to braking and accelerating traffic at a roundabout would not be factored into any calculations.</p> <p>JCH raised whether the issue of lighting on the proposed roundabout had been answered to PR's satisfaction. PR stated that JP had explained that the lighting proposed would be designed to what is termed 'full cut off lighting', however he was still concerned that this will create light pollution that will impact his property.</p> <p>Correction: POR stated that light will be reflected upwards and cause light pollution.</p>
Subsequent Communication	<p>To ensure that future communication was more structured, LB set a provisional date for a subsequent meeting on the 1st March 2019, at the Parish Offices (venue availability to be confirmed by DC).</p> <p>LB stated that if PR had any further queries or concerns to contact her directly.</p>

Ref	Action	Initial
01	AECOM to provide a USB stick containing the Development Consent Order Application documents following Acceptance.	LB
02	Highways England to provide further information relating to the WGAA reconfiguration proposals to PR once there is a firmer understanding of the potential or practical reconfiguration arrangements to enable PR to assess its impact on the Four Winds property.	CH / JP
03	Highways England to consider whether it is appropriate to pay for a professional advisor to PR.	CH / JP
04	Highways England to consider POR's suggestion to explore an option which included PR's request in regards to the acquisition of the Four Winds property to facilitate the WGAA reconfiguration	CH / JP
05	Highways England to review the rear access proposals to see if the arrangement could be designed to reflect the existing access arrangement.	JCH
06	Highways England to confirm how noise and air monitoring has considered the traffic movements that would be undertaken at Barbers Coppice Roundabout	JCH
07	Highways England to confirm lighting proposed and how the use of full cut off lighting will impact Four Winds.	JCH
08	Venue for meeting on the 1 st March to be confirmed	DC
09	HE/ AECOM to advise on why an option which included Four Winds had not been explored as an option despite discussions in January 2018 suggesting this as a possible solution.	LB/JP

Appendix B:

Alternative Option for the Reconfiguration of the WGAA Site



Note:
This drawing is copyright and must not be reproduced or disclosed to third parties without prior permission.
Do not scale from this drawing.
Any discrepancies in dimensions or details on these drawings must be drawn to our attention.
All dimensions in millimetres unless noted otherwise.

- LEGEND:
- LIMITS OF LAND TO BE ACQUIRED OR USED PERMANENTLY OR TEMPORARILY (THE ORDER LIMITS)
 - LAND NOT INCLUDED WITHIN THE ORDER LIMITS
 - CENTRAL RESERVES, SPLITTER ISLANDS & OTHER PAVED AREAS
 - CARRIAGEWAYS
 - PRIVATE MEANS OF ACCESS (PMA)
 - SURFACED CYCLEWAYS & FOOTWAYS
 - PROPOSED FOOTWAY
 - UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK FOR DRAINAGE
 - ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION
 - EMBANKMENT
 - VERGES, CUTTINGS
 - MAINTENANCE LAY-BY

6M WIDE PIPELINE PROTECTION ZONE CONTAINED WITHIN GRASSED ISLANDS TO CAR PARK

- PITCHES**
3NR. @ 90M X 145M
- CLUBHOUSE**
25M X 40M
- HURLING WALL**
50M X 30M
- CHILDRENS PLAY AREA**
25M X 15M
- CAR PARK**
252 SPACES (INCL. 12 DISABLED)
- COACH PARKING**
6 COACH SPACES

Rev.	Amendment	Date

Client: _____

Location:
Catherine de Barnes Lane
Solithull

Project:
WGAA Reconfiguration
M42 Junction 6 Improvement Scheme

Drawing Title:
Reconfiguration Option 1

Date: April 2019 Scale: As shown@A3 Drawn: _____

Drawing No: 001 Revision: A