



## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	M42 Junction 6 Improvement
<b>File reference</b>	TR010027
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	10 May 2017
<b>Meeting with</b>	Highways England
<b>Venue</b>	Temple Quay House
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> Tom Carpen – Infrastructure Planning Lead Emre Williams – Case Manager David Price – EIA and Land Rights Manager Kate Mignano – Case Officer <b>Highways England</b> Jonathan Pizzey – Project Manager, Highways England Will Spencer – DCO Manager, Highways England
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Inception Meeting – M42 Junction 6 Improvement
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely. The Inspectorate explained that the publication of the meeting note could be delayed up to six months, or until a formal scoping request had been submitted.

### Project Introduction

The meeting commenced with brief overview of the proposed development and the progress reached prior to a preferred route announcement (PRA) which was anticipated to be made later in the year. The Applicant described that the location of the scheme (M42 Junction 6) lies on the eastern edge of Birmingham in proximity to the city centre and provides an important connection between the national motorway networks and the A45 Coventry Road.

The Applicant explained in broad terms the relationship between the proposed development and existing and proposed schemes in the area including the HS2 Interchange Station and key business interests eg National Exhibition Centre (NEC). The Applicant explained that the proposed development was necessary to address existing problems with the network at the location and also because in absence of the proposed development the network would not have capacity beyond 2019 based on forecasts made. PINS asked questions about the level of



engagement between the Applicant and the relevant stakeholders at these locations. The Applicant explained that dialogue was ongoing and proving to be productive overall, In particular, they referred to particular discussions with a local sports club and involvement with Sport England. The Applicant confirmed that there had been no problem with obtaining necessary access to land for the purpose of surveys but they were aware of the s.53 process should they have any need to use it.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

The Inspectorate discussed the likely process following the PRA and the Applicant confirmed their intent to move to EIA scoping shortly thereafter. The Inspectorate explained the basic approach to EIA Scoping including timescales and the involvement with the consultation bodies. The Applicant was informed about the introduction of the new EIA Regulations and when these were required to be implemented into UK law. The Applicant asked a number of questions about how the process works following successful completion of the pre-application stage and the timescales applicable. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that following acceptance (assuming an application is accepted for examination) the examination stage moves at a very fast pace and all effort should be made during pre-application to agree matters upfront to reduce effort on all parties during the more constrained period of examination. The Applicant confirmed their understanding of this point and explained that considerable effort was being made to ensure that the application has addressed all of the key matters prior to submission.

The Inspectorate suggested that further meetings are arranged during pre-application and that involvement with the Inspectorate intensifies as the proposed development gets close to the point of submission. This approach was agreed by all parties.

### **Specific decisions/ follow-up required?**

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicant to provide details for the project specific webpage