

M54 to M6 Link Road
TR010054
Volume 5

5.2 Consultation Report Annex

**Annex P: Tables evidencing regard had to
consultation responses (in accordance
with S49 of the Planning Act 2008)**

Regulation 5 (2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

May 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**M54 to M6 Link Road
Development Consent Order 202[]**

5.2 Consultation Report Annex

**Annex P: Tables evidencing regard had to consultation responses
(in accordance with S49 of the Planning Act 2008)**

Regulation Number	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010054
Application Document Reference	5.2
Author	M54 to M6 Link Road Project Team and Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
2	May 2020	DCO Application

Annex P (Part 1)

Tables evidencing regard had to consultation responses (in accordance with s49 of the Planning Act 2008)

The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to Highways England's statutory consultation in accordance with s49 of PA 2008.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
General				
Scheme requirements and assets	We are not exactly clear with your requirement. Could you please confirm if the below one relates to any C3 enquiry.	Vodafone	N	Comment noted. It has been confirmed through the utility enquiry process that Vodafone does have apparatus affected by the Scheme.
Scheme requirements and assets	Unaware of the Coal Authority having any interests in the land shown marked 5/36a in green and 5/36b in blue, other than ownership of any mines and minerals of coal. Require further information on the rights referred to and copies of Register and title plan referred to.	Coal Authority	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	Please be advised that Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd will <u>not</u> be affected by your proposal.	Sky Telecommunications Services Ltd	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	at this time has no assets in the area and will not be implementing any in the near future, therefore Harlaxton	Harlaxton Gas Network	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	has no comment to make on this scheme.			
Scheme requirements and assets	<p>The proposed diversion of a large diameter high-pressure gas main (Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (MAHP)) in the vicinity of M54 Junction 1 is referenced. This MAHP is a Cadent Gas Ltd, Natural Gas, High Pressure Pipeline(s) (Alrewas/Ebstree (WM2402 A&B)). There are currently no Major Hazard Installations in the vicinity of the proposed road.</p> <p>HSE is unable to provide specific LUP advice regarding this proposal until details of any proposed alterations / diversions to the Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s) are made available to HSE, by the developer / pipeline operator.</p> <p>On receipt of this information, HSE will be in a position to provide case specific LUP advice.</p> <p>Although there are currently no Major Hazard Installations in the vicinity of the proposed road, should a Hazardous Substances Consent be granted prior to the determination of the present application, then HSE</p>	HSE	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>reserves the right to revise its advice.</p> <p><u>Explosives sites</u> HSE has no comment to make, as there is no licenced explosive site in the vicinity.</p> <p><u>Electrical Safety</u> No comment from a planning perspective.</p>			
Scheme requirements and assets	Based on the information provided, I can confirm that Energetics does not have any plant within the area.	Energetics	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	SGN do not cover this area.	SGN	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	Based on this information, I do not feel that any further comment at this stage needs to be provided.	Severn Trent Water	N	It has been confirmed through the utility enquiry process that the Scheme will affect Seven Trent Water assets. The impact on these assets will be determined via ongoing dialogue.
Scheme requirements and assets	The proposed M54-M6 Link Road conflicts with one of South Staffordshire Water's 24-inch potable water mains which is crossed by the proposed new link road. I attach a plan (Drawing 5274/1) that shows South Staffordshire Water's pipework coloured blue and the proposed link road in orange. It is evident from this	South Staffordshire Water	N	It has been confirmed through the utility enquiry process that the Scheme will affect South Staffordshire Water's assets. Liaison is ongoing through the NSRWA C4 process to agree diversionary works for the link road. Highways England will continue to engage with South Staffordshire Water.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	plan that the proposed link road crosses a 24-inch potable water main. It is respectfully submitted that no consideration has been given in the design of the proposed M54-M6 link on the impact of the existing infrastructure.			
Scheme requirements and assets	With reference to your plant enquiry below, we can confirm that KPN do not have any apparatus within the immediate proximity of your proposed works.	KPN	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	NATS operates no infrastructure in the vicinity of the planned works. Accordingly it anticipates no impact and has no comments to make on the proposals.	NATS	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and assets	We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.	C.A Telecom (Colt Technology Services)	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements	Email trail between HE and ORR. ORR had replied to HE's S42 letter	Office of Rail and Road	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
and assets	stating they have no comment			
Scheme requirements and assets	I can confirm that ESP Utilities Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.	ESP Utilities Group	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements	<p>The service support the improvement to the road infrastructure as proposed to relieve congestion on the local road network and to provide improved access to the M6 network.</p> <p>Staffordshire fire and Rescue Service request that timely information is received regarding all the works involved to allow pre-planning in regard to providing emergency response to the area. It also requests that access to site is maintain for emergency vehicles for the road networks and information regarding and site works is made available to allow for suitable risk planning and awareness.</p>	Staffordshire Fire and Rescue	N	Comment noted.
Scheme requirements and engagement	Whilst in support of the M54 to M6 J11 scheme, Midland Expressway Ltd (MEL) are concerned about current	Midland Expressway Ltd		Highways England are continuing to engage with Midlands Expressway Limited and have provided the requested existing and forecast traffic flows and

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>congestion on the A460 north and southbound carriageways between M6 Junction 11 and M6toll T8. Reviewing the consultation material available on line, The Statement of Community Consultation states that "The scheme will provide a new link road that will improve journey times and reliability on the motorway and local road networks."</p> <p>It is also noted from the Highways England M54 project website that one of the aims of the scheme is "Improving the link between the M54 and the M6, which will relieve traffic congestion on the A460, A449, and A5, providing more reliable journey times". The A460 between M6 J11 and M6toll T8 currently experiences high levels of congestion and MEL have requested evidence from the Highways England project team to demonstrate what impact the proposed scheme will have on the A460 linking the M6 and the M6toll.</p> <p>This information has not been provided yet and it has not been demonstrated by the Highways England project team before or during</p>			<p>turning flow data. The proposals to improve M6 Junction 11 will significantly increase the capacity of this junction and reduce the likelihood of large queues forming on the approaches. Highways England will continue to liaise with Midland Expressway Limited to discuss existing and predicted journey times post-construction.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>the statutory consultation period that traffic flows will improve on the A460 between M6 J11 and M6toll T8.</p> <p>Assurances have yet to be given regarding how the proposed scheme improves current congestion which has been observed queuing on the M6toll T8 off slip back onto main line M6toll, and on the A460 northbound carriageway.</p>			
Further Engagement	Requests were made through the consultation for further engagement, advice and partnership working from various stakeholders.		N	Highways England has and will continue to engage with those affected and interested in the proposals as the Scheme progresses.
Further engagement	Requesting contact via online enquiry service.	City Fibre	N	Noted. City Fibre has confirmed it is not affected by the Scheme.
Further Engagement	Would you please help us with the postcode or grids to find the correct location.	Virgin Media	N	It has been confirmed through the utility enquiry process that the Scheme will affect apparatus owned by Virgin Media. The impact on Virgin Media's assets will be determined via ongoing dialogue.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation and information to the public	Clarification was sought on why specific houses received information packs in Dark Lane and not others. Questions were also asked about the mature planting shown at the consultation and concern that this was showing how the Scheme could look in approx. 30 years time, rather than on completion.	Hilton Parish Council	N	All properties within Hilton were sent a consultation leaflet to provide a summary of the Scheme and publicise the consultation. The 3D model was for illustrative purposes only.
Overall support				
Scheme support	Cheslyn Hay Parish Council welcome this route as it is deemed to be the least disruptive route for Cheslyn Hay residents.	Cheslyn Hay Parish Council	N	Comment noted.
Overall Opposition				
Opposition to the route	As a parish council we understand the need for a link road but oppose the chosen route. We opted for option C along with all the neighbourhood parish councils and the district council. A great many residents also	Hilton Parish Council	N	Highways England have undertaken a detailed appraisal of route options, including two phases of non-statutory consultation on evolving route options. Further detail of this can be in Chapter 2 of this report and Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR10054/APP/6.1].

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>opted for option C as route B comes too close to Hilton.</p>			<p>We believe the Scheme provides the optimum route and design which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limits the loss of ancient woodland on the ancient woodland inventory, veteran trees and ecological habitat losses; - balances the impact to sensitive residential areas from operational noise with a need to protect the historic character of the area; - provides the highest level of congestion relief for the A460 (and benefits in terms of noise reductions and reduced vehicles emissions for properties closest to the A460 Cannock Road), whilst maintaining good local connectivity; - provides the best journey time and the highest benefit to the local economy; and - responds to consultation feedback in terms of alignment, design and mitigation to provide a balance between the Scheme objectives and environmental, social and economic impacts.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environmental impacts and proposed mitigation				
Support for the mitigation proposed	We have reviewed Chapter 8 (ecology) and chapter 13 (road drainage and water environment) and overall consider that the PEIR is well written and comprehensive and the ecological information collated in being collected is appropriate for the scheme.	Environment Agency	N	Comment noted.
Mitigation proposals	Having reviewed the relevant sections of the PEIR we do not have any significant comments to make further to the general advice contained within our EIA scoping response.	Environment Agency	N	Comment noted.
Further investigations	We welcome the commitment of the promoter to further investigate whether the proposed scheme might impact on Private Water Supply abstractions at the ES stage; it is recognised that these are over 1 kilometre from the study area.	Public Health England	N	Comment noted. The impact of the Scheme on private water supplies is assessed and reported in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. No adverse impacts on private water supplies are anticipated.
Further assessments	PHE notes the scheme promoter's commitment to carry out a long-term noise survey to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (11.5.6) and encourages continued	Public Health England	N	Comment noted. The baseline noise survey was conducted following agreement with South Staffordshire Council on both the monitoring locations and monitoring methodology.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	engagement with South Staffordshire Council in relation to proposed monitoring locations and methodology.			
Methodology and Monitoring for the ES	<p>Your letter requests comments by PHE in relation to the draft methodology submitted as part of the letter. The methodology submitted is insufficiently detailed to comment, as it lacks information regarding the methodology for the identification of populations at risk, vulnerable populations, baseline data, assessment of significance, mitigation measures and proposals for monitoring.</p> <p>PHE expects an assessment to include consideration of the need for monitoring. It may be appropriate to undertake monitoring where: critical assumptions have been made, there is uncertainty about whether negative impacts are likely to occur as it may be appropriate to include planned monitoring measures to track whether impacts do occur, there is uncertainty</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Changes to health determinants as a result of the Scheme are reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (LA 112). Significance is not assigned to health impacts in line with Design Manual for Road and Bridges LA 112. The Environmental Statement considers the sensitivity of communities and population as part of the assessment of impacts on Human Health. Consideration has been given to vulnerable or disadvantaged populations within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>The need for monitoring has been considered with the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>about the potential success of mitigation measures, and it is necessary to track the nature of the impact and provide useful and timely feedback that would allow action to be taken. The need for monitoring should be assessed and reported within the ES</p> <p>An approach to the identification of vulnerable populations has not been provided and does not make links to the list of protected characteristics within an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). The impacts on health and wellbeing and health inequalities of the scheme may have particular effects on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations, including those that fall within the list of protected characteristics. The EIA and any EqIA should not be completely separated.</p> <p>It would be useful to define health, normally the WHO definition, in support of the Dahlgren and Whitehead model and we welcome</p>			<p>The Environmental Statement considers the sensitivity of communities and population as part of the assessment of impacts on human health. Consideration has been given to vulnerable or disadvantaged populations within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Comment noted. Health is defined in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1], which considers the WHO definition in support of the Dahlgren and Whitehead model. This takes into</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>the specific inclusion of mental health.</p> <p>The final ES should include suitable and sufficient data to identify the populations at risk, vulnerable populations, baseline data, assessment of significance, mitigation measures and proposals for monitoring.</p> <p>The assessments and findings of the ES and any Equalities Impact Assessment should be crossed reference between the two documents, particularly to ensure the comprehensive assessment of potential impacts for health and inequalities and where resulting mitigation measures are mutually supportive.</p> <p>In relation to baseline data you should review, as a minimum, local data and public health reports</p>			<p>consideration determinant of mental health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Comment noted. This detailed is provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Significance is not assigned to health impacts in line with Design Manual for Road and Bridges LA 112.</p> <p>None of the protected characteristics are specifically affected by the Scheme, however, the EqIA is referenced in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>None of the protected characteristics are specifically affected by the Scheme as noted in the EqIA [TR010054/APP/6.7]. The key considerations in relation to health impact on vulnerable users is referenced in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Comment noted. Baseline information and a list of sources is provided in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	published by the local Director of Public Health, the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), Health and Wellbeing Board strategies or plans, CCG / NHS strategy or plans and the PHE fingertips data. This should be supported by liaison directly with the Director of Public Health, CCGs and NHS to assist in the drafting of the ES. It is also vital that information received through community engagement forms part of the assessment.			
PEI Report	PEIR Part A- Page 37-38. Table 5.4. We are unclear where the details in the table come from. They do not appear to match the details in APIS.	Natural England	N	The APIS records have been checked and the correct details are included within the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].
PEI Report	PHE notes the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as described in PEIR 11.7.1. The proposal for communication with local communities via a dedicated contact person, a website and phone line (11.7.3, 11.7.4) is welcomed. PHE recommends that these communicating channels are promoted to the local community in a	Public Health England	N	Comment noted. Details of the proposed community engagement and co-ordination are prescribed in the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [TR010054/APP/6.11], including the requirement to provide a Community Relations Manager and to use various methods of communication including online, a newsletter and works notices.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>variety of ways to make sure they reach a wide demographic.</p> <p>The PEIR has no detail concerning the methodology to explain how the receptor sensitivity, significance and final determination of significant effects has been decided. The PEIR has some population health data in relation to the wards affected, but does not necessarily identify the key public health priorities for these areas.</p>			<p>The PEIR did not include topic specific methodology and instead referred to the methodology as reported in the Scoping report submitted to PINs in January 2019. The Environmental Statement provides full methodology for the assessment of impacts on population and health and considers the sensitivity of communities and population as part of the assessment of impacts on Human Health. Consideration has been given to vulnerable or disadvantaged populations within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Land take	<p>Network Rail state that a section of the proposed new link road will span over their operational infrastructure, therefore the applicant will need to engage with them with regards to the proposed scheme. This will enable Network Rail to fully assess and understand the scheme and any impacts that it may have on the operational railway. An Asset Protection Agreement will be required before the applicant proceeds with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network</p>	Network Rail	Y	<p>It is confirmed that this area of land is not required for the Scheme and this has been removed from the Scheme Order Limits.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Rail infrastructure. Network Rail also has standard protective provisions which may need to be included in the DCO as a minimum.			
Designated sites	A number of designated sites have been identified within the study area including three that have been identified as potential receptors for changes to air quality. We would welcome discussion on which sites should and should not be included in the air quality assessment.	Natural England	N	In line with DMRB methodology, all statutory designated sites that have been identified within 200m of the affected road network (ARN) as identified through traffic modelling have been included in the air quality assessment. Details of the impacts of the assessment are provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Historic Environment	Historic England has commented on the Scoping Report and made recommendations for the approach to be taken for the EIA. We have liaised with Staffordshire County Council in that process. The historic environment was discussed at a meeting with Highways England on 2nd April 2019 in Birmingham and forms the basis of future consultation. The draft ES is expected to be completed in summer 2019 and a further meeting to discuss this is provisionally scheduled for August 2019. Historic England expects to receive the draft Historic Environment	Historic England	N	Additional information has been provided to Historic England and discussions on the value and impacts on the historic environment have been discussed with Historic England.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	ES chapter prior to that meeting. We note the PIER reports, and we expect to discuss detailed mitigation, including design and enhancement measures prior to, and as part of the preparation for final DCO submission.			
Woodland and Ancient Woodland	<p>Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat. Its loss cannot be mitigated and it cannot be counted in calculations towards net gain. Where there are negative impacts to existing ancient woodland, such as dust, these can be mitigated against, e.g. by erecting screens for the duration of the proposal and ensuring an adequate buffer is in place. The buffer around existing ancient woodland should never be at the cost of the ancient woodland. The implication of this is that all measures to avoid its loss should be taken.</p> <p>The report should be clearer in its definitions. It has used three different</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Highways England recognise the value of ancient woodland within the development of the design and have sought to minimise its loss. Through careful option selection and design the Scheme avoids any direct loss of ancient woodland listed on the Ancient Woodland Inventory.</p> <p>A buffer of 15m from construction activities has been included in the calculation for the loss of ancient woodland Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Compensation measures are reported in the Environmental Statement, these measures have not been included as part of the calculation of biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The terms of reference have been updated and are included within the Environmental Statement</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>Table 8.2 - your classification is ambiguous here. Recording canopy as "broadleaved woodland" and then recording "possible PAWS" is inconsistent – unless the canopy is non-native or naturalised.</p> <p>Table 8.2 - If the canopy is primarily of native woodland, it would classify as ASNW, while if it is of non-native woodland, it would classify as PAWS. There seems to be some confusion over this in your table as the habitat type identifies as broadleaf woodland. Also, have you considered that conifer woodland may be ancient?</p> <p>Table 8.2 - You have listed one of the woods as having Sorbus domestica, rather than S.aucuparia. We think this may be a mistake? If it is not and the woods do have Sorbus domestica, please be aware that there are only eight individuals recorded in England, so we would look to retain them.</p>			<p>Survey work has been completed in 2019 and the status of the woodland within the Scheme boundary and study area is documented in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Compensation measures are reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Survey work has been completed in 2019 and the status of the woodland within the Scheme boundary and study area along with compensation measures is documented in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Comment noted. It has been checked and confirmed that Sorbus domestica is not present at this location, it should instead refer to S. aucuparia. This has been corrected in the Environmental Statement and supporting appendices as appropriate Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>It is very important that you do not state that you will plant "new areas of ancient woodland". You can plant new areas of broadleaf woodland in compensation for ancient woodland lost but you cannot plant "new" ancient woodland.</p>			<p>Comment noted. Correct terminology has been used in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Badgers	<p>A bait marking survey is recommended to establish how many badger clans would be affected and the territories they occupy. It may be necessary to update the survey annually. A walk over survey will need to be undertaken 3 months prior to submission of the full licence application to confirm there have been no changes on site. It will be important to demonstrate any changes in the site, badger paths or latrines as this may indicate that there has been a change to badger territory.</p> <p>Whilst the footprint of the routes have been defined, the true impact area</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Full details of badger surveys undertaken are provided within the confidential appendix supporting the Environmental Statement Appendix 8.5: Badgers (CONFIDENTIAL) [TR010054/APP/6.3]. Given the findings of these surveys, the potential impacts and the mitigation proposed, bait marking was not considered necessary. Preconstruction surveys will be undertaken three months prior to the start of construction.</p> <p>As shown on the Environmental Masterplan Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2], mammal</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>will need to be further demonstrated. Consideration will need to be given to clans with territories that span both sides of the agreed route. The road could be considered a major barrier to them and sever connectivity across their foraging areas. Where this cannot be avoided, thought should be given to crossing points like underpasses or green bridges for example.</p> <p>Where it is necessary to close setts for the purposes of the development is it important to consider the impacts this will have on the species. Where an active sett is to be closed, badgers will naturally make more use of other setts within their existing territory. This can extend to setts that had previously fallen into disuse. We would encourage any disused setts in the development area to be proofed or destroyed prior to exclusion measures being undertaken on active setts.</p> <p>We would also encourage any areas that offer opportunities for sett creation to be excluded by casual exploration from badgers. Areas such as temporary spoils heaps within the</p>			<p>tunnels have been provided at several locations along the Scheme length in order to ensure connectivity to the wider landscape once the Scheme is operational.</p> <p>Measures to minimise the potential of badgers coming to harm during the construction phase are provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>construction area should be removed where possible but otherwise, chain link, heras fencing or even well considered use of electric fencing could dissuade attention from badgers building new setts in unwanted areas.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to how exclusion will be undertaken where setts will be lost to the development. A buffer should be built in to the time frames to allow for the exclusion not going quite to plan and the badgers re-gaining entry to sett(s) under-going exclusion measures.</p> <p>If an artificial sett is required to compensate for the loss of a main sett, it must be created at least 6 months in advance of the main sett closure.</p> <p>The location of an artificial sett to be created is incredibly important. It needs to be within the territory of the badgers that are losing the main sett and would need to be confirmed as part of a bait marking survey. The sett needs to have good links to surrounding habitat to be used for</p>				<p>Details of proposed sett exclusions are provided in the draft badger licence submitted to Natural England.</p> <p>Comment noted. Based on the impacts identified to date, there is no requirement to provide artificial setts. Should update surveys identify the need for an artificial sett to be constructed, details of this will be provided within the full licence application and these requirements will be taken into account.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>foraging. Barriers within the habitat surrounding the artificial sett also need to be considered, the roadway itself but also other heavily used road routes, flowing water courses etc. The artificial sett also needs to be above the flood plain and safe from any risk of becoming water logged. Ideally, the sett should also be in an undisturbed area. The sett can be planted to screen it from public view but will also make the badgers feel more at ease.</p> <p>The artificial sett will need to be found by the badgers before the corresponding main sett is destroyed. Efforts should be made to encourage the badgers to find the artificial sett, baiting with peanuts but this can be coupled with other measures such as camera trapping and guide fencing.</p> <p>Badgers living close to the bypass may choose to expand their sett. This can sometimes conflict with developments, causing road collapses with damage to pipes or electric cabling. Consideration should be given to underground proofing</p>			<p>Based on findings to date, there are no active setts within close proximity to the Scheme that will be retained. Should update surveys identify setts in closer proximity, details of fencing will be provided within the full licence application and these requirements will be taken into account.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>fencing along sections of the road when setts are at their closest to the bypass in order to help try and alleviate future problems.</p> <p>Permanent fencing along sections of the roadway may also help badgers, particularly young cubs, from becoming fatally injured as a result of collisions with traffic. The fencing should not restrict the badgers foraging habitat or range across their territories.</p>			
Bats and Bat Surveys	<p>We noted in section 8.4.3 (page 71) that trees within 50m of the DCO and transects within 100m of the DCO were being surveyed. This seems a very short distance from the project to allow for a robust baseline to be established. We would expect that the Altringham & Berthinussen model for survey protocols for transport infrastructure projects to be used which recommends walked transects of 1 km either side of and perpendicular to the road, with bat activity recorded using bat detectors during 10min stationary spot checks at 100m intervals from the road.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Detailed bat surveys have been undertaken including transects, static surveys, crossing point surveys, dusk emergence and dawn return surveys to establish how bats are using the Scheme. The methodologies and results of these surveys are provided in the bat survey appendix which supports the Environmental Statement, Appendix 8.7 Bats [TR010054/APP/6.3]. and mitigation measures are included within the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Weather and habitat variables are also recorded at each spot check. Transect should be walked both towards and away from the road. Highways Agency's Interim Advice Note supports surveying between 500m and 3km. Potential crossing points should be identified. To achieve a robust baseline of how and which bat species are using the area, 2 years surveying would be the minimum effort.</p> <p>Trees that are within the DCO and within 50m should be assessed for bat roosting potential. If potential is confirmed then the trees that are going to be impacted by the development should have a climbing survey completed.</p> <p>Roads and railways pose a significant barrier to bats and their impact should be monitored bi-annually for 10 years post construction.</p> <p>Bats - Lighting also creates a significant barrier as well as other impacts on foraging and insect availability. Consideration should be given as to how to mitigate for the</p>			<p>Comment noted. The impact of lighting on bats during construction and operation of the Scheme is assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>potential impacts. Underpasses, hop-overs and green bridges have been shown to be effective if placed in the right area and well thought out. Any replacement roost or habitats provided should be protected from future development.</p>			<p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1] reports the impact of the Scheme on bats and identifies the measures required to mitigate the impact. The Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] outlines the required mitigation measures, these will be secured within the DCO.</p>
Great Crested Newts	<p>GCN - It will be important to justify any waterbodies that are to be been scoped out due to physical potential barriers. Flowing watercourses, roads or infrastructure or other reasons for omission should be discussed.</p> <p>Where presence has been assumed but permission has not yet been granted, access to undertaken surveys should be pursued with the aim of gaining a full population size class assessment. This will help determine the level of impact to the species in that area. Any areas where access to survey has not been granted will also need to be discussed and shown clearly on</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Justification for waterbodies that have been screened or scoped out of the assessment is provided in the Appendix 8.11: GCN Chapter 8 [TR010054/APP/6.3] supporting the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Update surveys will be undertaken to inform a full licence application to ensure data is within date and where access has not previously been possible, this will be attempted and fully documented.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>any relevant Figures. In a full EPS Mitigation Licence submission, evidence will need to be provided for those areas where it has not been possible to gain access. Care should be taken when considering the age of the data against the level of impact proposed to ensure the survey data meets the data requirement stated within the 'Instruction' tab of the GCN Method Statement.</p> <p>A walk over survey will need to be undertaken 3 months prior to submission of the full EPS Mitigation Licence application to confirm there have been no changes on site. It will be important to acknowledge any changes on the site, either within the waterbodies or on the terrestrial habitat.</p> <p>Whilst the footprint of the proposed roadway has been defined, the true impact area will need to be further demonstrated. Consideration will need to be given to metapopulations that span both sides of the proposed route. The roadway would be considered a major barrier to GCN</p>			<p>Details of assumed metapopulations based on existing data have been provided in the draft GCN licence. As shown on the Environmental Masterplan Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2], there are several crossing points provided across the new link road compensation pond locations have been designed in order to minimise fragmentation.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>and sever connectivity across their habitat. Where this cannot be avoided, thought should be given to crossing points like green bridges or if a pond is likely to become isolated then it may be better to be lost and compensated for in a more suitable area with better connectivity.</p> <p>Where it is necessary to damage or lose waterbodies used by GCN for foraging or breeding for the purposes of the development is it important to consider the impacts this will have on the species.</p> <p>GCN are a species that use suitable waterbodies like stepping stones to widen their connectivity. By losing one of these stepping stones, it could mean that a metapopulation becomes isolated and falls into decline. Well considered compensation would be needed to ensure that the development does not have a detrimental effect on the Favourable Conservation Status of the GCN species.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to how exclusion will be undertaken where it is necessary to move GCN out areas</p>			<p>Full details of receptor sites and translocation strategy is provided in the draft GCN licence application.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>that will be subject to construction. Receptor Area(s) should be located away from the construction area but with access to suitable aquatic and terrestrial habitat. Should local opportunities for Receptor locations be considered unsuitable, GCN can be translocated up to 2km. If proposals include the movement of GCN out of their home range, and further than 2km then screening for chytridiomycosis (Chytrid Fungus Disease) is expected prior to agreement of any such proposal.</p> <p>Where waterbodies are to be created for GCN, Natural England require two waterbodies to be created for every GCN breeding waterbody lost due to development. This is to ensure that the new waterbodies hold water and establish well, as even with the best intentions this cannot always be achieved. For the habitat that GCN are going to be translocated to, forward planning is necessary to ensure that habitat has time to establish before being used by GCN. For a waterbody to support a small</p>			<p>A total of 12 ecology ponds are being created to compensate for the loss of assumed GCN ponds. Full details of receptor sites, translocation strategy and timing is provided in the draft GCN licence application submitted to Natural England.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>GCN population, this would need to be at least 6 months, for a medium population it is 12 months and for a large population this is 2 years. More details of profiling, planting and shading for waterbodies can be found within the GCN Mitigation Guidelines. The location of a waterbody to be created is very important. Linking in with suitable habitats for foraging but also existing metapopulations and improving connectivity is essential. Barriers within the habitat surrounding created aquatic and terrestrial habitat also need to be considered, the bypass itself but also other heavily used road routes, flowing water courses etc. The created waterbodies needs to be above the flood plain and safe from any risk of becoming water logged or infiltrated by fish. Management and maintenance are important tools to ensure that terrestrial and aquatic habitat establish well and become suitable for GCN to rely on. The proposals would be expected to compliment created habitats as well as manage those that are already in place. It will also be expected to help</p>			

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>overcome impacts the roadway could cause, such as run-off polluting GCN waterbodies, build up from rubbish and debris or introduction of fish as the area receives more traffic and people. These are only examples and there may be others you will need to explore. Monitoring of the population may form part of the full EPS Mitigation Licence application proposal. Agreement must be sought for any monitoring prior to licence submission for all off-site waterbodies to be included under as part of the full EPS Mitigation Licence application.</p> <p>Any area set aside for GCN should be protected in the longer term from being lost to development. This can be agreed through a protective covenant for giving the land Wildlife Site or Nature Reserve Status. It may be appropriate to consider permanent fencing to guide GCN away from the roadway or through a connecting feature such as a tunnel where connectivity needs to be maintained.</p>			<p>All receptor ponds created will be within Highways England land ownership. As shown on the Environmental Masterplan Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2], there are several crossing points provided across the new link road compensation pond locations have been designed in order to minimise fragmentation.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Otter	<p>Otters - The proposed mitigation is generally satisfactory and includes oversized bridges over watercourses to maintain the bank structure and mammal ledges under bridges – an interesting provision, given the oversized bridges. Artificial otter holts are also proposed but the 2015/2018 surveys failed to reveal the current presence of otters. Consideration should be given to improving some of the waterways in the area in an attempt to improve the habitat for otters – a joint study/discussion with the EA would be useful.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Otters have been confirmed present within the Scheme boundary, although currently no holts have been identified and therefore a licence will not be required. Mitigation measures to minimise potential impacts on this species have been included within the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Water vole	<p>We are generally satisfied with the desk studies and the methodology and timing of the 2015/2018 surveys. However, there were constraints including dense bankside vegetation and the surveyors were in some cases denied access to some watercourses/waterbodies. The studies do not appear to mention any desk studies or surveys for mink; a knowledge of the status of this predator on water voles is essential for reintroduction /recolonization of water voles.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Surveys have confirmed the presence of water voles on one watercourse (Watercourse 5) within the Scheme boundary. Currently, given the location of burrows a licence will not be required but update surveys will be undertaken in advance of works. Mitigation measures to minimise potential impacts on this species have been included within the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>The provision of oversized bridges is appropriate mitigation measures for water voles. The 2015/2018 surveys failed to reveal the presence of water voles, possibly because of the fragmentation and culverting of watercourses in the area. Again, improving some waterways could usefully be discussed with the EA.</p>			<p>Presence of water vole have been confirmed on Watercourse 5. The impacts of the Scheme on water voles has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Agricultural Land Classification	<p>PEIR Part A- 9.3.4 (page 95). We are pleased to see that an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey will be carried out to provide baseline evidence of the grades present and also collect data for the soil management plan. A soil resources plan should also be carried out to provide a record of the soils that are present, so that soil resources are protected, assessment made of what qualities of soils are available for the restoration and landscaping within the project and so that soils are not wasted nor treated as a waste product.</p> <p>Whilst there is some existing detailed</p>	Natural England	N	<p>A Soil Resource Plan will be prepared by the contractor as part of a Soil Management Strategy prior to the start of construction. An outline Soil Resource Plan is provided as an appendix to the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] to accompany the DCO submission. The final Soil Resource Plan will detail the areas and type of topsoil/subsoil to be stripped, stripping method, haul routes and the management of the soil stockpiles. The design has been designed to minimise the amount of surplus material, including soil, that would arise from the Scheme. Opportunities to conserve soils and avoid loss will be further explored during detailed design.</p> <p>An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>ALC surveys in the area, detailed ALC surveys will be required for those areas without, to provide baseline evidence. The Provisional ALC 1:250 000 scale map does not provide sufficient detail to determine grading of land at field scale. Significant areas of Best and Most versatile (BMV) land are likely to be affected by these proposals</p> <p>Soil is a valuable, finite resource and should not be treated as a waste for disposal. Surplus soils should be incorporated into landscaping or used on alternative nearby sites, but not disposed of-site as a waste.</p> <p>How is it intended that soil erosion will be reduced by improved drainage?</p>			<p>has been undertaken to determine the ALC and soil resources within the Scheme boundary and is reported in Environmental Statement Appendix 9.2 [TR010054/APP/6.3]. Areas of lower quality agricultural land have been used in preference to areas of higher quality land, but unfortunately the location of the Scheme means that loss of agricultural land is unavoidable. Where areas are subject to temporary use and where possible, soils will be removed and replaced to minimise impacts after the construction period.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Scheme has been designed to minimise the need to import or export soil for construction. Soil excavated as part of the Scheme will be utilised on-site where appropriate.</p> <p>The installation of a new impermeable area has the potential to cause increased runoff which may contribute to increased flow, and therefore erosion, within the receiving watercourses. The drainage design for the new link road follows guidance within</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>This only refers to compaction by vehicles during construction. There are several other ways in which the soils will be adversely affected during construction, such as soil sealing (affecting physical, biological and chemical properties), contamination, over – compacting, mixing of top soil and sub soil, mixing with other The stripping. handling, storage and replacement of soils should be carefully managed. Defra's Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils provides detailed advice on the choice of machinery and method of their use for handling soils at various phases. We would recommend the adoption of "Loose-handling" methods (as described by Sheets 1-4</p>		<p>the DMRB such that the surface runoff from the new impermeable areas of the Scheme would be directed through balancing ponds to attenuate the flow. The discharge requirements have been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency to be at the typical greenfield runoff rate for the area. Consequently, we do not expect there to be any adverse effects on the receiving watercourses from soil erosion.</p> <p>Works would be undertaken in compliance with BS 3882:2015 'British Standard Specification for Topsoil and Requirements for Use' (2015) and the Construction Code of Practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites (Defra, 2009).</p> <p>The re-use of excavated soils during Scheme construction would be governed by a Materials Management Plan (MMP) which would be developed in accordance with CL:AIRE Code of Practice which is a voluntary framework for excavated materials management and re-use.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>of the Guide), to minimise damage to soil structure and achieve high standards of restoration. materials, loss of soils or disposal as a waste product. The use of a Material Management Plan and a Site Waste Management Plan will help to ensure that soils are considered fully, using data from the Soil Management Plan that should be carried out.</p> <p>9.8.7 (page 103) This refers to 'the loss of soil as a resource would also have been realised during the construction phase', yet in section 9.8.4 (page 102) no reference has been made to loss of soil. These two sections need to be reconsidered and the full impact on soils properly assessed.</p> <p>No reference is made to protecting soils through on-site management, preventing soil erosion through appropriate landscaping and use of vegetation. The use of mitigation can ensure that the long term function of soils is maintained.</p>			<p>Comment noted. The impact of the Scheme on soil has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Comment noted. This has been addressed in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. The construction contractor would be required to produce a Soil Management Strategy, made up of a Soil Resource Plan and Soil Handling Strategy as stated in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>We would welcome an opportunity to discuss assessment of significance in particular for this project.</p> <p>10.6.2 (page 107) and 10.6.3 (page 107) implies soils could be treated as a waste. Soil is a finite resource which should not be sent to landfill. A Soil Resource Survey will allow volumes of soils to be calculated and a Material Management plan ensure that all the soils are carefully used in the project or in the near locality.</p>			<p>A Soil Resource Plan will be prepared by the contractor as part of a Soil Management Strategy prior to the start of construction. An outline Soil Resource Plan is provided as an appendix to the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] to accompany the DCO submission. The final Soil Resource Plan will detail the areas and type of topsoil/subsoil to be stripped, stripping method, haul routes and the management of the soil stockpiles. The design has been designed to minimise the amount of surplus material, including soil, that would arise from the Scheme. Opportunities to conserve soils and avoid loss will be further explored during detailed design.</p>
<p>Geology and Soils</p>	<p>Public Health England</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This is due to a change in nomenclature. In the Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [TR010054/APP/6.1] Kidderminster and Wildmoor Sandstone Formation has been amended to refer to Chester Formation of the Sherwood Sandstone group.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	recommended that, where possible, consistency is sought across these two topics at the ES stage.			
Waste Management	<p>We await opportunity to make further comments on the permitting implications of waste importation and reuse once we have had sight of the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan/Waste Management Plan. Consideration of waste matters should address, but not be reserved to; the reuse of materials under the CL:AIRE protocol, the movement of waste considering all duty of care aspects and what measures are implemented to mitigate the potential works impacts, preventing materials entering watercourses.</p> <p>Any waste produced as part of this development must be dealt with in accordance with the current Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2010 (2010 Regulations). Where possible, the production of waste from the development should be minimised and options for the reuse or recycling</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>Comment noted. Highways England would welcome discussions on any additional permitting applications once they are identified.</p> <p>The Scheme will aim to prioritise waste prevention, followed by preparing for re-use, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>of any waste produced should be utilised before considering off site recovery or disposal at a suitably Permitted facility.</p> <p>Should it be necessary to import suitable waste material to the site for use in the construction of the development (i.e. for the construction of hard-standing areas, access tracks etc.), then an Exemption under Schedule 3 of the 2010 Regulations will be required. Exemptions must be registered with the Environment Agency prior to bringing waste on site.</p>			<p>Comment noted and will be registered with the Environment Agency as required.</p>
Flood Risk	<p>In addition, we note that it is proposed to replace existing culverts/bridges and upgrade these structures taking climate change into consideration. Whilst we welcome this, modelling should be undertaken to determine whether flood risk will increase as a result of increased flow through the structures and relevant mitigation provided. We would expect soffits to be at least 600mm above the 100yr plus 50% climate change flood level. This should be</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>A flood risk assessment (FRA) [TR010054/APP/7.1] has been undertaken to understand any change in flood risk which may occur as a result of the Scheme, including a 100 year storm plus 50% climate change allowance. A clear span structure has been included in the design over Latherford Brook (Watercourse 5), and where possible all soffits are above at least 600mm above the 100yr plus 50% climate change flood level.</p> <p>The only exception to this is Watercourse 2, which has no freeboard during a 100 year return period</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>addressed in the FRA. We would have a preference for a clear span bridge as stated in paragraph 13.7.9 as this reduces the risk of blockage and maintenance.</p> <p>In light of this we have recommended that areas of JFLOW modelling is refined through hydraulic assessment, with an allowance for climate change. As a minimum, we ask that the following return periods are modelled; 1 in 20 year, 1 in 100 year, 1 in 100 year plus climate change (50%) and 1 in 1000 year. We require the baseline flood risk (the current state or pre-development flood risk) and the post scheme flood risk, so we are able to see the impact on flood risk in the area. We understand that it is also proposed to undertake modelling for flood risk along the other stretches of watercourse which do not currently</p>			<p>storm plus 50% climate change allowance. This is a result of a downstream existing culvert crossing the A460, causing flows to be throttled and backing up in to the new culvert. However, the FRA discusses how changes/improvements to the existing A460 culvert (to allow freeboard in the new culvert) may increase flood risk to properties downstream by allowing additional flows to pass forward.</p> <p>Four HEC-RAS models were constructed to inform the flood risk assessment [TR010054/APP/7.1]. These models include a baseline scenario and a post-Scheme scenario, enabling a comparison of flood risk to understand the impact on the area. The following return periods were tested: 1 in 20 year, 1 in 100 year, 1 in 100 year plus climate change (50%) and 1 in 1000 year. An additional 1 in 2-year return period was tested where design impacts needed to be confirmed for areas where repeated disruption could cause changes to habitats.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>benefit from indicate flood extents.</p> <p>A detailed FRA will need to be undertaken as stated within the report, paragraph 13.819 and 13.8.2020 page 148 in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. This FRA needs to include assessment of the appropriate climate change allowances for this catchment and also a floodplain compensation scheme, for any floodplain that may be lost as a result of development or land raising within the 100 year plus climate change floodplain.</p> <p>The Flood Assessment should fully assess flood risk in the area from all sources and where possible should be exploring opportunities to provide significant betterment to reduce flood risk overall as required by NPPF. We would welcome betterment to the existing situation particularly where flood water can be stored and slowed upstream at the source thereby</p>				<p>An FRA has been undertaken taking into consideration appropriate climate change allowances which have been agreed with the LLFA and EA through consultation [TR010054/APP/7.1]. A 50% climate change allowance applied to a 100 year storm for fluvial flood risk. The Drainage Strategy developed as part of the Scheme design includes SuDS features, such as ponds, which have been designed to accommodate a 100 year storm event with 40% allowance for climate change. The drainage network is designed not to flood in a 1 in 5 year return period storm event with climate change allowance of 20%.</p> <p>The FRA has assessed flood risk in the area from all sources [TR010054/APP/7.1]. Several iterations of Scheme design have been explored to understand if betterment is achievable within the scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Latherford Brook crossing has a small localised benefit to the downstream areas of flood risk. However these impacts are limited to within</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>reducing flooding pressures downstream to the River Penk catchment and especially the Featherstone Brook (Junction 1) and Latherford Brook (Watercourse 5) which both have a large flood plain extent downstream. Flood Storage areas should also be included and adequately sized taking climate change into consideration within the modelling and quantified in the FRA.</p> <p>We understand South Staffordshire District's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is soon to be published, and as such the proposals should take into account any findings or recommendations applicable to such a large scale scheme in this location, while also taking account development sites allocated for growth downstream at Featherstone which may have linked flood risk issues.</p> <p>We would still expect river crossings to be designed to minimise</p>				<p>the immediate vicinity of the crossing. Any additional works to improve flood risk downstream to the River Penk and Featherstone Brook would be outside of the Order limits and therefore not included in the scope. Tree planting has been included upstream of the crossing, which will expand the existing forest in this area and also slow/reduce surface water flows. Additional storage areas were not considered to be required, given the low impact on receptors in the area.</p> <p>The new South Staffordshire District's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was published in November 2019. A review of the report was undertaken in December 2019 which concluded that it contained no new or additional evidence pertinent to the Scheme. SFRAs cover large areas and have only very high level info, which we had already looked at in greater detail than that included in the new South Staffordshire District's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>The Scheme design retains and restores natural</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>detrimental impacts to the natural functioning of the river corridor and can advise further if required in order to support this. Further to this we recommend that opportunities for watercourse enhancement are implemented wherever possible as this will potentially improve the Water Framework Directive (WFD) waterbody status of downstream Main Rivers.</p> <p>The Saredon Brook waterbody in particular is a priority waterbody under WFD. In light of this it is essential that no deterioration of the brooks' water quality, channel, habitat or ecology occurs as a result of construction phase or pollution during the routes use when completed. The introduction of SUDs systems with provision to balance flows and incorporating pollution control systems would be required to mitigate impact on the water quality of the local area once the routes are in use. This would need to be demonstrated on plans.</p>			<p>processes for the affected watercourses as far as possible. Discussions have been undertaken with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the drainage strategy proposals and the preliminary design of structures.</p> <p>A Water Framework Directive risk assessment for this waterbody has been undertaken [Appendix 13.4 TR010054/APP/6.3], no deterioration to the status of the waterbody is anticipated. Sustainable urban drainage systems have been incorporated into the drainage strategy which has been discussed with the Environment Agency. The impact of the Scheme on local water quality has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Measures should be taken to ensure that silt, soil and suspended solids do not enter any watercourses as a result of the development, particularly during the construction phase. Such measures would accord with legal compliance and best practice guidance.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to protect Controlled Waters will need to take into account the results and findings of the proposed ground investigation and prepare an appropriate strategy to remediate areas that are considered posing a risk. The mitigation measures would also aim to ensure that the surface water run-off from the construction site (due to site preparation, earthworks and construction activities) do not have a detrimental effect on any receiving watercourses in the area and that any piling and/or penetrative ground improvement will come with a location-specific risk assessment to establish the means of mitigating the</p>			<p>Construction of the Scheme would be subject to measures and procedures as defined within the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] for the Scheme. This includes a range of measures to mitigate potential impacts on the water environment during construction, which accord with legal compliance and good practice guidance when working with or around sensitive water resources.</p> <p>Comment noted. The assessment of impacts on controlled waters takes into account the results of the ground investigation. Mitigation measures to reduce the risk to Controlled Waters are reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment [TR010054/APP/6.1], and detailed in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	risks of causing new pollutant linkages (or worsening existing ones) with respect to risks to Controlled Waters.			
Air Quality	We note that, despite our previous recommendation, no further baseline air quality monitoring has been proposed for PM10 and that the PEIR includes the statement "It is considered unlikely that specific PM10 air quality monitoring will be required as significant adverse air quality effects in relation to particulates are not expected". We continue to recommend that baseline air quality monitoring for PM10 is performed to inform the air quality modelling, especially in the light of the proximity of sensitive receptors to the scheme (within 50 metres).	Public Health England	N	<p>Additional baseline monitoring of particulates has not been undertaken because as previously described significant effects were not expected to be associated with the operation of the Scheme for particulate matter.</p> <p>The results described in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality [TR010054/APP/6.1] confirm that significant effects are not expected and in relation to the closest properties to the Scheme along Dark Lane referenced in the PHE consultation response, concentrations of particulates are well below relevant air quality objectives.</p> <p>Based on the absence of a significant operational air quality effect within the study area of the Scheme there is no requirement for air quality mitigation.</p> <p>The overall air quality significance of the Scheme and need for mitigation been determined from an evaluation of significance based on Interim Advice Note (IAN) 174/13 'Updated advice for evaluating significant local air quality effects for users of DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 'Air Quality' (HA 207/07) as set out in the Scoping report for the</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Scheme.
			<p>Based on the absence of a significant operational air quality effect within the study area of the Scheme there is no requirement for air quality mitigation.</p> <p>The overall air quality significance of the Scheme and need for mitigation been determined from an evaluation of significance based on Interim Advice Note (IAN) 174/13 'Updated advice for evaluating significant local air quality effects for users of DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 'Air Quality'' (HA 207/07) as set out in the Scoping report for the Scheme.</p>
			<p>The Scoping Report states that "in some circumstances it is possible to reduce impacts on air quality with appropriate mitigation measures, particularly if impacts are focused in a small geographic area rather than spread across the extent of the air quality study area. However, the proposed Scheme design to date does not include specific air quality mitigation measures for the operational phase." This text remains unchanged within the PEIR. We therefore continue to recommend that specific air quality mitigation measures are included for the operational phase.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>We welcome the commitment in response to our comments at Scoping Stage. We note that no further modelling has been submitted since the Scoping Study and no PM2.5 (or indeed PM10 background data) is presented. We would therefore expect to see a refined air quality assessment when the Environmental Statement (ES) is presented.</p>			<p>Following the completion of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), further refined air quality modelling has been undertaken. This has included detailed air quality modelling of both particulates with a diameter of 10µm and also 2.5µm (PM10 and PM2.5). The modelling has been undertaken for the worst-case opening year of the Scheme. Modelling has been undertaken for the situation with and without the Scheme across all routes along and around the Scheme. The full assessment will be presented in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Noise mitigation	<p>PHE expects decisions about noise mitigation measures to be underpinned by good quality evidence, in particular whether mitigation measures are proven to reduce adverse impacts on health and quality of life [4]. For interventions where evidence is weak or lacking, PHE expects a proposed strategy for monitoring and evaluating</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>The benefit of operational traffic noise mitigation measures such as low noise surfacing and noise barriers/bunds is included in the assessment through the use of a 3D computer model of the Scheme, which implements the standard UK traffic noise prediction methodology set out in the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN). From discussions with PHE it is understood the comment relating to interventions where evidence is weak or lacking relates to measures such as noise</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>their effectiveness during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to noise barriers, PHE notes the potential locations shown in Figure 11.1 Noise Location Plan. PHE recommends that the need to protect the north end of Noise Important Area 11490 is carefully considered when deciding the final extent of the barriers.</p> <p>PHE recommends that the noise survey is carried out in such a way as to provide a reliable depiction of local diurnal noise variations for both weekdays and weekends, in a variety of locations, including the difference between day (07:00-19:00), evening (19:00-23:00) and night-time (23:00-07:00) periods. This is particularly important if there are areas within the scheme assessment boundary with atypical traffic day/evening/night distributions. Achieving these aims is likely to require long-term noise monitoring in multiple locations for at</p>			<p>insulation. Noise insulation is not proposed as a mitigation measure to remove any significant effects.</p> <p>Discussions with PHE have established that they do not have concerns regarding the northern end of Noise Important Area 11490, which is located on the existing A460 which undergoes a large reduction in traffic as traffic transfers onto the Scheme.</p> <p>The baseline noise survey consisted of a combination of long-term unattended monitoring over a number of weeks at four locations, and a short-term daytime three hour monitoring session at one location, where access to a secure location at which long term monitoring was not available.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [TR010054/APP/6.1] reports the impacts of the Scheme.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	least seven days.			
Public Open Space	The scheme may have an impact on tranquility of public open space, which can affect amenity and usage by the local population. This needs to be considered within the ES. The PEIR identifies a proposed area of new woodland adjacent to Hilton. It is not clear whether this will be additional public open space or how this may be accessed. It is important to ensure that any impact on tranquility in open spaces is identified and assessed within the ES. The ES should confirm any new areas of public open space and confirm the design features to ensure accessibility across the life course.	Public Health England	N	There are no areas of public open space in proximity to the Scheme. Discussions with South Staffordshire Council have not identified any quiet places or other areas that are particularly valued for their tranquility or acoustic environment in the vicinity of the Scheme, therefore this has been scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The absence of such areas has been discussed with Public Health England. Areas of public open space would not be affected by the Scheme and therefore no new areas of public open space are proposed as part of the Scheme.
Landscape and Visual	PHE notes that impacts on quiet areas and tranquility will be considered in the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (11.3.3). There is currently no mention of quiet areas, noise or tranquility in Ch.7 of the PEIR, Landscape and Visual, so we are unable to comment on the suitability of the proposed	Public Health England	N	Discussions with South Staffordshire Council have not identified any quiet places or other areas that are particularly valued for their tranquility or acoustic environment in the vicinity of the Scheme, therefore this has been scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The absence of such areas has been discussed with PHE.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	assessment methodology.			
Biodiversity net gain	<p>We recommend that the proposed development is used as an opportunity to restore more natural processes to the watercourses as this would offer a significant biodiversity net gain (BNG) in line with revised NPPF Paragraph 170(d). Development should focus on enhancing the natural environment, beyond simply protecting it. Schemes should look to provide net gains for biodiversity, based on evidence which identifies ecological networks, designated sites, green infrastructure, wildlife rich habitats and opportunities for securing measurable net gains. Please note, BNG is in addition to, and does not replace, the mitigation hierarchy at paragraph 175. There is the potential for additional environmental gains on the back of this via improved ecosystem service function, with specific reference to NPPF paragraph 102 relating to the potential for large scale transport schemes such as this to realise environmental net gain (ENG).</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>The design has minimised culverts and diversions on existing watercourses wherever possible. Where these have been required, channels have been re-naturalised and running water habitat created elsewhere to compensate and the crossing at Latherford Brook has been designed as an open span structure in order to ensure it is WFD complaint and to retain the existing geomorphological structure and ecology.</p> <p>Biodiversity metric calculations have been completed and are reported within the Environmental Statement, Appendix 8.2 [TR010054/APP/6.3].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Impacts on fish	Consideration should be given as to the proposals impact on fish, with specific regards to the proximity of works to fishing pools. Piling in water can for example, physically shock fish. As the pools are commercial fished pools this is largely a concern for the fisheries owner however the Environment Agency may get involved in the event of works resulting in a fish kill or fish in distress incident, so extra care will be needed to ensure these risks are managed.	Environment Agency	N	The Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1] reports the impact of the Scheme on fish. The Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] identified mitigation measures to minimise impacts on fish, these will be secured within the DCO.
Design				
A460 and M6 Junction 11	Please can Highways England consider MEL's concerns and provide the information to demonstrate that journey times and reliability on the A460 between M6 J11 and M6toll T8 are not compromised as a consequence of the proposed scheme. Please can Highways England also consider MEL's suggestions for improvements to the A460 and M6 J11 in order to improve journey times and reliability and provide feedback as to whether these improvements	Midland Expressway Ltd	N	The proposed layout has been developed through preliminary modelling. Further detailed design work will be undertaken which may result in minor amendments to improve operation of the road layout and Highways England will liaise with Midlands Expressway during this period to communicate the outcomes of the detailed design modelling.

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	can be incorporated into the proposed scheme.			
Free Flow Design	Our Chair, Councillor Steve Hollis, requests that there is a direct link from the A462 to the M6 before the junction link in order to save time waiting in traffic.	Cheslyn Hay Parish Council	N	Comment noted. A direct link from the A462 to the M6 is outside of scope, however the Scheme includes proposals to provide a larger Junction 11 to accommodate the forecast traffic flows.
Use of A460	The design must encourage drivers to use the link road and not the A460.	Hilton Parish Council	N	The new link road will be named the A460 and signage will be provided to direct strategic traffic along the new link road between the M54 and M6. The existing A460 is to be reclassified to an un-numbered local road, retaining the name Cannock Road, and appropriate signing changes will be made to indicate the minor nature of this route.
Options for screening barriers at Junction 1, Dark Lane, Hilton, M6 junction 11 and M54 junction 1	Timber barrier with climbing vegetation	Hilton Parish Council	N	Comment noted.
Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders (WCHs) – also referred to as Non-motorised users (NMU)				
Traffic management for WCHs	The final ES should identify the temporary traffic management system design principles or standards that will be maintained with specific reference to NMU. This may be	Public Health England	N	Details of the proposed arrangements for traffic management during construction are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan [TR010054/APP/7.5]. Mitigation for the impact of temporary traffic management are reported in the

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	incorporated within the Code of Construction Practice.			Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Impacts on routes	<p>The report identifies how NMUs will be impacted through the loss or change in formal Public Rights of Way (PRoW), open space and the existing road network. Active travel forms an important part in helping to promote healthy weight environments and as such it is important that any changes have a positive long term impact where possible. Changes to NMU routes have the potential to impact on usage, create displacement to other routes and potentially lead to increased road traffic collisions.</p> <p>A scheme of this scale and nature can also provide opportunities to enhance the existing infrastructure that supports active travel and we expect the proposal to contribute to improved provision for active travel and physical activity. The scheme should continue to identify any additional opportunities to contribute to improved infrastructure provision for active travel and physical activity.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Impacts on NMUs have been assessed within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] for construction and operation of the Scheme. Improvements to NMU facilities have been included where possible.</p> <p>The Scheme proposals ensure that all existing NMU routes are retained. The existing bridleway (Shareshill 1) which is severed by the link is to be diverted across the new accommodation bridge adjacent to Brookfield Farm. Facilities for NMUs are provided at the new M54 Junction 1 layout to retain existing NMU connectivity. The existing M6 Junction 11 has pedestrian routes, however, the uncontrolled crossings are considered to deter their use. The improvements involve provision of improved crossing facilities at Junction 11 to</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>The opportunity to contribute to infrastructure should be discussed with the local Transport and Highways Depts.</p> <p>The PEIR identifies the nature and number of RTC involving NMU, in particular incidents at motorway junctions. The scheme provides an opportunity to increase NMU safety but the PEIR does not identify details of mitigation in this respect.</p> <p>The overall risk to NMU and impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, the number and type of users and the effect that the temporary traffic management system will have on their journey and safety.</p> <p>The three NMU routes not already surveyed should have a survey completed in order to identify the nature and frequency of their use. This will help determine the potential impact on NMU but also the potential</p>			<p>enhance NMU provision at this junction and reduce severance. Further details are provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7]</p> <p>Mitigation embedded in the Scheme design, such as the diversion and realignment of PRoW are reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 2: The Scheme [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Impacts on walkers, cyclists, equestrians and active travel have been assessed within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] for construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Two of the routes, the traffic free cycle route along Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal and the Monarch's Way Recreational Route/ National Trail though within the Scheme boundary will not be affected by the Scheme permanently or temporarily. For this reason, these routes have not</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>for the scheme design to contribute to improved NMU infrastructure and connectivity. Any traffic counts and assessment should also, as far as reasonably practicable, identify informal routes used by NMU or potential routes used due to displacement.</p> <p>The ES should identify action to improve road safety for NMU both during construction and operation.</p>			<p>been surveyed and are not considered further in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Featherstone Bridleway 3 will be affected by the Scheme but has not been subject to survey. An assumption of the use and therefore sensitivity has been based on the survey results of other similar routes in the area and anecdotal evidence.</p> <p>Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] highlights potential improvements to safety for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>
Traffic				
Traffic information requests	<p>MEL would like Highways England to carry out an assessment of the traffic information and provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing traffic flows on the A460 North and Southbound carriageways between M6 J11 and M6toll T8, Forecast traffic flows on the A460 North and Southbound carriageways between M6 J11 and M6toll T8 in the scheme opening year, Forecast traffic flows on the A460 North and Southbound carriageways between M6 J11 and M6toll T8 in the 	Midland Expressway Ltd		<p>Highways England are continuing to engage with Midlands Expressway Limited and have provided the requested existing and forecast traffic flows and turning flow data. The proposals to improve M6 Junction 11 will significantly increase the capacity of this junction and reduce the likelihood of large queues forming on the approaches. Highways England will continue to liaise with Midland Expressway Limited to discuss existing and predicted journey times post-construction.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>scheme design year,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing journey time information for traffic on the A460 North and Southbound carriageways between M6 J11 and M6toll T8, and • Forecast journey time information for traffic on the A460 North and Southbound carriageways between M6 J11 and M6toll T8 in opening and design years. <p>The provision of this information will enable an assessment to understand the impact of the proposed scheme on the A460 north and southbound carriageways and whether access and egress to/from the M6toll/M6 is improved or worsened in scheme opening and design years.</p> <p>As MEL are concerned that accessibility from/to the M6toll at T8 will be compromised in the proposed scheme, we have carried out a review of the following information kindly provided by Highways England;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE514465-ACM-HGN-M54_SW_PR_Z-DR-CH-1001 General Arrangement Scheme Wide (Rev P07 dated 10-05-19) • HE514465-ACM-HGN-Z3_SW_PR_Z-DR-CH-1007 General 			<p>The proposed layout has been developed through preliminary modelling. Further detailed design work will be undertaken which may result in minor amendments to improve operation of the road layout and Highways England will liaise with Midlands Expressway during this period to communicate the outcomes of the detailed design modelling.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>Arrangement Sheet 7 of 10 (Rev P04 dated 10-05-19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE514465-AMY-HSN-M54_SW_PR_Z-DR-CH-001 <p>Proposed Sign and Gantry Locations Option 1 (Rev P01.1)</p> <p>MEL consider that there is an opportunity to improve journey times and reliability further on the motorway and local road network by reviewing the current design and making small refinements at the following locations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Markings on A460 Southbound Carriageway, from the available drawings the M54 J1 to M6 J11 scheme proposal is to widen the A460 southbound approach to M6 J11 to 6 lanes from the existing 2 lanes in the future scheme. <p>In order to reduce queuing on the M6toll T8 off slip and A460 southbound carriageway consideration should be given to ensuring that there is no conflict between M6toll traffic merging with A460 traffic, in order to reach the A460 (south) exit towards Featherstone. MEL Recommendation that traffic joining the A460 southbound from M6toll T8 should be</p>			

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>able to reach primary destination (e.g. A460 south) exits at M6 J11 without having to change multiple lanes. Make amendments to road markings on A460 southbound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Markings on M6 J11 Circulatory Carriageway, from the available drawings it would appear that the M54 J1 to M6 J11 scheme proposal for the M6 J11 circulatory is to provide 4 lanes for the A460 southbound reducing to 2 lanes a short distance down the new A460 "entry slip". This reduction in lanes around the circulatory will result in several lane change conflict areas and could cause congestion to back up around circulatory and onto A460 southbound carriageway. MEL recommendation to revise road markings on circulatory carriageway. • Advance Signing on A460 Southbound Carriageway, from the available drawings it would not appear that the M54 J1 to M6 J11 scheme is providing any advance signing on the A460 southbound in advance of the M6toll T8 off slip merge. MEL recommendation to provide advance signing to assist in 			

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	reducing conflict between vehicles on the A460 southbound and those merging from M6toll T8 in order to reduce potential accidents and congestion on A460 southbound.			
Dark Lane, Hilton and Hilton Lane				
Realignment of Dark Lane	We welcome the slight alteration of the route which has been implemented since the Scoping Report to increase the distance from properties on Dark Lane by 25 metres, so that there is 47 metres between the edge of the carriageway and the nearest property.	Public Health England	N	Comment noted.
Realignment of Dark Lane	The position of the route is too near to some houses on Dark Lane, just a mere 25m, and this is after the parish council objected when it was virtually 0 metres away from properties. A great swathe of historic parkland is going to be lost along with part of lower pool which is an area of scientific interest. A rookery which has been there for many decades and an area of bluebells will also be lost.	Hilton Parish Council	N	Highways England has looked extensively at the options for the alignment of the road in the vicinity of Dark Lane since the statutory consultation. Following an in-depth appraisal of all options, it was concluded that on balance, the alignment proposed during the statutory consultation should be taken forward. Further detail is provided in Section 5.2 of this report, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] and Appendix 3.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Land opposite	The land opposite houses in Dark	Hilton Parish Council	N	Mitigation measures are illustrated on the

Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Dark Lane	Lane must be compulsory purchased if this route goes ahead, also the land used for a car boot at moment, and both fields must be planted as woodland to mitigate natural environments that will be destroyed. The ecology pond on the car boot field must go ahead to mitigate losing part of Lower Pools. Planting this land as woodland would protect Hilton from further development and go some way to mitigate environmental damage			Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement in [TR010054/APP/6.2] and described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan, [TR010054/APP/6.11].
Fencing	Hilton Parish Council would like to see the corrugated iron fence in Dark Lane replaced with a wooden fence with vegetation. Where Dark Lane could be closed off it must be done in a way that fly tippers cannot get access, also the tree planting should include some evergreen trees and some mature trees, not just whips.	Hilton Parish Council	N	Comment noted. Mitigation measures are illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement in [TR010054/APP/6.2] and described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan, [TR010054/APP/6.11].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
General				
Sharing of plans	It is suggested that the County Council requires sight of all draft Orders, Plans and Schedules to ensure they accurately reflect the Definitive Map and Statement. Highways England need to ensure that where paths are split as a result of the line their numbering may need to change. This needs to be reflected in the Development Consent Order so that the Definitive Map and Statement can be amended.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Plans have been checked against the Definitive Map. An early draft of the Order was shared with SCC on 14th November 2019, with a revised draft sent on 20th January 2020. Numerous plans have been shared with SCC at meetings and for review before submission of the application.
Scheme proposals	The County Council has considered the information provided within the statutory consultation brochure. Based on this assessment the County Council has no comment on the proposals for the M54 to M6 Link Road Scheme.	Warwickshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Further Engagement	Requests were made through the consultation for further engagement, advice and partnership working from various stakeholders	Various	N	Highways England has and will continue to engage with those affected and interested in the proposals as the Scheme progresses.
Further Engagement	Further discussion will be required on the detailed design of the affected local highway network. Whilst the full	Staffordshire County Council	N	Highways England has and will continue to engage with those affected and interested in the proposals as the Scheme progresses.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	engineering details may be a matter for consideration post consent certain key principles need to be agreed to inform the wording of the consent order.			
Overall Support				
Scheme support	The key objectives of the scheme are welcomed and supported from a transport perspective.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Scheme support	Cannock Chase Council welcome the planned highway improvements, which will improve the reliability of journey times when travelling between the M54 and M6, as well as creating greater capacity at M6 Junction 11.	Cannock Chase Council	N	Comment noted.
Economic and local benefits	It is recognised that the link road has an important role in improving connectivity and in relieving traffic congestion in the local area, in particular on the A460 which is operating at capacity. It is also acknowledged that the new link road will bring economic benefits to the district and the wider sub region, including helping support the delivery of key strategic developments around the M54 corridor. Therefore the	South Staffordshire Council	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	principle of the proposed new link road is supported.			
Economic and local benefits	The junction improvements are important for the future growth of the Cannock Chase area as they form an important access point for both leisure and employment travellers to the strategic highway network and will be critical in maintaining future traffic flows through a heavily used part of the road network. The Council would like to see the proposed highway improvements made as soon as practicable, following completion of the improvements at Walsall Junction 10 of the M6.	Cannock Chase Council	N	Comment noted.
Overall opposition				
Preferred route	Notwithstanding this in principle support, Highways England will be aware that the council's previous preference was for Option C West. The Council does have a number of concerns relating to the alignment and detail in Option B West that we would like to see addressed prior to the application being submitted.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Comment noted.
Impacts on the local community, landowners and businesses				

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
M6 Diesel	The proposed scheme could result in more HGVs using the A460 than do now to access the M6 Diesel Truck Stop for fuel. As it currently stands, the obvious route for HGVs approaching from the south wishing to access the truck stop is through Featherstone.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shareshill, the number of HGV movements along the existing A460 is forecast to reduce significantly (26,000 vehicles per day [3,300 HGV] to approximately 3,000 vehicles per day [650 HGV per day]). Ongoing discussions have been held with Staffordshire County Council to include a monitor and manage approach to monitor the situation post-opening of the new link road.
Environmental impacts and proposed mitigation				
PEI Report	The ecology surveys carried out to date and scoped for further work as explained in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report Section 8 are acceptable. There still appear to be a number of omissions that have not been taken up from our previous consultation response (Scoping consultation 11-02-19).	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Landscape mitigation	Landscaping - the Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures (6.7) seem appropriate	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Veteran trees	We cannot find a reference to assessment of veteran trees in their own right, rather than as bat roost potential (which is covered.) Veteran	Staffordshire County Council	N	A tree survey has been completed and the presence of veteran trees has been identified. The impacts on veteran trees have been reported within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	trees should be surveyed and considered in the avoid – mitigate – compensate hierarchy. Survey may also indicate the need to have additional terrestrial invertebrate assessment. Veteran trees are now accepted to be irreplaceable habitat (as with Ancient Woodland.) Older mature trees and intermediate veterans should also be assessed and considered because these are the veterans of the future.			
Native Species	The vegetation diversity could also accommodate a remnant heathy character using appropriate native species such as birch and oak.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The possibility to provide heathland planting around Junction 11 of the M6 has been explored, however borehole testing results indicate that the soil is neutral to slightly alkaline. This is at odds with the acidic conditions preferred by heathland. In addition, the fertility of the soil on site is shown as 'moderate' as per Soilscape 18 (http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscape/), whilst heathland prefers areas of low fertility. Therefore, it is not considered that the area around Junction 11 of the M6 is appropriate for heathland habitat, and species-rich grassland has been shown on the Environmental Masterplans (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2]) in this location.
Bats and Bat Surveys	Lesser horseshoe bat is now found further north in the county than	Staffordshire County Council	N	Highways England are aware of the lesser horseshoe records and all of the survey recordings

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	previously understood and data searches will not necessarily pick this up. All bat surveys should now consider this species by specifically checking results for it.			have been analysed for all bat species, including lesser horseshoe. The Environmental Statement Appendix 8.7 Bats [TR010054/APP/6.3] provides details of the survey data and analysis.
Local Wildlife Sites	We remain concerned about possible effects on Lower Pool and Brookfield Farm Local Wildlife Sites (also known as SBIs) through permanent loss of habitat. This may also apply to woodlands that have not yet been confirmed as ancient. If avoidance is not possible, then mitigation effort should be excellent, including translocation and habitat creation with appropriate long-term aftercare. This also applies to indirect effects such as those mentioned for Oxden Leasow Wood.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The impact of the Scheme on Lower Pool and Brookfield Farm Local Wildlife Sites and Oxden Leasow ancient woodland have been assessed and are reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. The Scheme has been designed to minimise impacts on these areas as far as possible whilst also considering other constraints (e.g. veteran trees and historic parkland). Additional planting, waterbody and watercourse creation has been incorporated into the design to mitigate the loss and is detailed within the Environmental Statement.
Hilton Park	The significance of Hilton Park as an 18th century historic parkland is acknowledged in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. The parkland is attributed to Repton as a nationally significant figure in Landscape design history. Although the parkland has already been compromised by the M6 and M54, the	Staffordshire County Council	Y	The impact of the Scheme on the Hilton Park Historic Landscape has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Highways England note that the historic landscape has already been compromised to a degree by the M6 and M54. A brief historic development of the park and an assessment of its significance is included in Appendix 6.5 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>cumulative impact associated with this proposal deserves to be considered, and we would recommend that a more detailed study of the Repton landscape with historic plans overlain on the proposals should be undertaken as part of the Environmental statement- in order to assess the impact on the Hilton Park historic landscape.</p> <p>The Fields adjacent to Hilton and Dark Lane are shown as being planted as woodland with ponds to compensate for the loss of ponds in Hilton Park. The landscape design of these areas should be considered along with the historic environment report, and the ecological mitigation measures.</p>			<p>The Environmental Masterplan Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2] demonstrate an integrated approach to mitigating the adverse effects of the Scheme, balancing ecological, landscape, historic landscape and access requirements. This area has been revised on the latest version of the masterplan to better fulfil ecological objectives and reinforce the parkland character.</p>
Viewpoints	<p>The Landscape section of the PEI report identifies almost 20 viewpoints including a view from the Portobello tower. The views from Hilton Hall are some of the most significant and the recommended detailed Historic Landscape study should consider further visual impacts from the parkland during the design</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>As discussed with Staffordshire County Council, viewpoints from Hilton Hall and Portobello Tower have been included within the Environmental Statement. Due to the heritage nature of these views, they are provided as part of the cultural heritage assessment (Chapter 6) rather than the in the landscape and visual assessment (Chapter 7) reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Though the baseline view will</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	development.			be recorded within the landscape chapter. The heritage assessment has taken these viewpoints into account when considering impacts on listed buildings and as part of the wider assessment of the historic landscape, Hilton Park.
Demolitions of structures and impact on the historic landscape	The Environmental Statement should also cover the demolition of the current M6 J11 infrastructure and how that is to be undertaken – the new junction is significantly larger than the current arrangement. The impact on existing vegetation is not dealt with in any detail in the reports- although the Environmental plan indicates woodland and trees to be conserved; this should be examined in more detail particularly in Hilton Park Historic landscape.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The assessment reported within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] considers the demolition of these structures and any measures required to reduce the environmental effects of this. The Environmental Statement contains an assessment of the impact on existing vegetation from an ecological and visual perspective and also in terms of the impacts on the Hilton Park Historic Landscape and the loss of any key features within this.
White-clawed crayfish	The inclusion of possible enhancement measures is welcome. It would be particularly helpful to have a pond / pond created that precludes use for fishing and can act as an offline white-clawed crayfish refuge for a local population (Walk Mill Clay Pit SAC) that is under threat.	Staffordshire County Council	N	A total of 12 ecology ponds have been incorporated into the design which will preclude fishing; however, the proposed waterbodies will not be suitable for a white-clawed crayfish refuge as field ponds are typically too shallow and too warm in summer. It is not possible within the limitations of the Scheme to provide a new waterbody suitable for white-clawed crayfish.
Hedgerows	Hedgerow assessment should use the HEGS methodology in addition to the	Staffordshire County Council	N	Hedgerows that will be directly impacted by the Scheme have been subject to a HEGS assessment.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Hedgerow Regulations as it is more reliable as an indicator of habitat quality in Staffordshire. This would also ensure compatibility with the Local Wildlife Site assessment guidelines.			The impact of the Scheme on hedgerows has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Mitigation hierarchy	As regards mitigation (Section 8.7) we welcome the intention to comply with the avoid – mitigate - compensate hierarchy, but find it disappointing that aspirations to achieve net gain will not be in place until 2040.	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>A biodiversity metric calculation has been undertaken based on the method published by Defra in the Biodiversity Offsetting Pilots Technical Paper: the metric for the biodiversity offsetting pilot in England (Defra, 2012), to determine effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>In July 2019 DEFRA published Net Gain: Summary of responses and government response to consultation on the objectives of net gain policy. The document was clear that consultation proposals for a mandatory requirement for net gain did not include nationally significant infrastructure projects because they have 'fundamentally different characteristics to other development types'.</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that Highways England is seeking to acquire the majority of the land required for the Scheme through compulsory acquisition. In order to secure those powers, Highways England must demonstrate that the land subject to compulsory acquisition is required for the Scheme or is required to facilitate or is incidental to the Scheme</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)	
			<p>(section 122 of the Planning Act 2008). This means that, whilst land required to mitigate the impact of the Scheme can be secured through compulsory acquisition, such powers do not extend to the acquisition of land for enhancement or gain. Highways England is nonetheless seeking to fully mitigate the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity as far as possible and seeks to deliver a Scheme that results in no net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>The results of the biodiversity metric calculations are provided in Appendix 8.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].</p>	
Biodiversity targets	A biodiversity metric should be employed to demonstrate that the scheme achieves at least no net loss. This should use realistic timescales and target conditions for any compensation habitat, for example the target time for new woodland to achieve reasonable condition should be 30+ years.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The results of the biodiversity metric calculations are provided in Appendix 8.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3]. Biodiversity units have been determined using Distinctiveness Scores and Condition Scores defined Highways England in April 2018 within Chief Highway Engineer Memorandum 422/18 and the method published by Defra in Biodiversity Offsetting Pilots Technical Paper: the metric for the biodiversity offsetting pilot in England.
Landscape mitigation	The Fly through video appears to show a considerably larger buffer zone of planting adjacent to Featherstone and this opportunity should be further developed with the	Staffordshire County Council	N	The Environmental Masterplan Figure 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2] demonstrates an integrated approach to mitigating the adverse effects of the Scheme, balancing ecological, landscape, historic landscape and access requirements. Environment

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>community during the next stage of design. Once again- public access to the woodland and open space areas should be considered as part of the project.</p> <p>Landscaping – as outlined in our Scoping Report, we would still be keen to retain the potential for preservation in situ to be an option at this stage.</p> <p>Landscaping - a consideration of the potential effects on geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental deposits and their appropriate mitigation would be appropriate here. With regards to the Assessment of Effects (6.8) most of</p>			<p>have no issues providing access. Engagement is ongoing with Staffordshire County Council and affected landowners to explore opportunities for access to woodland areas for recreational use. These discussions will continue through ongoing design development.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed, as far as possible, to avoid and minimise impacts and effects on heritage assets through the process of design development. An archaeological mitigation strategy will propose a programme of archaeological migration. This will include the process for what will be done in the event of significant archaeological deposits being identified, including, if possible, preservation in situ. The detail of this work will then form the archaeological management plan (AMP) which will be developed once the detailed design has progressed.</p> <p>The information presented in the PEIR has been updated with additional information obtained from ground investigation works and the assessment and mitigation presented in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] has been amended accordingly.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>the conclusions provided in this are supported, however attributing a 'no more than negligible' value to the cropmark complex mentioned in 6.8.5 (site A36) would be a touch presumptuous at this stage. This value would be better understood based on the results of the geophysical survey and other mitigation measures such as trial trenching going forward.</p>			
Landscape Character	<p>The Landscape and Visual section of the Consultation Document contains some baseline information regarding Landscape and Visual matters. The main accepted sources of information appear to be covered, and the document states that assessment follows the methodology described in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA), Third Edition, 2013. The LVIA should be used to inform the design of the proposed development and mitigation measures. The section correctly identifies that the site falls on the boundary between two National Landscape Character Areas- Cannock</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>The possibility to provide heathland planting around Junction 11 of the M6 has been explored, however borehole testing results indicate that the soil is neutral to slightly alkaline. This is at odds with the acidic conditions preferred by heathland. In addition, the fertility of the soil on site is shown as 'moderate' as per Soilscape 18 (http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscales/), whilst heathland prefers areas of low fertility. Therefore, it is not considered that the area around Junction 11 of the M6 is appropriate for heathland habitat, and species-rich grassland has been shown on the Environmental Masterplans (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2]) in this location.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>Chase and Cankwood; and Mid Severn Sandstone Plateau. West of the A460 the site falls mainly in the character type Settled Heathlands; to the east the character type is Settled plateau farmland slopes in Cannock Chase and Cank Wood National Character Area. The heathy influences on the vegetation character may provide opportunities for landscape restoration and enhancement and in particular for the reinstatement of the enlarged J11 M6 island which could be given a locally distinctive heathy character in the range of species rich grassland verges. The heathland character could be interpreted to motorists passing through this junction as part of raising awareness of Cannock Chase AONB and its significance as a valued lowland heath.</p>			
Cultural Heritage and historic buildings	<p>In general the findings and interim conclusions of the Cultural Heritage section (Section 6) are supported. This will need to be refined going forward as further information comes to light, particularly the results of additional work such as the</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>The Cultural Heritage chapter in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] has been refined with new information as it became available including the results of the geophysical survey and archaeological monitoring of the ground investigation which have been discussed with the County Archaeologist.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>geophysical survey (which we will be discussing with the applicant's archaeological consultant shortly). Given the baseline information (Section 6.5) provided so far, the Potential Impacts (6.6) identified seem appropriate and it is welcome that mitigation is currently being considered which will potentially reduce the impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, based on currently available information, the below ground archaeological resource is likely to be appropriately addressed by mitigation measures as outlined in the report, however, the key issues will be ensuring that design and mitigation will address the impact on the setting of the historic buildings identified in the study area and, perhaps more crucially, the impact on the historic landscape, which is so important to the character of this area. Further work as part of the ES process, such as the production of an LVIA and the recommended detailed Historic Landscape Study, will be key to this.</p>			<p>Highways England have considered the impact of the Scheme on the setting of historic buildings and the historic landscape within the study area, and the findings are reported within the Environmental Statement. [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Cultural heritage and listed buildings	HE should be aware that Portobello Tower is located just to the east of the new M54 Junction 1 and is classified as a listed building, which has fallen into disrepair over recent years and is therefore at risk of further damage during the construction of the road. HE will need to be mindful of this during groundwork operations, and ensure that further damage does not occur, and if possible help facilitate repairs.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Comment noted.
Peak District National Park	Having considered the location of the proposed scheme, and its proximity to the Peak District National Park, officers of the Authority do not believe that the scheme will have any significant direct impact on the National Park. Therefore, do not intend to make any representations in relation to the scheme.	Peak District National Park Authority	N	Comment noted.
Minerals	While the ES acknowledges that the site would affect land within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA), no assessment is provided to address the requirements of policy 3 of the Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire	Staffordshire County Council	N	An assessment of the effects on the Minerals Safeguarding Area is provided in Appendix 10.1 to the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>i.e. the existence, the quantity, the quality and the value of the underlying or adjacent mineral resource.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the impact of the Scheme on the nearby permitted Hilton Park quarry.</p> <p>An assessment on the impact of mineral production and landfill capacities should include those facilities reasonably capable of supplying the Scheme taking into account economic haulage distances and timescales for the availability of mineral / landfill sites.</p>			<p>An assessment of material assets and waste is reported in Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Appended to the Environmental Statement (Appendix 10.1 [TR010054/APP/6.2]) is an assessment of impacts on mineral safeguarding.</p> <p>The reduction or alteration in the regional capacity of landfill as a result of accommodating waste from the Scheme is included in the assessment. The impact on specific mineral production site capacities or landfills has not been considered as this detail is not yet available and does not form part of the assessment methodology.</p>
Use of excavated materials	A balanced cut and fill engineering scheme is an aim of the scheme. The future ES should estimate the quantity of aggregate material required for the Scheme and identify the potential sources for such materials (both on-site and off-site). Note, that paragraph	Staffordshire County Council	N	The design has been amended to have a cut/fill balance as far as possible and all earthworks materials are anticipated to remain within the Order limits. For more information refer to Chapter 10 - Material Assets and Waste of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>2.3.9 of the PEIR Summary already indicates that the proposed earthworks design would suggest an initial deficit of 90,000m³ of fill material.</p> <p>With regard to the production of excavated wastes, will a materials management plan be produced to identify where material can be deposited within the scheme to avoid off-site disposal? It is suggested that one should be. Paragraph 10.3.2 indicates that data on waste generated by the Scheme will be produced as its design continues to develop.</p>			<p>The requirement to produce a Materials Management Plan during the detailed design stage is included in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] and will be secured in the DCO.</p>
Impacts of lighting	<p>The impact of junction lighting and views of signage gantries should be considered in more detail and incorporated into the visual appraisal. Night time views and impact on tranquility and dark skies should also be considered.</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>The assessment provided in the PEIR was preliminary, and further detail on the assessment of the potential impact of junction lighting and signage has been provided within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. In addition, night time views have been recorded from a select number of the viewpoint locations, and the changes in view at night described in those viewpoint assessments accordingly.</p>
Future use of	<p>It is noted that temporary sites</p>	South Staffordshire	N	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
land	compound is being proposed to the west of Junction 11 and also Junction 1. The Council requests that [attached to response] requirements are put in place to ensure that this compound must be restored to its existing condition. It is also requested that all planting proposals are conditioned.	Council		
Construction				
Temporary use of PRow	<p>Construction traffic will, in some locations, use the public rights of way network. Where PRow are kept open signage must accurately reflect that the public have the legal right and construction traffic needs to give way to them, not the other way round.</p> <p>In places where construction traffic has used the PRow network, we expect Highways England to ensure all path surfaces are fully repaired and improved before routes reopen. The original character of some of these routes needs to be retained as best as possible.</p> <p>Welcome plans for further consultation regarding the detailed plans for the</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	construction phase.			
Construction phasing	It is understood that further consultation will take place regarding the detailed plans for the construction phase. We welcome this as the Council will want to ensure that cumulative impacts of the construction of other local schemes are included, and that roads outside of the planning area are included, including the A460 south of the scheme into Westcroft, and north of the M6 towards Cheslyn Hay. This will help ensure any impacts on amenity are kept to a minimum during construction. The Council would welcome HE exploring opportunities to improve local amenity for local people, particularly pedestrian safety in the communities closest to the construction. For example, implementing a pedestrian crossing in Westcroft, or improving footpath conditions and signage in Featherstone.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Highways England has submitted an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] and Outline Traffic Management Plan [TR010054/APP/7.5] with the DCO application. There will be a requirement placed on the DCO to produce a more detailed TMP in the pre-construction phase and this will be developed in consultation with SCC and SSC.
Design				
Free Flow design	The Council is disappointed with the lack of free flow at Junction 11 of the M6, given that this had been	South Staffordshire Council	N	The existing Junction 11 suffers from heavy congestion and concerns were raised that this will continue to be a problem after the Scheme is

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>incorporated into earlier iterations of Option B. HE will need to ensure that capacity at this new Junction 11 is 'future proofed' and has sufficient head room to accommodate increases in traffic well into the future. In particular sufficient capacity needs to be built in to avoid tail backs along the new link road, and from the M6 Toll, impacting on the junction. In terms of traffic modelling and future proofing, the Council would like confirmation that the road scheme has been modelled in terms of the proposed West Midland Interchange (WMI), both during its construction and its operation.</p>			<p>built. The Scheme includes proposals to provide a larger junction to accommodate the forecast traffic flows which will alleviate the problem significantly. Provision of a free flow link is not required to achieve effective flow of traffic around this junction. Free flow links would increase the land take, environmental impacts and cost of the Scheme so would not be a proportional design in the context of a junction that works effectively without those links.</p>
Free flow design	<p>Telford & Wrekin welcomes the consultation on the options for the M54/M6/M6 Toll Link Road. The lack of connectivity to the M6 north and M6 Toll is a key issue for businesses in Telford & Wrekin. Telford & Wrekin is a key growth point in the region and the population is set to grow to over 200,000 by 2031 alongside the delivery of 17,000 houses. Telford & Wrekin has the largest supply of ready to go developable</p>	Telford and Wrekin Council	N	<p>A direct connection to the M6 Toll is outside the scope of the Scheme. The Scheme design does not prevent the construction of a free flow link to the M6 Toll in future.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>land in the Midlands and is home to some 4,500 companies with regional strengths in advanced manufacturing particularly the automotive, aerospace and defence sectors. The Borough also has c.150 FDI from the United States, Japan, Taiwan, Germany and France who rely on connectivity across our region, nationally and internationally.</p> <p>But maintaining this growth is dependent on excellent connectivity by road and rail and there is evidence from our private sector partners of poor connectivity in the region constraining the growth potential of Telford and the Marches. As such the M54/M6/M6 Toll Link Road is vital to providing excellent connectivity to the region.</p>			
Junction 11	<p>The design of these junctions will be key to the operation of the new route, and seem to be dealing with significant conflicting traffic flows, particularly at J11. It is our view that the new link should not be constrained by junction capacity at either end of the new link, so as not to impact the potential of this scheme to improve</p>	Telford and Wrekin Council	N	<p>The design of the junction was informed by the forecast 2039 traffic flows. The proposed design aims to meet the needs of all road users and be as 'future proof' as possible.</p> <p>Traffic flows in the area indicate that a high proportion of link road traffic is travelling in an east-west direction, with a relatively low volume of traffic</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	connectivity in the area.			looking to travel north on the M6. Traffic modelling was used to assess the signal operation and junction performance. This modelling indicates that the roundabout is functioning within its operational capacity at all peak times using predicted 2039 flows, with no significant queuing on the approaches.
M54 Junction 1	Comfortable with the proposed junction arrangement at Junction 1 of the M54.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Comment noted.
A460	With regards to the 'Capacity' objective we are mindful that potentially without further measures the proposed reductions in vehicle flows on the A460 may not be achieved, particularly in relation to HGV's. Around 700 vehicle per day utilise the HGV filling station (M6 Diesel) on the A460. It is reasonable to assume that HGV's drivers who have regularly used the filling station may continue to wish to do so and as such could travel the entire length of the A460 by coming off the motorway network to re-fuel, rest or otherwise use the filling station facilities. If considered against the anticipated	Staffordshire County Council	N	Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shreshill, the number of HGV movements along the existing A460 is forecast to reduce significantly (26,000 vehicles per day [3,300 HGV] to approximately 3,000 vehicles per day [650 HGV per day]). Ongoing discussions have been held with SCC to include a Monitor and Manage approach to monitor the situation post-opening of the new link road.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>4,000 vehicles per day use of the A460 post scheme, then the potential HGV proportion of this traffic could be in the region of 17%. This could undermine the stated benefits in the consultation document as well as what may be possible via any 'Legacy Schemes' that may be considered. This is a matter we believe needs to be addressed via the DCO, including measures to facilitate access to/from M6 diesel from the new link road via M6 junction 11 only. This matter needs to be explored further with the local highway authority and measures agreed prior to submission of the DCO application.</p>			
A460	<p>There are concerns that HGVs approaching from the south will still use the A460 to access M6 Diesel as there are no plans to restrict access on the A460. This seems contrary to one of the schemes key objectives of taking such vehicles off local roads like the A460. As such, the Council request that a weight restriction is placed upon the A4460 for vehicles</p>	South Staffordshire Council	N	<p>Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shareshill, the number of HGV movements along the existing A460 is forecast to reduce significantly (26,000 vehicles [3,300 HGVs] per day to approximately 3,000 vehicles [650 HGVs] per day). The traffic modelling shows HGV use of the road to be significantly reduced and does not indicate the need for any further measures to reduce HGV use.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	approaching from the south. The only section where this weight restriction should not apply is the stretch of road between the new Junction 11 and M6 Diesel; this would effectively mean that HGVs can only access the truck stop from Junction 11.			
Access to residential properties in Featherstone	We also require further detail and consideration of the access arrangement for residential properties in Featherstone off the A460 where the old alignment will be stopped up. We met with you on the 25 th June to discuss how the scheme will tie in to the local road network, those options are still evolving and it will be prudent to continue a dialogue as work progresses.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Since statutory consultation, discussions have been held with Staffordshire County Council to discuss the proposed layout to improve access for local residents. The access arrangements are now shown on the General Arrangement Plans [TR010054/APP/2.5] provided with the application.
Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders, (WCHs) – also referred to as Non-Motorised Users – (NMUs) and Public Transport				
WCHs	The proposed new link road between the M54 and M6 will also lead to alterations of the existing M54 and M6 and other roads in the area. The scheme will have a significant impact on the non-motorised routes and these comments are submitted predominantly in relation to the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Review Report and to the Statutory Consultation brochure (24 May – 5 July 2019).			
WCHs	<p>The affected routes are predominantly in a rural area, albeit one already affected by a number of major roads and other development. There are no special landscape features e.g. National Park, SAC, etc in the area through which the paths run although several the paths are popular means of access into the countryside for local path users. The appeal of walking, cycling and horse riding in this area may reduce if the new road is approved because it will cut through the rural landscape. However, the scheme also represents an opportunity to improve parts of the existing path network.</p> <p>The Strategy recognises the need to minimise the impact on the path network and, where possible, the need to avoid diverting paths adjacent to the new road which is welcomed. All the routes, bar Bridleway No 1 Shareshill, require minimal change in length which is positive.</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted and engagement with Staffordshire County Council will continue through design development.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Where possible, comments in relation to the proposed effect on each of the routes are included below. Unfortunately, the document does not make it clear which plan refers to which path. Whilst a number of them can be identified it has not been possible in all cases and annotation of plans with the path name/number is requested.			
Public Transport routes	Routes 854 and 868 are school bus journeys primarily for the use of school children only to access Cheslyn Hay High School, there are other school routes that serve this school that aren't registered so aren't included on the map. Consideration should be given to these and it is suggested that you contact our passenger transport team to discuss.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4]
Public Transport routes	Routes 54/54A from Wolverhampton to Stafford via i54 and Coven are not shown on the plan or referenced in the text. It is suggested they should be included given they operate within the study area.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4]
Public Transport routes	The text in Section 2.3.1 for services 67 and 71 should refer to them being	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	operated by 'Select Bus Company'.			on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4]
Public Transport routes	The route of service 67 shown on Figure 2.2 is slightly different around Featherstone than shown on Figure 2.2.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4]
Public Transport routes	There are other services in Landywood, Great Wyrley and Cheslyn Hay which aren't referenced in Section 2.3.1 or shown in Figure 2.2, (routes 1, 2, X51), but they are operating in the study area.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4].
Public Transport routes	Probably needs a little more detail on Landywood station in terms of service level and frequency other than just a passing reference in the text in 2.3.1.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4].
Public Transport routes	The application documents need to consider the impacts of the new route on public transport both in terms of permanent effects post completion and during construction, particularly for those routes pass through M6 Junction 11 and/or M54 Junction 1.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4].
PRoW mapping	Unfortunately, the document does not	Staffordshire County	N	Comment noted. The annotation requested is

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)	
	make it clear which plan refers to which path. Whilst a number of them can be identified it has not been possible in all cases and annotation of plans with the path name/number is requested.	Council	provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7] and this has been presented to the Council in meetings to discuss and agree the proposed Public Rights of Way impacts and amendments.	
PRoW mapping	There has been an application to add footpaths to the Definitive Map under section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. These are in the vicinity of J1 of the M54 but are not recognised in the strategy (reference number LM645G) This application runs very close to the scheme although the General Arrangement Scheme plan suggests it will not directly be affected it should be considered as part of the Environmental Statement.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The impact of the Scheme on walkers, cyclists and horse riders is considered in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Bridleway No 1 connectivity	Public Bridleway No1 Shareshill – This bridleway provides the predominant arterial route into the countryside to the east of Shareshill. The route is an important local link to allow path users to access a network of paths in an attractive rural landscape and a few years ago the County Council worked closely with Shareshill Parish Council	Staffordshire County Council	N	Public Footpath No 17 (Shareshill) is outside of our current Scheme boundary and any upgrades to this are currently beyond the scope of the Scheme.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>to improve this and other routes for the benefit of path users. Whilst the route is a bridleway it is, unfortunately, a cul-de-sac route meaning that for equestrians and cyclists it does not connect to another bridleway. Walkers are able to connect to a number of other footpaths and if Public Footpath No 17 Shareshill were upgraded to public bridleway then horse riders and equestrians would be able to do so too. There is no mention of doing so within this scheme, but this represents a possible opportunity for Highways England to consider such an improvement.</p> <p>The proposed diversion of the bridleway to cross an accommodation bridge south of Brookfield Farm will allow path users to maintain the links with the network to the east although it's likely that the appeal of recreation in this area may reduce as a result of the proposed road. The diversion is longer than the existing route, which is unfortunate but understood such that the network links are maintained. Proposed Paths Sheet 6 of 10 indicates that the proposed diversion</p>			<p>The diversion of Public Bridleway No.1 Shareshill has been amended to tie into the existing junction of Public Bridleway No. 1 Shareshill and Public Footpath No. 3 Shareshill to improve connectivity between the existing Public Rights of Way in this area.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>will cross Public Footpath No 3 Shareshill before connecting with the original line of Public Bridleway No 1 Shareshill. It would make sense to upgrade the short section of Footpath No 3 to a bridleway then divert Public Bridleway No 1 along this to maintain a close link with Footpath No 4 Shareshill which heads north and the original alignment of Bridleway No 1.</p> <p>Within the main body of the Report Note 1 on page 6 suggests that there is another alternative by using Footpath No 5 Shareshill and the realigned Hilton Lane bridge. It's not entirely clear why this is considered a viable alternative as it is considerably further south and only available to pedestrians, not equestrians or cyclists.</p>			<p>The new Scheme crosses Public Footway No. 5 Shareshill, therefore, it is proposed to close a 235m long section of this route and it is proposed to link Public Footpath No. 5 Shareshill to Hilton Lane and to provide a new footway along Hilton Lane from this point westwards to tie into the existing footway adjacent to Hilton Lane. This results in a new equivalent WCH route of 370m in length as indicated on the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7]</p>
Public Footpath No 4	<p>Public Footpath No 4 Shareshill - This route is due to be slightly affected by the changes at J11, but the information provided is not accurate enough to enable comments to be submitted at this time.</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	<p>The details of the tie in of Public Footpath No. 4 Shareshill to M6 Junction 11 via the realigned Public Footpath No. 8 Saredon are indicated on Sheet 6 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Public Footpath No 5	Public Footpath No 5 Shareshill - This route will be severed by the proposed new road and its western section extinguished. The path will be diverted along an existing farm track to meet Hilton Lane then cross the new road via the Hilton Lane road bridge. There are no significant concerns about this diversion and access north-west towards Shareshill will be maintained through the new footway. We also welcome the proposed new shared footway/cycleway that provides a link to Dark Lane which is a vital route for pedestrians, runners, cyclists and equestrians	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Public Footpath No 8	Public Footpath No 8 Saredon - This route provides a link between the J11 M6 island (via Public Footpath No 1R/2214 Saredon) and the wider path network to the east of Shareshill. These proposals will require a short section of Footpath No 8 to be diverted to link to the amended road layout at J11. Whilst, in principle, there are no particular concerns about this amendment further details are required about the layout of the new J11 island and whether this route will	Staffordshire County Council	N	The details of the tie in of Public Footpath No. 4 Shareshill to M6 Junction 11 via the realigned Public Footpath No. 8 Saredon are indicated on Sheet 6 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	meet a footway.			
Public Footpath No 1R/2214	Public Footpath No 1R/2214 Saredon - This route provides a link between the J11 M6 island and Public Footpath No 8 Saredon. The proposals to amend the J11 island will mean this route will need to be extinguished. The link between Footpath No 8 Saredon and the J11 island will be maintained by the slight diversion of Footpath No 8 meaning the loss of this route will have minimal impact.	Staffordshire County Council	N	It is proposed to extinguish Public Right of Way 1R/2214, however amendments to Footpath No 8 Saredon will provide equivalent WCH routes at this location, with improved facilities around M6 Junction 11 as indicated on Sheet 6 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Public Bridleway No 13	Public Bridleway No 13 Saredon - In an area of limited bridleway provision this route provides an important off-road access between Saredon Road and the A460. Whilst potential changes to this route are mentioned in the strategy (p. 5) it is not yet clear what impact the realignment of the northbound A460 will have on this route. At present the bridleway is used predominantly by equestrians as an out and back route from Sharedon Road because of the poor access at its southern end onto the A460. If there is an opportunity to improve this access and ensure this route can be	Staffordshire County Council	N	Public Bridleway No. 13 Saredon is to be adjusted locally to terminate at an equivalent position at the new M6 Junction 11 (to its current termination point). There are no proposals to provide enhanced bridleway provision across the M6 as part of this Scheme as this would result in a significant amount of new infrastructure and would require improvements to bridleways to the west of the A460 to ensure connectivity.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	used between both roads that would be a real improvement.			
Public Bridleway No 3 Featherstone	Public Bridleway No 3 Featherstone - This route provides a link between the old A460 Cannock Road and Public Bridleway No 8 Featherstone. The proposals to amend the M54 J1 island will mean this route will need to be slightly diverted and, according to plan 3, extended to link with Cannock Road. The alterations appear to be relatively minor meaning the diversion of this route will have minimal impact.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The suggested minor adjustments to existing rights of way are to be implemented as part of the Scheme.
Public Bridleway No 3 Shareshill	Public Footpath No 3 Shareshill - This route runs very close to the scheme although the General Arrangement Scheme plan suggests it is not directly affected clarification is required. It will be affected by the proposed diversion of Public Bridleway No 1 Shareshill – see comments in Public Bridleway No 1 Shareshill section.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. It is anticipated that Public Footpath No. 3 Shareshill will not be affected by the Scheme.
Public Bridleway No 8 Featherstone	Public Bridleway No 8 Featherstone - This route runs very close to the scheme although the General Arrangement Scheme plan suggests it is not directly affected but given it joins into Featherston 3 it should be	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. It is anticipated that Public Bridleway No. 8 Featherstone will not be affected by the Scheme.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	considered.			
Alternative routes	All temporary and permanent alternative routes should be open prior to the closure of the legal lines.	Staffordshire County Council	N	All temporary and permanent alternative routes are assumed to be open prior to any closures, where possible. This forms part of the assumption within the assessment and will be confirmed through discussions between the construction contractor and Staffordshire County Council.
Diversions	Non-motorised users should not be diverted on to the vehicular highway network, without appropriate mitigation, during construction. This is not a suitable alternative and presents safety concerns for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Where there is a need to divert a non-motorised user onto a vehicular highway during construction, appropriate mitigation would be provided. We are working to minimise the disruption and diversion requirements.
Gaps, Gates and Stiles	All new path furniture must conform to the British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles (currently BS5709:2018); British Horse Society (BHS) advice and the least restrictive principle (Equality Act 2010).	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
Footpath Standards	Public Footpath's should be designed to be a minimum of 3 metres wide and Public Bridleways should be designed to be a minimum of 4 metres wide	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
PRoW Standards	Standards for overbridges carrying bridleways and rural lanes should be in accordance with the Design Manual	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All overbridges carrying bridleways and rural lanes will be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and BHS

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and BHS standards			standards.
Footway provision	Footways should be provided on bridges, underpasses and highway verges where they are shared with vehicles. A verge for equestrians or a shared use footway/cycleway will be required in certain locations.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
Surfaces	Case by case specification for path surfaces to be agreed with the County Council and expectation that some non-sealed paths will be built with compacted stone + MOT specification. This applies during the construction phase and on completion of the scheme.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
Signage	Schedule for path signage to be agreed with the County Council with requirement for location, design and destination signage where appropriate.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
Fencing	Any new fencing erected alongside the PRow network must avoid using barbed wire, razor wire or electric fencing and must not create a tunnelling effect for path users. Highways England and affected	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council. Boundary details are to be developed during detailed

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	landowners should note that County Council is not responsible for maintaining fencing either during or post-construction.			design in consultation with the local highway authority.
Equality Act	Each diversion or new crossing of the road must be designed according to Equality Act standards and consideration must be given to ramps to improve accessibility where appropriate.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. All footways/ footpaths and bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with Staffordshire County Council.
PRoW mapping	Highways England also need to recognise that paths must be shown very clearly in large scale on the correct alignments. This will ensure that there is no ambiguity with landowners regarding the alignment of a right of way or its status.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The location and alignments of all footpaths and bridleways have been discussed with the landowners and included within the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Planting	Highways England will need to ensure that planting schemes, new hedgerows, wetland areas, etc. do not negatively impact on the PRoW network. Appropriate natural screening should be in place alongside the PRoW network.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. This has been reflected in the Environmental Masterplans submitted with the Environmental Statement (Figures 2.1 – 2.7 of [TR010054/APP/6.2].)
M54 Junction 1	Modifications to NMU facilities at the M54 J1 that provide an off-carriageway route are supported	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The proposed connectivity for Non Motorised Users through M54 Junction 1 is to be provided using on-carriageway shared

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	along with any necessary crossing improvements and requirements to ensure and improve safety and connectivity. On-carriageway options should also be explored. Shared use routes are considered suitable.			footway/cycleways as indicated on the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
M6 Junction 11	Shared-use facilities at M6 J11 are also supported to enable NMU access across the junction and improvements to on carriageway facilities is also welcomed.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. The proposed connectivity for Non Motorised Users through M6 Junction 11 is to be provided using on-carriageway shared footway/cycleways as indicated on the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
A460	Consideration of improved NMU facilities along the existing A460 corridor is supported with the intention to encourage safe sustainable travel along this less traffic dominated corridor. Links to the National Cycle Network are supported. Off-carriageway facilities should be considered where possible.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. Improvements to the Non-Motorised User facilities along the existing A460 and outside of Order limits are outside the scope of the Scheme. However, whilst legacy works are not to be provided as part of the Scheme, Highways England will work with SCC to identify potential legacy schemes through alternative funding streams and assist in delivering these where possible..
Connectivity to Cheslyn Hay	New facilities providing sustainable access to Cheslyn Hay along Saredon Road are also supported improving connectivity to Cheslyn Hay Primary school in particular.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Improvements to the Non-Motorised User facilities along the existing A460 and outside of Order limits are outside the scope of the Scheme. However, whilst legacy works are not to be provided as part of the Scheme, However, whilst legacy works are not to be provided as part of the Scheme, Highways England will work with SCC to identify potential

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				legacy schemes through alternative funding streams and assist in delivering these where possible.
Circular routes	The community should also be involved to consider opportunities for public access and circular routes within the restored woodland areas.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Engagement is ongoing with Staffordshire County Council and affected landowners to explore opportunities for access to woodland areas for recreational use. These discussions will continue through ongoing design development.
Brookfield Farm	The current proposal includes a bridge north of Hilton Lane to enable Brookfields Farm access to their land to the east of the new link road. This is marked as an access track on their plans. There is an existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) from Shareshill that cuts through Brookfields Farm and carries on east, before being directed south to cross the M6 at Hilton Lane. The Council requests that access to this PRoW is maintained and is not cut off by the new link road. We consider the best way to do this is to convert the access track into a 'green bridge' so that it doubles up as both a access track for the farm but also a PRoW to enable access to the countryside.	South Staffordshire Council	N	Highways England agree that this would be beneficial and SSC's recommendations regarding provision of a single bridge to retain the PRoW and land access have been incorporated into the design. The PRoW (bridleway) in question, Shareshill 1, is proposed to be realigned to cross the link road on the accommodation bridge south of Brookfield Farm. However, it is not currently proposed to provide a green bridge at this location.
Traffic				

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Transport Modelling	<p>Telford & Wrekin Council supports the construction of a direct, high capacity road link between the M6 / M6 Toll and the M54 motorways which will strengthen transport links to and from the borough. The construction of the new road will assist with the objectives of providing more reliable journey times, improving traffic flow and enhancing links from the borough to regional and national destinations such as airports and ports.</p> <p>Transport modelling data held by Telford and Wrekin Council indicates that there is a reasonable flow of traffic taking A-roads from Telford towards the Potteries and M6 junction 15 across Shropshire, Staffordshire and Telford and Wrekin. The creation of the new link road along with other improvements made to the M6 will hopefully encourage more of those drivers to use the M54 and M6, easing traffic on those less suitable A-roads and through some of the sensitive villages sited along those roads.</p>	Telford and Wrekin Council	N	Comment noted.
Dark Lane, Hilton and Hilton Lane				
Proximity to	The Council continues to have	South Staffordshire	N	Highways England have looked extensively at the

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Hilton Village	<p>concerns regarding the alignment of the proposed link road, specifically relating to the proximity of the road to Hilton village. Feedback from HE to date seems to suggest that environmental considerations have been a principal consideration in determining the alignment, in particular a desire to protect Lower Pools and the setting of Hilton Hall to the east. Whilst the Council recognises the importance of environment consideration, there are concerns that these have taken precedence over the impact on the amenity of residents living in Hilton. It is important that Highways England balance the views of statutory consultees like Historic England and Natural England with other statutory consultees like South Staffordshire Council, and the views of local residents. The Council therefore requests that the road alignment is moved east away from Hilton village. It is considered that a reasonable compromise would be to move the road between the pools so that the road is broadly equidistant between Hilton Village and Hilton Hall.</p>	Council		<p>options for the alignment of the road in the vicinity of Hilton since the Statutory Consultation, including numerous assessments, optioneering team meetings, meetings with statutory environmental bodies and survey work.</p> <p>Following an in-depth appraisal of all options, it was concluded that on balance, the alignment proposed during the statutory consultation should be taken forward. Further detail is provided in Section 5.2 of this report, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] and Appendix 3.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Proximity to Dark Lane	As part of the DCO application the Council would like to see an options appraisal setting out the predicted noise impact on the properties of the current option chosen and the alternatives road alignments not selected. The Council would also like to see what the optimum location and design features are for minimising the impact of noise on residential amenity i.e. route location; use of barriers including fencing and green walls; and low noise road surfacing. The Council would like to see how these have been assessed against the impacts identified by Natural and Historic England and how the decision to run the new road adjacent to the properties in Dark Lane has been arrived at.	South Staffordshire Council	N	These issues have been considered during design development and are presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives [TR010054/APP/6.1] and Appendix 3.2 Dark Lane Alignment [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Dark Lane noise impacts	The Council would like to know how the 50 dB criterion set by the WHO Guidelines for Community Noise will be achieved to protect the residential amenity of the residents. HE proposes to Compulsorily Purchase the land north and south of the properties in	South Staffordshire Council	N	The WHO 50 dB criterion relating to community annoyance from ambient noise is exceeded at many residential properties within the study areas both with and without the Scheme. None of the WHO Guidelines have been formally adopted by the UK government. They have informed policy but have not been accepted as fixed standards. The transfer of

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Dark Lane and plant trees in these areas. What consideration can be given to providing additional acoustic screening at the boundary of or within the Dark Lane area.			traffic off the existing A460 onto the Scheme results in a reduction in traffic noise levels at the front façade of numerous properties which face directly onto the existing A460. Increases in traffic noise levels due to the introduction of the new Scheme have been minimised through the inclusion of mitigation into the vertical and horizontal alignment of the Scheme, the use of noise barriers, such as the barrier proposed at Dark Lane, and the use of a low noise surface on the Scheme. During construction, mitigation measures such as the use of Best Practicable Means (BPM) through the choice of plant and working methods, and the use of site hoarding will ensure construction noise impacts are minimised as far as reasonable practicable. Such mitigation measures are secured through the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11], compliance with which is secured through the Development Consent Order (DCO)
Dark Lane air quality impacts	Whilst it is unlikely that air quality standards will be breached in Dark Lane it is likely that air quality levels will deteriorate in Dark Lane due to the proximity of the proposed road. There are serious concerns that the proposed road layout could lead to a significant deterioration in PM10 and PM2.5 levels on the A460.	South Staffordshire Council	N	The results described in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality [TR010054/APP/6.1] confirm that significant effects are not expected and in relation to the closest properties to the Scheme along Dark Lane concentrations of particulates are well below relevant air quality objectives.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	The Council also has concerns that the line of the proposed road offers little opportunity to protect the amenity of the residents in Dark Lane during construction works from the effects of noise and dust.			A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period. These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].
Severance of Dark Lane	Severance of Dark Lane and loss of cycle and footway links to/from Hilton Lane should be mitigated with suitable alternative facilities including new crossing infrastructure. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this route is well used by cyclists and walkers/runners.	Staffordshire County Council	N	The proposed design includes a new shared pedestrian / cycle link from Hilton lane to Dark lane to provide the required access as indicated on the Streets, Rights of Way and Public Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Mill Lane				
Closure of Mill Lane	It is understood that the proposal is to close off Mill Lane at the point where it currently meets the A460 in order to accommodate the larger Junction 11. The Council has some concerns about this proposal, and in particular, with blocked off roads increasing the likelihood for fly tipping. Therefore the Council requests that any blocked off	South Staffordshire Council	Y	Access will be maintained as Mill Lane will be kept open. The design has been updated to reflect this.

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	roads have an appropriate gate installed with the relevant authority.			

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
General				
Engagement	Nurton would welcome a meeting with Highways England at the earliest convenience in 2019 so as to discuss this objection and potential solutions that will allow both schemes to come forward.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. A meeting has been held with Nurton Developments to discuss the potential impacts of the proposed development on their interests.
Further Engagement	Requests were made through the consultation for further engagement, advice and partnership working from various stakeholders.	Various	N	Highways England has and is committed to continuing to engage with those affected and interested in the proposals as the Scheme progresses.
Impacts on the local community, landowners and businesses				
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Section 122 is such that the applicant must be clearly able to demonstrate how the applicant intends to use the land which it is proposes to acquire. Without such justification the applicant simply cannot show conclusively that the compulsory acquisition of land meets the two conditions in Section 122. The Schedule summarised above confirms that Highways England are not currently aware of the proposed use of Plots 3/29, 4/9a and Plot 4/9b, Plot 4/9d and Plot 4/9g and as such the Section 122 test has clearly not	Allow Ltd	N	<p>Comment noted. Each plot is required to construct the link road, undertake utilities diversions or provide essential mitigation, use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p> <p>Design development has continued since statutory consultation, this has included a small reduction in land required at plot 5/4 (formerly 4/9g). Further detail has been provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>been satisfied in relation to those plots. The compulsory acquisition of Plot 4/9a would remove access to land in Allow's ownership and the right of access Lower Lodge has the benefit of.</p> <p>The purposes for which a DCO authorises the compulsory acquisition of land should be legitimate and sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. This consideration has simply not been applied to Allow's rights, interests and property set out in the Schedule.</p>			<p>Note that the plot references have changed since the original issue of land plans as follows:</p> <p>3/29 has been removed; 4/9a is now 4/20b; 4/9b is now 4/20c; 4/9d is now 4/20b and 4/20g; 4/9g is now 5/4.</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>Allow is prepared to consider the more suitable location of Plot 4/9g for woodland planting if Highways England are able to demonstrate that it has met the test set out above. Allow does not however agree that there is a compelling case in the public interest to acquire Plot 4/9b nor does it agree that Plot 4/9b is required for the development which the Proposed DCO relates. Allow has attempted to discuss this alternative proposal...however the conclusion of</p>	Allow Ltd	N	<p>Mitigation to the east of the Link Road has been considered. However, woodland planting cannot be undertaken at this location as this would result in further adverse impacts on Hilton Park historic parkland, degrading the setting of historic listed buildings.</p> <p>The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the Scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting is significant and the proposed area is adjacent to the</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>such discussions have simply led to all of the plots listed above and set out in the Schedule being included in the Proposed DCO for purposes yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>Should Highways England be agreeable to the removal of Plots 4/9a and 4/9d from the Proposed DCO Allow would be prepared to begin negotiations with Highways England in relation to the alternative proposal of Plot 4/9g (if required and justified in accordance with the test at Section 122). As Highways England will be aware, applicants should seek to acquire land by negotiation wherever practicable and as a general rule, authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought as part of an order granting development consent if attempts to acquire land by agreement fail.</p> <p>Government guidance on CPO does require there to be consideration of the appropriateness of any alternative proposals put forward by the owners of the land. It also advises on examining the suitability of any</p>				<p>habitat loss and located to appropriately deliver areas of ecological mitigation.</p> <p>The mitigation proposed includes the provision of replacement habitat, screening for residential properties, replacement planting for the loss of part of Lower Pool Site of Biological Importance, measures to avoid and reduce potential construction impacts on bats and great crested newts as well as planting to help integrate the Scheme into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Note that the plot references have changed since the original issue of land plans as follows:</p> <p>3/29 has been removed; 4/9a is now 4/20b; 4/9b is now 4/20c; 4/9d is now 4/20b and 4/20g; 4/9g is now 5/4.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	alternative locations for the purpose for which the land is being acquired. There are serious concerns about the use of Plot 4/9b for woodland planting which would result in potentially the destruction of existing trees and a wildlife corridor in an inappropriate location. Allow would therefore welcome a meeting with Highways England to discuss suitable alternatives.		
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The Schedule makes no reference to the nature of the permanent rights required in relation to plots 3/1m, 4/22a and 4/22b and therefore it is unclear how Allow's rights and interests in relation to each of these plots are affected. For the reasons above, Allow submit that, unless the Proposed DCO is amended as proposed above and the further information sought is provided the clauses enabling the compulsory acquisition of rights, interests and property affecting Allow's interest should not be allowed to pass into law. Should the Proposed DCO remain unchanged Allow will have no alternative other than to register as an	Allow Ltd	N
			Comment noted. Each plot is required to construct the link road, undertake utilities diversions or provide essential mitigation, use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. Note that the plot references have changed since the original issue of land plans as follows: 3/1m is now 4/1k; 4/22a and 4/22b have been removed.

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>Interested Party to reserve its position to make representations about the Application in the Examination.</p> <p>Government guidance advises that the applicant also needs to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. Accordingly, further information is sought in relation to those permanent rights sought and referred to in the Schedule together with Highways England's response as to how the acquisition of those rights are necessary and proportionate in relation to the Proposed DCO.</p>			
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>This is an ecological/drainage feature (earmarked as 'proposed meadow grassland' and a 'proposed drainage pond' on the key) which is at the bottom of 'The Prairie' field. This area suffers with waterlogging. We would challenge the requirement for the ecological mitigation and drainage pond at this location and seek justification for the proposals. From</p>	W2	N	<p>Land is required at this location to minimise flood risk to the wider area and the Scheme. This location has been identified as a suitable location to sustainably manage water, whilst providing some ecological benefit. The low point of the land means that water does already drain in that direction and minimises the need to change landform.</p> <p>The pond is required for drainage and</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>our clients' perspective it appears that agricultural land which they have managed for over 50 years is being destroyed and replaced with a pond.</p> <p>We submit that if the drainage pond is to remain that an improved layout so that it mitigates the land lost would be for it to be in an east / west configuration rather than the north / south configuration as proposed. Please confirm whether our clients shall be able to own, manage and fish from the pond after its construction.</p>			<p>ecological purposes so fishing will not be possible as this will be owned and maintained by Highways England. Discussions are ongoing with the landowner around the details of the pond.</p> <p>Chapter 13 of the ES provides more detail on Road Drainage and the Water Environment. [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>Our clients understood that the motorway had moved westwards to save the fishing pool here and are disappointed to note that the scheme now proposes an area of proposed meadow grassland. By the loss of this pool and the end pool which would be under the link road, our clients submit that it would render the fishing pool business unviable as only two ponds would remain i.e. 50% of its pools and fishing pegs enterprise will have been lost. Please set out the ecological justification for this proposal. Furthermore, in this area our clients</p>	W2	N	<p>The alignment of the route has been moved to the west as far as possible (approximately 5m) to reduce the impact on the fishing ponds and other stakeholder constraints. The majority of the pool that lies to the east of the link road, within the Order Limits, is required temporarily and will be returned to the landowner post-construction. Further discussion is ongoing with the landowner to identify opportunities to avoid all impact on this pond.</p> <p>The route to the accommodation bridge has been designed to ensure that excessive gradients are not required to facilitate movements of agricultural vehicles and users</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	consider the proposed access track to be convoluted to reach the accommodation bridge. To minimise the land taken, a redesigned access track is required which would be a track constructed in between the motorway and the middle pool (assuming this pool is saved) so that the access track runs alongside the new link road.			of the diverted Public Right of Way. Discussions are ongoing with the landowner regarding both points. Information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Access to land parcels	In addition, our clients have a vehicular right of way from Area G into and across adjoining land...to exit to the A460 which it is considered would be cut off by the current proposals. In view of the fact that our clients' land is part of the Nurton Developments area they propose a further accommodation bridge at this location subject to the accommodation bridge at Area C (as above) being sufficiently wide enough to accommodate agricultural equipment.	W2	Y	Highways England are not currently proposing to retain this particular access point and will continue to discuss access arrangements with the landowner. Alternative access routes for agricultural machinery are proposed via the new accommodation bridge to the south of Brookfield Farm. It is proposed that the traffic width of the structure is increased to 4.5m in order to accommodate the indicated vehicle. The raised verge will be reduced accordingly to retain the overall size of the super structure. Sufficient forward visibility is provided on either side of the structure therefore it is anticipated that users will wait on either side of the structure for the other to pass to eliminate the risk of vehicles and users crossing on the structure causing potential conflicts.
Land parcel access	The scheme seems to include the	W2	N	Highways England does not intend to take

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>access track from Hilton Lane to the fishing pools and more generally into our client's land, this is a main access point into the land and the access must be preserved.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the footpaths are not included within the consultation document, however the plans at the consultation event seemed to have more detail on them, and did show the diversion of the footpath away from the woodland the diversion being along the existing access track noted above. The access track is very important to the efficient operation of the agricultural holding any diversion of the public right of way should not be along the track, it is currently a private driveway and allowing public access will cause significant security issues, as our clients would not be able to control who enters the land at this location, already there are problems with those stealing fish, poaching, and non-paying anglers. This footpath should therefore only be diverted from Hilton Lane to run alongside the motorway, so that it then meets the existing</p>			<p>ownership of this access track, however access is sought to carry out infrequent periodic maintenance to the attenuation pools required for the link road. The access gate is to be retained to prevent public access to the track. Further discussions will be held with the landowner to agree access arrangements, maintenance rights and appropriate compensation. It is not proposed to divert any Public Rights of Way along the existing track to Hilton Lane.</p> <p>Refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans for details of PROW diversions [TR010054/APP/2.7].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	footpath as shown on the attached plan as a dotted line.			
Accommodation Bridge	Accommodation Bridge – Our clients have serious concerns regarding the width of this bridge and its ability to be able to accommodate agricultural equipment critical for the continuing agricultural operation at the holding.	W2	Y	It is proposed that the traffic width of the new structure is increased to 4.5m in order to accommodate the indicated vehicle. The raised verge will be reduced accordingly to retain the overall size of the super structure. Sufficient forward visibility is provided on either side of the structure therefore it is anticipated that users will wait on either side of the structure for the other to pass to eliminate the risk of vehicles and users crossing on the structure causing potential conflicts.
Access track to Hilton Lane	In this location, the existing access track to Hilton Lane from the fishing pools has been obliterated. This will of course need to be re-provided as part of any future proposals. Please clarify the proposals for the new access track.	W2	N	The track from Hilton Lane is not affected by the proposed route. Discussions have been held with the landowner to clarify this point.
Brookfield Farm right of way	Our clients have a right of way through Brookfield Farm, i.e. along the bridleway. We bring to your attention that neither our clients' vehicular right of way nor the bridleway is accommodated in the consultation proposal although it appeared to be accommodated on the	W2	N	Comment noted. Bridleway Shareshill 1 is to be diverted across the new bridge as indicated on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7] and vehicular access for the landowner is to be provided by the new accommodation bridge with adequate right of access provided within the DCO. Vehicular access will also be provided for

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	larger plans at the consultation event. Current and future design versions should include both our clients' right of way and the bridleway.			Highways England to maintain the drainage pond. Further discussions will be held with the landowner to understand their access needs.
Use of land	The red line boundary in your consultation document contains the entirety of our clients' landholding, however you have not explained whether your scheme envisages the land is to be acquired permanently or on a temporary basis.	W3	N	The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, balancing pond and environmental mitigation. More detail is now available on the land requirements of each plot and has been provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Use of land	The red line boundary in your consultation document contains the entirety of our client's landholding, however you have not explained whether your scheme envisages the land is to be acquired permanently or on a temporary basis.	W1	N	The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, balancing pond and environmental mitigation. More detail is now available on the land requirements of each plot and has been provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Extent of land take	<p>Whilst initial discussions have been held between our transport consultants (DTA Transportation) and HE regarding accommodation works, we are yet to receive confirmation of the extent of land required and what land is required on a temporary or permanent basis. As we have made clear to HE, it is critical to have certainty on these points – these matters are fundamental to our ability to review the Scheme. Accordingly, we reserve the right to submit further representations as and when the detailed scheme design is finalised with sufficient detail to allow meaningful engagement.</p> <p>At present there has been an inadequate consideration in terms of the detailed alternatives in terms of the manner of delivery of the scheme, including bridges. As a minimum we require details that the road can be built with more crossing points over the road, or alternatively one wider accommodation bridge with appropriate internal connections. In order to undertake a robust and legally compliant EIA HE must</p>	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>The extent of permanent land requirements has been confirmed in plans issued for supplementary consultation and at a subsequent meeting. Each plot is required to construct the link road, or provide essential mitigation, use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p> <p>Highways England is not able to facilitate third party development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	consider reasonable detailed alternatives in terms of the manner of delivery of the Scheme so as to avoid any adverse effects on the delivery of the redevelopment of the Site.			
Commercial development	The Scheme will potentially have an adverse impact in relation to the Site and the redevelopment of it. It is an established principle that in the event that any land with potential development value is severed, the density and/or timing of development on the retained land can be seriously and adversely affected. The representations submitted by Bruton Knowles on behalf of the landowners of the Site deal further with this point.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals.
Bridge to the north of Hilton Lane	On review we have now also shown the potential for a new bridge just to the north of Hilton Lane, and the potential to provide a link to the A460, thus removing the need for a second replacement bridge on Hilton Lane. We consider this layout has significant mutual benefit in terms of deliverability and would be grateful for your consideration of this as part of the scheme progression.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Highways England have considered a number of alternative alignments for the new bridge at Hilton Lane. The proposed alignment has been selected to minimise impact on local residents and environmental constraints. Highways England cannot facilitate a third-party development and therefore cannot seek to relocate the bridge or provide a larger structure that would increase the environmental impact of the Scheme.

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Mapping confirmation	As we discussed at our meeting, we have reviewed our site layout in line with the indicative alignment of the new link road (assuming it routes under Hilton Lane and then joins the M6 J11 at grade). We have assumed D2AP corridor and this is attached. Perhaps you could confirm this is broadly comparable with your current layout / scheme.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Highways England can confirm the alignment you have shown is broadly in-line with our proposed Scheme. Further detail has been provided in the land plans issued during the supplementary consultation.
Use of land for environmental mitigation	It is also noted that the scheme includes a drainage pond in the middle of the field, if this is required it is requested that this is located to the edge of the land so that it has a more limited impact on our clients' retained land	W3	N	The land parcel is proposed to be acquired permanently and therefore would not be returned to the landowner post construction. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The scheme envisages that much of our clients' land is to be utilised for woodland, this appears to be excessive given the land in question is at the motorway junction and is unlikely to screen residential or other properties from the motorway, hence it is requested that the woodland is minimised to facilitate a larger area of land being returned to our client for agricultural use.	W3	N	The land parcel is proposed to be acquired permanently and therefore would not be returned to the landowner post construction. The woodland planting is required to replace habitat lost during the construction of the new junction and integrate the Scheme into the surrounding landscape. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The scheme envisages that much of our client's land is to be utilised for woodland, this appears to be excessive given the land in question is at the motorway junction and is unlikely to screen residential or other properties from the motorway, hence it is requested that the woodland is minimised to facilitate a larger area of land being returned to our client for agricultural use.	W1	N	The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, balancing pond and environmental mitigation. The woodland planting is required to replace habitat lost during the construction of the new junction and integrate the Scheme into the surrounding landscape. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Our clients' land is included within an area of land being promoted for commercial development by Nurton Developments and it is important that the road scheme is developed in such a way as to be sympathetic to that proposal, and we confirm that we are also supportive of the representations made by Nurton. In particular The Scheme will potentially have an adverse impact in relation to the Site and the redevelopment of it. It is an established principle that in the event that any land with potential development value is severed, the density and/or timing of development	W1	N	Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals.

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	on the retained land can be seriously and adversely affected.			
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>Our clients' land is included within an area of land being promoted for commercial development by Nurton Developments and it is important that the road scheme is developed in such a way as to be sympathetic to that proposal, and we confirm that we are also supportive of the representations made by Nurton.</p> <p>In particular The Scheme will potentially have an adverse impact in relation to the Site and the redevelopment of it. It is an established principle that in the event that any land with potential development value is severed, the density and/or timing of development on the retained land can be seriously and adversely affected.</p>	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals.</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>If part of the land is to be returned to our client the new road will sever access to that land and therefore the scheme must provide for access to any land retained by our clients.</p>	W1	N	<p>It is proposed to permanently acquire the entire landholding, therefore access to severed parcels of land will not be required.</p> <p>Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Use of land for environmental mitigation	If part of the land is to be returned to our clients', access to the land from the A460 must be retained.	W3	N	<p>The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, balancing pond and environmental mitigation. More detail is now available on the land requirements of each plot and has been provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans.</p> <p>Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>
Commercial Development	<p>Our clients' land is included within an area of land being promoted for commercial development by Nurton Developments and it is important that the road scheme is developed in such a way as to be sympathetic to that proposal, and we confirm that we are also supportive of the representations made by Nurton.</p> <p>In particular The Scheme will potentially have an adverse impact in relation to the Site and the redevelopment of it. It is an established principle that in the event that any land with potential development value is severed, the</p>	W3	N	<p>Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	density and/or timing of development on the retained land can be seriously and adversely affected.			
Use of land for environmental mitigation	A significant area of further ecology / balancing ponds is proposed in this location. Please set out your justifications as to the extent of ecology mitigation proposed for this area and the reasoning for its location.	W2	N	<p>The balancing pond is required to sustainably manage water to prevent runoff from the new link road from flooding local watercourses. The low point of the land means that water does already drain in that direction and minimises the need to change landform.</p> <p>Ecology ponds have been included in this location to compensate for the loss of one pond and the potential partial loss of a second pond to the south-east of Brookfield Farm. Replacement ponds should be provided in proximity to the location of the pond(s) lost. The replacement ponds could not be provided directly adjacent to the pond(s) lost due to the topography of the area. The Scheme would also result in the loss of an area of Brookfield Farm Site of Biological Importance (SBI) and Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The LWS is an area of wet woodland, the ponds and combined woodland planting in this location has been designed to mitigate for the loss of this habitat. Further information on the effects is contained within the Environmental Statement chapter on Biodiversity, Chapter 8 [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Environmental impacts and proposed mitigation				
Moseley Old Hall and Whitgreaves Wood	<p>As set out in previous consultation responses, the Trust is concerned about the significant threat that a proposed link road to the ROF Featherstone development site poses to Moseley Old Hall. The M6/M54 link road proposals are relevant as they could either enable or prevent an alternative means of access to the ROF Featherstone site that would avoid this harm.</p> <p>We have commissioned advice from Infrastructure Planning and Design (IPaD) regarding this issue. Their report concludes, "The amendment to the HE scheme providing the proposed access road to the east side of the ROF site provides an acceptable route into the proposed ROF Featherstone development with only a minor reconfiguration of the HE's Link Road T-junction. The proposal includes an all movements junction which would take HGVs off the local road network."</p> <p>A plan of the IPaD proposals for reconfiguration of the T-junction and provision of a link road to ROF</p>	National Trust	N	<p>Comment noted. Highways England is not able to provide improvements to facilitate or influence the planning of third-party developments. However, the planned development at ROF Featherstone has been considered in the development of the Scheme traffic model and forecast traffic growth calculations for the proposed network include the additional traffic that will be generated by the ROF Featherstone development. The design has been developed to accommodate these forecast flows. Regarding the route proposed in National Trust's response to the M54 to M6 Link consultation, Highways England's Scheme would not prevent such a route from being constructed. However, it is noted that the alignment indicated results in a movement of the existing A460 to the east, which would impact on existing tree planting, which Highways England's Scheme proposes to retain.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>Featherstone north of the M54 is attached. A copy of their report is being sent separately. We urge Highways England to revise the junction to make this alternative possible.</p> <p>Despite screening in this direction from woodland in our ownership and alongside the M54, there may be potential effects from lighting and signage. We ask for further information on lighting and signage and further consideration of the effects of the proposals on the setting of the Old Hall.</p> <p>We have been notified that an area of the Whitgreaves Wood / Oxden Leasow Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland is required for the proposed changes to M54 Junction 1. The Trust is opposed to the loss of land in its protective ownership and concerned at the potential direct and indirect harm to the Ancient Woodland arising from the proposals. The loss of this land from our ownership should be avoided. Harm to the ancient woodland should be</p>			<p>A summary of the lighting and signing strategy is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 2: The Scheme [TR010054/APP/6.1]. The potential effects of lighting and signage have been assessed and are reported in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>An assessment of impacts on ancient woodland at Whitgreaves Wood / Oxden Leasow is reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. There will be no direct loss to the woodland at Oxden Leasow as a result of the Scheme; however, as work is required within 15m, the potential loss of ancient woodland would be compensated for in the north of the Scheme through compensation planting at a ratio of 7:1, adjacent to another area of ancient woodland in the north of the Scheme. The Order limits have been extended to include Oxden Leasow</p>

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	minimised and mitigated.			wood to allow enhancement of this ancient woodland to form part of the compensation for the loss of ancient woodland. This has been discussed and agreed with the National Trust and Natural England.
Travel to Moseley Old Hall	<p>Many of our visitors reach Moseley Old Hall via M54 junction 1. Construction of the link road has the potential to effect visitor journeys. The Trust has a rolling programme of events some of which are dictated by calendar dates (e.g. Easter or the anniversary of Charles II being at Moseley Old Hall) and some of which are set by us. We are also increasingly able to provide information to visitors using our website, app and social media so that they can be advised of access restrictions.</p> <p>We ask for ongoing dialogue to help us mitigate the impacts of delays and closures on our visitors and our visitor business.</p> <p>We also ask for there to be co-ordination between Highways England and the two local highway authorities (Staffordshire County Council and Wolverhampton City</p>	National Trust	N	Comment noted. The Traffic Management Plan [TR010054/APP/7.5] sets out how traffic is to be managed during construction to minimise disruption to road users. Highways England will continue to work with the relevant local authorities and other stakeholders (including the National Trust) to help manage traffic during the construction of the link road.

Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Council) to holistically manage traffic in the area during the construction period.			

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
General			
Cost of the Scheme	Concerns raised around if this is a cost-effective solution to the traffic issues in the area.	N	<p>Funding for this Scheme was identified as part of the Government's first Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020) which sets out the long-term approach to improve England's motorways and major roads.</p> <p>Value for money has been a key consideration throughout the options identification and design process. The unadjusted Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of this Scheme is 3.0.</p> <p>A Department for Transport benchmark is a BCR of 2, above which a project is considered high value for money. The unadjusted BCR for this Scheme is 3.0 and therefore is considered to be a high value for money Scheme. Further details of how this has been considered can be found in the Case for the Scheme [TR010054/APP/7.2].</p>
Further Engagement	Requests were made through the consultation for further engagement, advice and partnership working from various stakeholders.	N	Highways England has and will continue to engage with those affected and interested in the proposals as the Scheme progresses.
Consultation Events	Local residents offered suggestions to improve future consultation events, including models of the Scheme to be shown, and accurate built Scheme sound demonstrations to aid understanding.	N	Comment noted. Highways England continually seek to improve engagement with the community and welcome considerations for improvements to the consultation events. These comments will be used to inform engagement at future Highways England consultation events.
Programme of Works	Requests were made for a timetable of works to be published when available.	N	Comment noted. Key project dates are indicated on the project webpage.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Economic Growth	Support was demonstrated for the completion of the Scheme to benefit economic growth and job creation in the local area.	N	Comment noted.
Overall Support			
Proposed Scheme welcomed	Views were expressed that a link road is needed and should be completed as soon as possible.	N	Comment noted
Support for reduction in journey times	There was support for the view that the Scheme will reduce journey times and improve journey time reliability both for local and long-distance journeys.	N	Comment noted
Wider connectivity	There was support for the view that the Scheme will improve connectivity with the wider motorway network, which will benefit commuters and businesses.	N	Comment noted
Improvements to the A460	There was support for a solution to ongoing issues on the A460 from residents, members of the public and users due to safety and current congestion. Concerns were also raised about future implementation of a weight restriction (7.5T limit) on the current A460 between M54 J1 and M6 J11.	N	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>There would still be a need to retain access to local businesses for HGVs and therefore Highways England does not propose to provide a weight restriction on the existing A460.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions have been held with SCC to include a monitor and manage approach to monitor the situation post-opening of the new link road.</p>
Overall Opposition			
Opposition to the	Respondee opposed to the principle of the	N	The need for a new link road between the M54 and the M6 /

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
link road	link road in general and the creation of new roads in the area and a feeling that the scheme is not needed.		<p>Birmingham Northern Relief Road (now known as the M6 Toll) was originally identified in 2001 in the West Midlands Area Multi Modal Study. This study was commissioned to consider the long-term demand for travel in the West Midlands and establish a 30-year framework to deliver an integrated transport system covering all modes of travel, including cycling and walking.</p> <p>A commitment to deliver a link road between the M54 and M6 is included within the Government's first Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020).</p> <p>The main objective of the Scheme is to transfer high volumes of strategic traffic onto the new link road and reduce delays on the local road network.</p>
Opposition to the proposed route	There was opposition to the route proposed and expressions for alternative routes to be re-considered. A number of solutions were provided, including 'Option C', a route through the Hilton Services, a shorter slip and a solution over the existing Junction 11.	N	<p>Highways England have undertaken a detailed appraisal of route options, including two phases of non-statutory consultation on evolving route options. Further detail of this is provided in Chapter 2 of this report and Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>We believe the Scheme provides the optimum route and design which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limits the loss of ancient woodland, veteran trees and ecological habitat losses; - balances the impact on sensitive residential areas from operational noise with a need to protect the historic

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			character of the area; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides the highest level of congestion relief for the A460 (and benefits in terms of noise reductions and reduced vehicles emissions for properties closest to the A460 Cannock Road), whilst maintaining good local connectivity; provides the best journey time and the highest benefit to the local economy; and responds to consultation feedback in terms of alignment, design and mitigation to provide a balance between the Scheme objectives and environmental, social and economic impacts.
Benefits for local communities			
Reduction of congestion on the existing A460	There is a strong feeling that the Scheme will reduce the volume of traffic and congestion on the current A460. This will benefit local communities, in particular Featherstone, Shareshill and Hilton.	N	Comment noted.
Improve quality of life for local residents	There is a feeling that this Scheme will improve quality of life for those living locally by reducing the number of HGVs passing properties and alleviate safety concerns, improve access and connectivity whilst keeping travel times consistent.	N	Comment noted.
Separation of local and strategic traffic	The Scheme will help to relieve congestion around local roads including the A460, A449 and A5, separate local and strategic traffic on	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the current network.		
Access to Shareshill	The Scheme will provide benefits for access to/from Shareshill Village as a result of improved traffic flows on the A460, crossing the A460 from Hilton Lane to Church Road. There was support for a link road to cut down on traffic using Saredon Rd, Mill Land and routes through Shareshill.	N	Comment noted.
Access to Featherstone	The Scheme will provide benefits for access to/from Featherstone Village as a result of improved traffic flows on the A460.	N	Comment noted.
Air quality	Support for cleaner air in the villages as a result of reduced HGV traffic.	N	Comment noted.
Impacts on the local community, landowners and businesses			
Land take	Concern that the land take required for the Scheme is too great and will have an impact on the character of the local area.	N	<p>Highways England has sought to minimise permanent land take required by the proposed new link road. Design development has continued since statutory consultation and land take required has been reviewed and where possible reduced, in part as a result of feedback received.</p> <p>Highways England is only able to acquire land for the purposes of this Scheme, if there is a compelling case to do so. More detail is now available on the land requirements of each plot and this information has been provided to the affected landowners as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Impact on local businesses	Concern over the potential adverse impact of the Scheme on local businesses with specific reference to businesses in Featherstone and the fishing ponds. There is a concern that local facilities, pubs, petrol station and shops will close due to a lack of passing trade and concerns whether compensation will be paid due to loss of trade.	N	<p>Highways England have a statutory duty to maintain, upgrade and develop the road network, for the safety of all road users. While we understand that businesses will have concerns over potential impacts, as a publicly funded body we are not able to pay compensation for disruption, costs or loss of business caused by our works. We will continue to engage with affected business owners. A Community Liaison Officer, dedicated phone line and website will be available throughout construction to act as a point of contact for businesses and residents.</p> <p>More information on compensation for business owners and occupiers can be found here:</p> <p>Compensation to Business Owners and Occupiers - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/compulsory-purchase-and-compensation-booklet-2-compensation-to-business-owners-and-occupiers</p>
Impact on property prices	Concerns from the local community that the Scheme would impact on the prices of properties in the area.	N	<p>Large scale or major public works near a property have the potential to reduce its value, making it difficult to sell at market rate. However, these works can also have a positive impact on property prices, through improving transport links and connectivity.</p> <p>There may be situations where owners have a pressing need to sell their property and are unable to do so except at a significant loss as a result of our road Scheme. While we are under no obligation to purchase these properties, Parliament has given us the ability to purchase properties using discretionary powers in the following sections of the Highways Act 1980.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>For further information on the discretionary purchase process, you can find the following guide online:</p> <p>Your Property and Discretionary Purchase - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/your-property-and-discretionary-purchase</p>
Impact on land owners	Concern that the impact to land owners is excessive and the future viability for remaining land parcels.	N	Highways England acknowledges that there will be impact on individuals' land and property as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme. Conversations are ongoing with the affected landowners to discuss individual concerns and compensation as appropriate.
Local travel	Concerns that the Scheme will lead to an increase in journey times for residents making local journeys in between villages and the associated petrol cost.	N	The Scheme will significantly reduce traffic on the local road network. Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shareshill, the number of HGV movements along the existing A460 is forecast to reduce significantly (26,000 vehicles per day [3,300 HGV] to approximately 3,000 vehicles per day [650 HGV per day]). This is likely to significantly reduce journey times for local journeys.
Isolation impacts and village identity	Opposition to further building near the Featherstone area and opposition to villages being in close proximity to several motorways, making them feel 'surrounded' and affecting the distinct identity of these villages.	N	The Scheme will significantly reduce traffic on the local road network, from over 26,000 vehicles per day on the existing A460 to approximately 3,000 vehicles per day. This will result in traffic being routed further away from the villages in the Featherstone area and this would result in a reduction of severance between the local villages of Featherstone, Shareshill, Hilton and Laney Green caused by high flows of congested traffic along the A460 Cannock Road. The reduction in traffic will also allow easier access for WCH and vehicles users to shared community facilities.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Agricultural Land	Concerns over the loss of agricultural land and the feeling of increased importance on local food production.	N	An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey has been undertaken to determine the ALC and soil resources within the Scheme boundary and is reported in Environmental Statement Appendix 9.2 [TR010054/APP/6.3]. Areas of lower quality agricultural land have been used in preference to areas of higher quality land, but unfortunately the location of the Scheme means that loss of agricultural land is unavoidable. Where areas are subject to temporary use and where possible, soils will be removed and replaced to minimise impacts after the construction period.
Little Saredon	Respondee raised concerns for the current use of local roads by HGVs, in particular quarry traffic and large delivery lorries coming through the hamlet of Little Saredon and the possibility of this being made worse by the proposed closure of Mill Lane.	Y	Access will be maintained as Mill Lane will be kept open. The design has been updated to reflect this.
Access from the post office to the M54	Direct footpath still needed from post office to M54.	N	As part of the Scheme it is proposed to provide a new edge of carriageway footway/cycleway between Featherstone and the A460 to the south of the M54 to retain current linkages for Non Motorised Users. Further details are provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7]
Impact on car boot sale sites	Queries relating to the fields currently used for car boot sales.	N	Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Environmental impacts and proposed mitigation			
Support for proposed mitigation	Respondee noted support for the general mitigation approach and that the impacts had been considered fairly	N	Comment noted.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Opposition to the general impact on the environment	Opposition to the Scheme based on the impact it will have on the environment. Concern that no amount of mitigation will offset the impacts of the scheme on the environment and the rural area	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the effects of the Scheme during construction and operation has been undertaken and is reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Through the processes of option identification and selection, iterative design-development and detailed assessment, the approach has been to apply a hierarchy of avoiding/mitigating/compensating effects wherever possible. Where effects are unavoidable, the approach to mitigation has focused on integrating measures into the design to reduce effects, with compensatory measures proposed only where other solutions would not be effective. The resulting landscape and environmental design seeks to deliver no net loss to biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement in [TR010054/APP/6.2]) and described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>
Green Belt	Consideration to local green sites and the effect of the Scheme on the green belt and the wider countryside	N	<p>Section 8.6, Chapter 8 of the Case for the Scheme [TR010054/APP/7.2] presents the assessment of the impact of the Scheme on the Green Belt. Given that the area between the M54 Junction 1 and the M6 Junction 11 is almost exclusively Green Belt, the Scheme could not be constructed without affecting the Green Belt. The Scheme proposed would result in the loss of a smaller area of Green Belt than alternative route options that, for example, followed the M6 more closely.</p>
Ancient woodland	Concern relating to the loss of woodland in the	N	Highways England recognise the value of ancient woodland within

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
and woodland planting	area. Requests for the proposed woodland planting to be fulfilled, double the amount of trees to be replanted as are cut down and mature trees to be planted.		<p>the development of the design and have sought to minimise its loss. Through careful option selection and design the Scheme avoids any direct loss of ancient woodland listed on the Ancient Woodland Inventory.</p> <p>However, the Scheme would result in the direct loss of a small area of ancient woodland within Brookfields Farm Site of Biological Importance and 'indirect' loss through development within the 15 m buffer area around Whitgreaves Wood and Brookfields Farm Site of Biological Importance.</p> <p>The total direct loss of ancient woodland is 0.0015 hectares and the total loss including indirect loss would be 0.32 hectares.</p> <p>A buffer of 15m from construction activities has been included in the calculation for the loss of ancient woodland Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>An assessment of impacts on woodland and ancient woodland is reported in the Environmental Statement. Mitigation and compensation measures are described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] and illustrated on the Environmental Masterplans Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2], these measures have been discussed and agreed with Natural England. Loss of ancient woodland is being compensated for at a ratio of 7:1.</p> <p>An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Appendix 7.1 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3]) has been undertaken to understand the impact of the Scheme on trees and</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>areas of woodland.</p> <p>Compensation measures are reported in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1], these measures are in addition to measures which seek to achieve no net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects of construction and operational lighting is included within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1]. Wherever possible, lighting will be directed away from sensitive habitats, including the woodland edge.</p>
Impact on Ancient Woodland	<p>Concerns were raised over Oxden Leasow/Whitgreave's Wood ASNW, recorded on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory, bordering the M54. Concern was raised over root protection areas for boundary trees and assurance that the Scheme does not encroach further on the ancient woodland or cause damage to the delicate root systems.</p> <p>There were also concerns over the protection of woodland during construction, particularly from light pollution on the woodland edge and the need to retain a barrier to protect the woodland from dust.</p>	N	<p>Highways England have been engaging with Natural England and the National Trust to refine our proposals and the construction areas required in the location around Whitgreaves Wood / Oxden Leasow Wood. As a result of these discussions and further design development we have extended the Order limits to the south of the M54 to include Whitgreaves Wood as a temporary land acquisition so that improvements can be made to the ancient woodland as part of the strategy to compensate for the impact of the Scheme on ancient woodland elsewhere. We will continue to discuss the proposed improvements with the National Trust to agree the nature of the works. No works beyond ancient woodland improvements are proposed in this area.</p> <p>We do not propose to remove any of the Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland for construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects of construction and operational lighting is included within the Environmental Statement</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>[TR010054/APP/6.1]. Wherever possible, lighting will be directed away from sensitive habitats, including the woodland edge.</p> <p>The air quality assessment has identified the level of dust mitigation required to control emissions to the extent that there will not be a significant effect. These measures are listed in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>
Impact on local wildlife, ecology and biodiversity	Concerns over the scale of the impact on ponds, wildlife, ecology and biodiversity. Concerns over the impact of the Scheme on specific species such as bats.	N	<p>As shown on the Environmental Masterplan Figures 2.1 to 2.7 [TR010054/APP/6.2], mammal tunnels have been provided at several locations along the Scheme length in order to ensure connectivity to the wider landscape once the Scheme is operational.</p> <p>Extensive surveys have been undertaken to assess potential impacts on species and habitats including bats, badgers, great crested newts, otters, water vole, birds, reptiles, invertebrates and aquatic species. The methodologies and results of these surveys are provided in the appendices to Chapter 8 in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3]</p>
Impact on Barn Owls	Concerns were raised over the negative impact of the Scheme on barn owls in the area.	N	<p>Comment noted. Barn owl surveys have been completed, the results of which are appended to the Environmental Statement (confidential Appendix 8.6 [TR010054/APP/6.3]. An assessment of impacts on barn owl has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, the results of which are reported in the Environmental Statement. As shown on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1-2.1 [TR010054/APP/6.2], planting is proposed alongside the road throughout a large part of the Scheme to minimise the potential for road collisions.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Further mitigation	Proposals require further assessment and consideration with more mitigation measures. This included specific request such as earth bunds to feature wild flowers.	N	<p>A detailed assessment of the effects of the Scheme during construction and operation has been undertaken and is reported in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Through the processes of option identification and selection, iterative design-development and detailed assessment, the approach has been to apply a hierarchy of avoiding/mitigating/compensating effects wherever possible. Where effects are unavoidable, the approach to mitigation has focused on integrating measures into the design to reduce effects, with compensatory measures proposed only where other solutions would not be effective. The resulting landscape and environmental design seeks to deliver no net loss to biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement in [TR010054/APP/6.2]) and described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>
Mitigation targets	Concerns about biodiversity mitigation timescales and targets and whether these can be met.	N	<p>A biodiversity metric calculation has been undertaken based on the method published by Defra in Biodiversity Offsetting Pilots Technical Paper: the metric for the biodiversity offsetting pilot in England (Defra, 2012), to determine effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>In July 2019 DEFRA published Net Gain: Summary of responses and government response to consultation on the objectives of net gain policy. The document was clear that consultation proposals for a mandatory requirement for net gain did not include nationally significant infrastructure projects because they have 'fundamentally different characteristics to other development types'.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>In addition, it should be noted that Highways England is seeking to acquire the majority of the land required for the Scheme through compulsory acquisition. In order to secure those powers, Highways England must demonstrate that the land subject to compulsory acquisition is required for the Scheme or is required to facilitate or is incidental to the Scheme (section 122 of the Planning Act 2008). This means that, whilst land required to mitigate the impact of the Scheme can be secured through compulsory acquisition, such powers do not extend to the acquisition of land for enhancement or gain.</p> <p>Highways England is nonetheless seeking to fully mitigate the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity so far as possible and seeks to deliver a Scheme that results in no net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>The results of the biodiversity metric calculations are provided in Appendix 8.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].</p>
Landscape restoration	Comments related to opportunities for landscape restoration and enhancement and how this had been considered.	N	The Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.2]) demonstrates an integrated approach to mitigating the adverse effects of the Scheme, balancing ecological, landscaping, historic landscape and access requirements.
Hilton Hall	Respondee requested further opportunities to minimise impacts to Hilton Hall historic site and its landscape and parkland	Y	The Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] contains an assessment of the impact on existing vegetation from an ecological and visual perspective and also in terms of the impacts on the Hilton Park Historic Landscape and the loss of any key features within this. Highways England note that the historic landscape has already

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			been compromised to a degree by the M6 and M54. A brief historic development of the park and an assessment of its significance is included in Appendix 6.5 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Moseley Old Hall	Concerns over any impact to the historic sites and parkland at Moseley Old Hall.	N	<p>Comment noted. Moseley Old Hall is not directly impacted by the Scheme, however, it is acknowledged that many visitors reach Moseley Old Hall via the M54 Junction 1 roundabout and therefore there may be impacts to journeys whilst the junction improvements are being constructed. The Traffic Management Plan [TR010054/APP/7.5] sets out how traffic is to be managed during construction to minimise disruption to road users. Highways England will continue to work with the relevant local authorities and other stakeholders (including the National Trust, who manage Moseley Old Hall) to help manage traffic during the construction of the link road.</p> <p>In line with DMRB methodology, all statutorily designated sites that have been identified within 200m of the affected road network (ARN) as identified through traffic modelling have been included in the air quality assessment. Details of the impacts of the assessment are provided in the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Community Health	Concern over local residents' quality of life and health as a result of increased noise and air pollution from a new road in the area.	N	<p>The Environmental Statement considers the sensitivity of communities and population as part of the assessment of impacts on Human Health. Consideration has been given to vulnerable or disadvantaged populations within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>Based on the assessment to date, we have not identified there to be</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			a significant effect on air quality as a result of the Scheme. Significant effects as a result of noise are likely to be localised. Highways England are looking to reduce noise effects to a minimum in line with the National Policy Statement for National Networks. Any significant effects, adverse and beneficial are reported within Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].
Care for the existing environment	Concern over the consideration of existing features such as the stone wall and mature trees along the A460 through Featherstone.	N	It is proposed to retain as much of the existing trees and wall adjacent to the existing A460 through Featherstone as possible. Highways England is continuing to engage with the local authority and parish councils to discuss the details of works required to remove sections of these existing features.
Local flooding	Concerns over flooding, the affect the scheme may have on groundwater and increased flooding in the area. Concern as to whether due regard has been taken for surface water drainage that goes to soakaways, rather than drainage.	N	<p>A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been undertaken to understand any change in flood risk which may occur as a result of the Scheme, including a 100 year storm plus 50% climate change allowance.</p> <p>The FRA has assessed flood risk in the area from all sources, including groundwater. Several iterations of Scheme design have been explored to understand if betterment is achievable within the scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme design retains and restores natural processes for the affected watercourses as far as possible. Discussions have been undertaken with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the drainage strategy proposals and the preliminary design of structures.</p> <p>The Latherford Brook crossing has a small localised benefit to the downstream areas of flood risk. However these impacts are limited to within the immediate vicinity of the crossing. Any additional works</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			to improve flood risk downstream to the River Penk and Featherstone Brook would be outside of the Order limits and therefore not included in the scope. Tree planting has been included upstream of the crossing, which will expand the existing forest in this area and also slow/reduce surface water flows. Additional storage areas were not considered to be required, given the low impact on receptors in the area.
The positioning of balancing ponds	Concerns were raised regarding the location of the balancing ponds and whether these could be moved further away from residential properties.	N	<p>Balancing ponds are required to reduce the impact of road drainage on the water environment and will be owned and maintained by Highways England.</p> <p>Ponds are required at specific locations to minimise flood risk to the wider area and the Scheme and these have been identified in suitable locations to sustainably manage water, whilst providing some ecological benefit and minimising the need to change landform.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with affected landowners around the orientations of ponds and will continue through design development.</p>
Impact on horses and riders	Concern that horses are susceptible to vibrations and sudden noises and this needs to be allowed for in the construction phase. There was also concern raised around the PRoW being fulling recorded on the definitive map and for further engagement with the British Horse Society around information on tolerance of horses for bridges and tunnels and provision	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period. These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p> <p>From discussions with Staffordshire County Council, we understand that the definitive map includes all Public Rights of Way within the</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	for screening and horse lorries in the design.		<p>Scheme boundary.</p> <p>Engagement will be undertaken with the British Horse Society during the detailed design stage.</p>
Construction			
General construction disruption	Local residents expressed view that they wish disruption to be minimised as much as possible during the construction period.	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period. These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p> <p>Highways England will work with local businesses to minimise the impact of construction works.</p> <p>A Community Liaison Officer, dedicated phone line and website will be available throughout construction to act as a point of contact for businesses and residents.</p>
Noise impacts during construction	Concern over potential noise impacts during construction, particularly for properties close to the proposed link road	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period. These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11].</p>
Air quality impacts during construction	Concern over potential air pollution during construction, particularly for properties close to the proposed link road	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR10054/APP/6.11].
Traffic disruption during construction	Concern over traffic disruption during construction and impact of delays and closures on businesses	N	<p>Highways England will work with local businesses to minimise the impact of construction works.</p> <p>A Community Liaison Officer, dedicated phone line and website will be available throughout construction to act as a point of contact for businesses and residents.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan [TR010054/APP/7.5] outlines initial proposals for traffic movements during construction. This will be further developed through consultation and design development, prior to construction.</p>
Light pollution from HGVs at night	Concern over light pollution from HGV movements at night	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period.</p> <p>These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan ([TR010054/APP/6.11]. Proposed working hours are:</p> <p>08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday 08:00 -13:00 Saturday</p> <p>There will be up to an hour before and after these times for start-up and close down activities (except Sat at 13:00). These hours are subject to change in consultation with the local authority.</p>
Working hours	Local residents asked if construction be taking	N	Proposed working hours are:

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	place 24/7		<p>08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday 08:00 -13:00 Saturday</p> <p>There will be up to an hour before and after these times for start-up and close down activities (except Sat at 13:00). These hours are subject to change in consultation with the local authority.</p>
Traffic management	Local residents asked for a coordinated approach to traffic management required during construction period	N	<p>Comment noted. The Traffic Management Plan [TR0010054/APP/7.5] sets out how traffic is to be managed during construction to minimise disruption to road users. Highways England will continue to work with the relevant local authorities and other stakeholders to help manage traffic during the construction of the link road.</p>
Temporary impacts on PRow	Further information on the temporary and permanent changes to public footpaths and Public Rights of Way (PRow)	N	<p>Highways England will endeavour to ensure all temporary and permanent alternative PRow routes are open prior to any closures. This will be confirmed through discussions between the construction contractor and Staffordshire County Council prior to construction.</p>
Position of site compounds	Concerns were raised over the impact of construction noise, light pollution and dust from the site compound impacting on quality of life for residents	N	<p>Once the compound sites are established, work within the two compound areas will be limited to vehicle movements within the working hours.</p> <p>Proposed working hours are:</p> <p>08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday 08:00 -13:00 Saturday</p> <p>There will be up to an hour before and after these times for start-up and close down activities (except Sat at 13:00). These hours are</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			subject to change in consultation with the local authority.
Design			
Free flow design	There is strong concern about the design for M6 Junction 11 and a lack of a free flow link from the M54 to the M6. There is a view that the current design will lead to congestion and delays and will therefore not solve the overall problem	N	The existing Junction 11 suffers from heavy congestion and concerns were raised that this will continue to be a problem after the Scheme is built. The Scheme includes proposals to provide a larger junction to accommodate the forecast traffic flows which will alleviate the problem significantly. Provision of a free flow link is not required to achieve effective flow of traffic around this junction. Free flow links would increase the land take, environmental impacts and cost of the Scheme so would not be a proportional design in the context of a junction that works effectively without those links.
Redesign of Junction 11	There is support for an enlarged Junction 11 to cope with extra traffic and a view that improvements at this junction are needed	N	<p>The design of the junction was informed by the forecast 2039 traffic flows. The proposed design aims to meet the needs of all road users and be as 'future proof' as possible.</p> <p>Traffic flows in the area indicate that a high proportion of link road traffic is travelling in an east-west direction, with a relatively low volume of traffic looking to travel north on the M6.</p> <p>Traffic modelling was used to assess the signal operation and junction performance. This modelling indicates that the roundabout is functioning within its operational capacity at all peak times using predicted 2039 flows, with no significant queuing on the approaches.</p>
M6 Toll connectivity	There is a view that the Scheme should include a direct link to the M6 Toll or that this should be future proofed in the design	N	A direct connection to M6 Toll is outside the scope of the Scheme. The Scheme design does not prevent the construction of a free flow link to the M6 Toll in future.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
M54 Junction 1 Roundabout	Concerns were raised that the proposed roundabout at M54 Junction 1 will cause congestion and delays and that the complex design may confuse motorists	N	<p>The link road will significantly reduce the amount of traffic using the local network. The layout has been designed to allow for the predicted flows using this route.</p> <p>The junction will be designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard. It is accepted that some people have concerns that the junction appears to be complex in form, however the roundabouts will be similar in nature to all other roundabouts on the road network and will be relatively simple to navigate. Signing will be provided to assist drivers with route finding. The layout has undergone a Road Safety Audit which has highlighted no safety concerns with the operation of this junction.</p>
M6 Junction 11 Roundabout	Safety concerns were raised with regards to the M6 Junction 11 roundabout, that it is too large and complex, leading to driver confusion	N	<p>M6 Junction 11 has been designed to comply with DMRB standards.</p> <p>It is accepted that some people have concerns that the junction appears to be complex in form, however clear white lining and signage, including a number of overhead gantries, will be provided to assist with navigation of the junction. The layout has undergone a Road Safety Audit which has highlighted no safety concerns with the operation of this junction.</p>
Land take for Junction 11	Concern that too much land take is required for M6 Junction 11 roundabout	N	<p>A detailed appraisal of options for M6 Junction 11 has been undertaken. Further details can be found in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>The extent of land take is the required to provide an improved junction layout with sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast flows. In Order to construct the proposed junction with minimal</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			impact on the existing network, alterations have been made to the layout to enable off line construction and minimise disruption to road users during construction.
Public Transport	Comments relating to public transport provision and that this has been considered in the design	N	The impacts of the Scheme on public transport have been considered. The impacts on bus routes are considered to be minimal as reported in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4]
M6 Diesel	Measures are required to facilitate access to and from M6 Diesel from the new link road via M6 Junction 11 only	N	The existing access to M6 Diesel from Cannock Road will be unaffected and therefore there is no need to provide an alternative access to M6 Diesel from M6 Junction 11.
Heights of roundabouts	Concern over the heights of the junctions/roundabouts	N	<p>The improvements at M54 Junction 1 include the provision of two new roundabouts to the north of the M54. The heights of the roundabouts have been reduced through design development since statutory consultation. The eastern roundabout would be approximately 3.9 m above existing ground level. The western roundabout would be approximately 6.2 m above existing ground level.</p> <p>The roundabouts will be screened by retaining the existing planting to the east of the A460 as far as possible and the provision of new planting as indicated on Figure 2.1 to2 .7 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.2].</p>
Signage on M6 Junction 11	Questions were raised regarding provision for new signage on the link road, the existing A460 and village roads to direct local and strategic traffic	N	The new link road will be named the A460 and signing will be provided to direct strategic traffic along the new link between the M54 and M6. The existing A460 is to be reclassified to an un-numbered local road, retaining the name Cannock Road, and appropriate signing changes will be made to indicate the minor

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			nature of this route.
Traffic calming	Requests for traffic calming measures on the A460 between the M6 and M54 roundabouts and speed cameras to be considered to improve safety	N	<p>A primary objective of the Scheme is to transfer strategic traffic away from the local road network onto the Strategic Road Network. The current Scheme proposals are designed to significantly reduce the numbers of HGV vehicles using the local road network.</p> <p>The existing A460 Cannock Road is maintained by the local highway authority, SCC. Therefore, it would be for Staffordshire County Council to determine whether and how any further measures should be implemented along the route following construction of the Scheme by Highways England. However, the reclassification of the road and significant reduction in traffic will make it easier for the local highway authority to implement future changes to Cannock Road if considered appropriate.</p>
Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders (WCHs) – also referred to as non-motorised users (NMUs)			
Walking, Cycling and equestrians	General comments regarding the provision of walking, cycling and equestrian routes. Concern over the lack of provision for walking or cycling shown in design for junctions at M54 or M6	N	<p>Impacts on WCHs have been assessed within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] for construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>The design provides a footway and crossing points along the length of the proposed local roads at the M54 junction, allowing WCH access.</p> <p>A footway and crossing points have been provided to connect the existing A460 at Shareshill with the existing network to the west of the M6. For further details refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].</p>
PRoW connectivity	Concerns over retaining PROW routes impacted by the Scheme	N	Footway access along the length of the existing A460 will be maintained through the new junctions.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			Existing Public Rights of Way that are affected by the Scheme will also be maintained, however, in some cases the routes of these may be altered around the proposed development. For further details, refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Walking route safety	Concerns over the safety of new walking and cycling routes adjacent to the link road, used by school children in the area	N	No walking or cycling routes are to be provided alongside the new link road. Improved footway/cycleway links will be provided alongside the new junction layouts at M54 Junction 1 and M6 Junction 11 to improve safety for walkers and cyclists. For further details, refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Wider connectivity	Concerns over impacts to wider pedestrian and cycle travel routes, including between New Road, Featherstone and Hilton Lane, Cheslyn Hay to Coven and cycling routes to Essington Farm Shop via Hilton Lane and Hilton Green	N	<p>The Scheme proposals ensure that all existing WCH routes are retained. The existing bridleway (Shareshill 1) which is severed by the link is to be diverted across the new accommodation bridge adjacent to Brookfield Farm. Facilities for WCHs are provided at the new M54 Junction 1 layout to retain existing WCH connectivity. The existing M6 Junction 11 has pedestrian routes, however the uncontrolled crossings are considered to deter their use. The improvements involve provision of improved crossing facilities at Junction 11 to enhance WCH provision at this junction and reduce severance.</p> <p>The reduction in traffic along the existing A460 and adjacent local roads will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists travelling between New Road, Featherstone and Hilton Lane. Whilst no specific pedestrian or cyclist improvements are proposed for the local roads between Cheslyn Hay and Coven and between Essington Farm Shop and Hilton Lane, it is expected that the</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			reduction in traffic on these local routes will improve safety. For further details refer to the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7].
Traffic			
Increase in traffic on the A460	Concerns that the proposed link road will lead to additional traffic on the A460 and local roads, particularly when there are issues on the M6 which will negate the expected benefits	N	Traffic modelling indicates that approximately four-in-five vehicles would be removed from the 'bypassed' length of the A460.
HGV movement on the A460	Concerns that traffic will still use A460 particularly HGVs and that a weight limit, use restrictions or traffic calming should be put in place to address this	N	A primary objective of the Scheme is to transfer strategic traffic away from the local road network onto the Strategic Road Network. The current Scheme proposals are designed to significantly reduce the numbers of HGV vehicles using the local road network. The section of the A460 between the M54 and the M6 is maintained by the Local Highway Authority; Staffordshire County Council (SCC). Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shareshill, the number of HGV movements along the existing A460 is forecast to reduce significantly (26,000 vehicles per day [3,300 HGV] to approximately 3,000 vehicles per day [650 HGV per day]). Ongoing discussions have been held with SCC to include a monitor and manage approach to monitor the situation post-opening of the new link road.
Dark Lane, Hilton and Hilton Lane			
Consideration for a route that avoids Dark Lane	Local residents raised queries about whether an alternative route to avoid Dark Lane could be considered and why it needed to be closed	N	Highways England has looked extensively at the options for the alignment of the road in the vicinity of Dark Lane since the statutory consultation.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	as a result of the Scheme		Following an in-depth appraisal of all options, it was concluded that on balance, the alignment proposed during the statutory consultation should be taken forward. Further detail is provided in Section 5.2 of this report, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] and Appendix 3.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Proximity to residential property and loss of privacy	Concern over the proximity of the proposed link road to residential properties in Hilton and requests to move the alignment further away	N	Highways England has looked extensively at the options for the alignment of the road in the vicinity of Dark Lane since the statutory consultation. Following an in-depth appraisal of all options, it was concluded that on balance, the alignment proposed during the statutory consultation should be taken forward. Further detail is provided in Section 5.2 of this report, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] and Appendix 3.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Environmental impacts	Concerns over the specific visual, lighting and air quality impacts to residents on Dark Lane and Hilton Lane	N	The Scheme alignment and environmental mitigation proposals have been developed with careful consideration given to minimising the impact on local residents. For example, the alignment has been moved further from residents as it passes through Dark Lane, enabling retention of a belt of trees to screen the road visually from the nearest properties. A noise barrier has also been proposed in this location, which is effective at minimising the noise impact on properties. The assessment on air quality in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1] demonstrates that no properties will experience air pollution levels above national air quality objective values post construction. The significant reduction in traffic along the A460 will potentially enable future improvements to the road for pedestrians and cyclists, improve the environment

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>around the road and may contribute positively to the identity of these villages along the route.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects of construction and operational lighting is included within the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p>
Noise impacts during construction	Concern over potential noise impacts during construction, specifically for residents on Dark Lane and Hilton Lane	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Scheme to reduce, remediate or compensate for effects during the anticipated three-year construction period. These detailed measures are set out in an Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR10054/APP/6.11].</p> <p>Proposed working hours are:</p> <p>08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday 08:00 -13:00 Saturday</p> <p>There will be up to an hour before and after these times for start-up and close down activities (except Sat at 13:00). These hours are subject to change in consultation with the local authority.</p>
Rat running	Support for the severance of Dark Lane as it is currently used as a cut through during peak times	N	Comment noted.
Access	Concerns over how the closure of Dark Lane will impact through traffic and requests that access is maintained along Hilton Lane both for vehicular and NMUs. Requests for an additional signalised pedestrian crossing at the	N	<p>As part of the Scheme proposals, Hilton Lane will remain open once the Scheme is complete.</p> <p>Access will also be maintained along Hilton Lane throughout the construction phase.</p>

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	bottom of Hilton Lane across the A460 for alleviate current safety issues.		<p>The proposed design includes a new shared pedestrian / cycle link from Hilton lane to Dark lane to provide access.</p> <p>It is not proposed to provide an additional pedestrian crossing across the existing A460, however the significant reduction in traffic will make this route safer for WCHs.</p>
Lowering of the road alignment	Support for lowering the level of the proposed link road at Hilton Lane to minimise impact on local residents	N	Comment noted. At Hilton Lane the link road is in cutting, minimising the impact on the vertical alignment of Hilton Lane.
Use of Hilton Lane	Concerns over the current use of Hilton Lane by HGVs, which is subject to a weight restriction. Respondees queried whether the link road would provide a solution to this.	N	<p>Hilton Lane currently has a weight restriction 'except for access' and it is not proposed to alter this as a result of the Scheme. The existing weight restriction is on a road that is under the authority of Staffordshire County Council.</p> <p>The Scheme will provide an improved route for strategic traffic travelling past the Featherstone area which will significantly reduce the number of vehicles using the existing A460 between M54 Junction 1 and M6 Junction 11 for this purpose.</p>
Traffic lights at Hilton	Concerns that the traffic lights at Hilton are causing delays and queries as to whether replacing these would solve the congestion issue.	N	Congestion on the existing A460 is due to the high volume of vehicles using this route currently and the signalised crossing at Hilton makes this problem worse. The Scheme will significantly reduce traffic along the existing A460 which will result in no congestion under normal conditions, therefore the signals would operate without any impact on congestion of traffic. It is therefore not proposed to replace these signals apart from allowing right turns into Dark Lane.
Noise barrier at	Requests to add/extend noise barrier at end of	N	Following initial noise modelling of the outline Scheme design,

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Dark Lane	Dark Lane before the farm		<p>proposals for potential noise barriers were developed in conjunction with other environmental disciplines to avoid secondary impacts (including, for example, landscape and visual impacts).</p> <p>In response to the comments received during the consultation, and subsequent development of the traffic and noise models, it is proposed to provide a noise barrier on the west side of the main line as it passes close to Dark Lane as indicated on Figure 2.1-2.7 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.2].</p>
Access from Wolverhampton	Questions were raised as to whether the traffic lights will be changed to allow turning into Dark Lane from the Wolverhampton direction. Once Dark Lane is closed at the junction with Hilton Lane, it is perceived that this will be difficult to access.	N	It is proposed to permit right turns into Dark Lane.
Mill Lane			
Support for Mill Lane Closure	Support for the closure of Mill Lane as a result of the Scheme.	N	Comment noted
Opposition to Mill Lane Closure	Concerns that closing Mill Lane will restrict access for local residents and farmers as well as increase journey times. There was also a concern over the impact this closure will have on the car boot sale site and other local roads.	Y	<p>The proposal to close Mill Lane was suggested at the 2017 non-statutory consultation, however feedback following the statutory consultation has indicated concerns that the closure of Mill Lane would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact on local businesses that use Mill Lane for access (particularly by HGVs); - result in large vehicles that are currently using Mill Lane travelling along narrow roads though Shareshill; and - increase the potential for fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour.

Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>Following consideration of this feedback Highways England has changed the Scheme design to retain the connection between Mill Lane and the existing A460.</p> <p>Highways England is proposing to permanently acquire the land used for the car boot sale at Mill Lane. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses for all plots, including the one used for the car boot sale, is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>
WCH Access	Access for pedestrians and cyclists should be retained on Mill Lane.	Y	Access will be maintained as Mill Lane will be kept open. The design has been updated to reflect this.
Farm access	Concerns over access being maintained for farm machinery going to/from Junction 11.	Y	Access will be maintained as Mill Lane will be kept open. The design has been updated to reflect this.
Anti-Social behaviour	Concern over unauthorised access to the land, anti-social behaviour and fly tipping as a result of Mill Lane being stopped up.	Y	Access will be maintained as Mill Lane will be kept open. The design has been updated to reflect this.
Mitigation on Mill Lane	Support for additional tree planting as a result of the Scheme and any mitigation that will help to screen local residents from the new link road and reduce noise and pollution.	Y	The provision of mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse environmental impacts has been informed and further developed by the environmental assessment reported in the Environmental Statement. Mitigation measures are illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.1 to 2.7 of the Environmental Statement in [TR010054/APP/6.2]) and described in the Outline Environmental Management Plan, [TR010054/APP/6.11].

Annex P (Part 2)

Tables evidencing regard had to further consultation responses (in accordance with s49 of the Planning Act 2008)

The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to Highways England's non statutory supplementary consultation and additional consultation with additional newly identified land interests in accordance with s49 of PA 2008.

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
General	Historic England does not have any additional comments in response to these changes to the Draft Order.	Historic England	N	Comment noted.
General	We have reviewed the documents and we have no specific comments to make.	Natural England	N	Comment noted.
Access and assurance of existing assets	SSW have apparatus in land parcels 6/17p, 6/17r and 6/17s to which we will require access at all times to be maintained. A plan showing our apparatus in this area is attached.	South Staffordshire Water (SSW)	Y	Liaison is ongoing through the NRSWA C4 process to agree diversionary works for the link road. Highways England will continue to engage with SSW.
Access and assurance of existing assets	We will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus.	National Grid	N	From the records provided it indicates that a stretch of overhead cables crosses part of the proposed scheme between Junction 1 and Junction 2 of the M54. The span is between pylons ZNB001A and ZNB001.

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET's & NGG's apparatus, both will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights</p> <p>National Grid infrastructure within / in close proximity to the revised order boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Electricity Transmission: National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) has two high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines and a substation within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits. The overhead lines and substation form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. - Overhead Lines: ZNB (275kV) Overhead Line Route Bushbury to Drakelow and ZN (400kV) Overhead Line Route Bushbury to Drakelow 			<p>For clarity: the stretch of M54 from the Junction 1 slip roads up to and including Junction 2 of the M54 has been incorporated in the scheme for the finalisation of the positioning and form of the signage and gantry requirements for the scheme.</p> <p>The proposals for positioning of the signage and gantries in proximity of the National Grid service are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of existing ADS signs between Junction 2 and Junction 1 (the closest ADS approx. 50m to the east of the service) • Addition of new ADS sign located approx. 35m to the west of the service. • Addition of new ADS cantilever gantry approx. 350m to the east of the service. <p>At this stage in design the design of the signage is indicative only and there is suitable flexibility in the design to ensure that signs can be located away from any existing apparatus therefore it is anticipated that there will be no impact on the networks at this location.</p> <p>Further discussions will be had with National Grid</p>

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses:	Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>- Substation: Bushbury 275kV Substation</p> <p>In our response dated 27th June 2019 we provided information about the protection of our assets and requirements for working in close proximity to our apparatus. Those requirements remain and should be read in conjunction with this response.</p> <p>Whilst we have no comments to make on the revisions made to the design of the scheme or changes to the land required, other than those above and in our letter dated 27 June 2019, we have reviewed the excerpts from the Land Interest Schedule and the Land Plans forwarded to us.</p> <p>National Grid has no gas transmission assets in proximity to this proposed scheme. All references to National Grid Gas assets and rights are most likely to be referring to gas distribution</p>			<p>through the detailed design once the height of any new proposed signage is known to ensure suitable clearance for any overhead apparatus and determination of exclusion zones required during construction to satisfy National Grid that there will be no impact or risk to the electrical services in this area.</p>

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees

Topic Area and Consultation Responses:		Prescribed Consultee(s):	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>assets which, for this area, are now with Cadent Gas.</p> <p>List of assets and deeds provided that do not belong to National Grid. Suggest contacting Western Power Distribution and Cadent, and isn't of deeds that cannot be located so request HE provide.</p>			

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
General				
General	<p>Thank you for consulting Staffordshire County Council on the M54-M6 link road scheme. We acknowledge that the consultation is non-statutory, but it is helpful to understand the reasons</p>	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	for the amendments to the Order Limits at this stage.			
General	The remaining changes we acknowledge as being necessary and have no further comment to make.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
General	We will continue our on-going dialogue during this pre-application stage.	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted.
Changes to Order limits				
Changes to Order limits	In relation to the specific changes to the Order Limits we fully support the inclusion of the full length of the A460 between the two motorway junctions. We understand that the new road is likely to take the name of A460 so that existing signage can remain in situ, which we are comfortable with. As a result, the existing A460 will need to be re-named. In order to achieve the objectives of the scheme to their greatest extent the current A460 will need to be re-classified as stated and potentially subject to further Traffic Regulation Order/s to ensure that strategic traffic, in particular HCV's, are kept to the new road at all times	Staffordshire County Council	N	Comment noted. It is proposed to name the new link road the A460 and amend the classification of the existing A460 between M54 J1 and M6 Junction 11 as indicated on the Classification of Roads Plans [TR010054/APP/2.9]. The future classification of the current A460 will be discussed further with Staffordshire County Council.

Supplementary consultation carried out with regard to s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities					
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)	
	and during times of closure diverted via the A5 and A449 trunk roads to connect between the M54 and M6.				

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land					
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)	
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The Environmental plan dated 8th November 2019 (After our site meeting) now shows our land you wish to acquire with some trees but majority being grassland. If you are thinking of taking the land for the environmental aspect of	W8	N	Comment noted. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting across the scheme is significant and the proposed area is required to mitigate for the	

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>the motorway. You have already taken massive of acres of verges, embankment, ecology ponds and agricultural land. In response to this consultation we would like to know the outcome and would strongly like to put our point across about retaining the land. As we feel there is no need for you to take the land if it is only going to be taken for grassland.</p> <p>All our above comments still arise we do believe we have been misled and think it is inexcusable to take this land for no reason. We strongly disagree with you taking the land from us and cannot see on what boundaries you have to take it.</p>			<p>loss of habitat, including the loss of grassland areas. The proposed areas of species rich grassland would be managed to replicate the benefits of hay meadow management.</p> <p>Highways England is only able to acquire land for the purposes of this Scheme, if there is a compelling case in the public interest to do so. More detail is now available on the land requirements of each plot and this information has been provided to the affected landowners as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner with the view to returning the land to original ownership, subject to agreement.</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The Tower House Farm land which you wish to take for trees would be the only flat land we are left with on the Farm. We don't	W8	N	Highways England acknowledge the landowner's concern regarding the use of land at Tower House Farm and Mill Lane and that the scheme design has developed in these

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>have issue with a tree belt along the side of the motorway but the hole field to be taken is sheer madness! As you are taking half the holding all ready.</p> <p>As for the land at Mill Lane we had agreed to a site compound but to take the fields for trees afterwards will not serve any purpose what so ever. It does appear to us, ourselves and our adjoining neighbour that we do seem to be taking the blunt of all the tree planting if this goes ahead - all there needs to be is a screen. Maybe someone is using the motorway legislations for another reason and that is not acceptable. Another point is the cost of the land and tree planting seems outrageous. We do question whether the acquisition of this land for tree planting is permissible with in the compulsory purchase Act. As we believe it is not essential for</p>			<p>areas since initial conversations with the landowner. During construction of the link road, this area of land will contain a construction compound and therefore be cleared of vegetation. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting across the scheme is significant and the proposed area in question is adjacent to the habitat loss and therefore appropriately located for ecological mitigation.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the Motorway.			
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Another concern of ours is if the land is taken out of private ownership and is planted with trees. These areas of land will become a potential nuisance area attracting Scrambling and Quad biking and this will cause great disturbance for the local residents of Featherstone, Hilton, Shareshill and Saredon.	W8	N	Highways England acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the changes in land ownership as a result of the scheme. It is anticipated that all mitigation areas, created as a result of the construction of the link road, will be fenced off to prevent unauthorised access.
Use of land for environmental mitigation	The National Trust welcomes the removal of land in its ownership from the area which is proposed to be permanently acquired. The Updated Land Plan and Land Interest Schedule show National Trust land in parcels 3/7a, 3/7b,	National Trust	N	Comment noted. Whitgreaves Wood has now been included in the Order limits and the key for the Environmental Masterplan has been updated to make this clearer. This area has been included so that improvements can be made to the ancient woodland to compensate for the impact of the link road on ancient woodland elsewhere. No works beyond ancient woodland improvements are proposed in this area. Engagement has been ongoing with the

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>3/7c and 4/2 as land to be temporarily used. The Schedule does not identify the purposes of, or limits to, temporary use of our land. We have had regard to the Draft Environmental Masterplan (revision P09 dated 08.11.2019) but the shading used for the land at Oxden Leasow / Whitgreaves Wood is not explained in the key for figure 2.1, figure 2.2 or figure 2.7 of the Draft Environmental Masterplan. From previous discussions we understand that the intention is for Highways England to have temporary use of this area for the purposes of enhancing the Ancient Woodland habitat which it contains.</p> <p>The National Trust agrees in principle to the temporary use of</p>			<p>National Trust to discuss these improvements and agree the nature of the works. These conversations will continue as through design development.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	land in its ownership for the enhancement of the existing Ancient Woodland it owns and for the enhancement of the adjoining area of woodland. The Trust also agrees in principle to access being obtained through its land to carry out these enhancement works. The Trust does not agree to temporary use of its land for other purposes.			
Use of land for environmental mitigation	On 28 October, you proposed a meeting to discuss the Proposed DCO and to consider revised plans you were putting forward for consultation between 11th November and 11th December 2019. Allow received the revised plans direct on 9 November 2019 leaving no time for discussion prior to the meeting on 11 November 2019.	Allow Ltd	N	Comment noted. Each plot is required to construct the link road, undertake utilities diversions or provide essential mitigation, use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting is significant and the proposed area is adjacent to the habitat loss and located to appropriately deliver areas of ecological

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>Your revised plans do not take into account Allow's objection nor do they take into consideration the offer of alternative land put forward at the meeting on 28 August 2019 (for the sale of plot 4/9g save for that part of plot 4/9g to the north of The Shrubbery on the basis that plots 4/9b, 4/14, 4/9d, 4/9e and 4/9f were removed from the DCO and in the event that you establish a need for woodland planting, Allow would be prepared to enter into negotiations to permit planting to take place on land to the east of the proposed alignment), and set out in the Letter of Objection. The revised plans indicate proposals to take slightly less land from plot number 5/4 (formerly 4/9g). However the revised plans continue to include the land to the frontage of The Shrubbery which at the meeting you accepted would have a detrimental impact on the</p>			<p>mitigation.</p> <p>The mitigation proposed includes the provision of replacement habitat, screening for residential properties, replacement planting for the loss of part of Lower Pool Site of Biological Importance, measures to avoid and reduce potential construction impacts on bats and great crested newts as well as planting to help integrate the Scheme into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation to the east of the Link Road has been considered. However, woodland planting cannot be undertaken at this location as this would result in further adverse impacts on Hilton Park historic parkland, degrading the setting of historic listed buildings. Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner through design development to minimise impact on The Shrubbery as far as</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>residential use of The Shrubbery and you were unable to provide any justification for the acquisition of that part of plot 5/4 (formerly 4/9g). The revised plans also continue to include plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20f.</p> <p>Allow continues to object to the proposal to acquire all the land shown on the plans in which it has an interest. Your revised plans indicate that the majority of plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20g are to be acquired for proposed woodland, proposed species rich grassland, the creation of ecology ponds and the creation of marsh and wet grassland. The land shown for proposed woodland, proposed species rich grassland, ecology ponds and proposed marsh and wet grassland is: not required for the development to which the</p>			reasonably practicable.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>development consent relates, namely the construction of a highway; and not required to facilitate or is incidental to the construction of the highway. There is no compelling case in the public interest to justify acquisition of plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20g. There is no compelling case to establish that such planting and/or provision of ecology ponds and grassland should take place on plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20g. In the event that you are able to establish a case for woodland/tree planting or the creation of ecology ponds and grassland in the Hilton Park estate area, our client is willing to enter into negotiations to permit such planting and/or the creation of ecology ponds and/or grassland on land to the east of the proposed route alignment.</p>			

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>Allow have no 'in principle' objection to the proposed highway scheme, However it objects, to the proposal to acquire its land (identified in plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20g) for the purposes identified in the draft Environmental Masterplan Keyplan dated 8 November 2019. There is no justification for taking their land for that purpose. In the event that it is established that there is a justification for woodland planting, tree planting, the creation ecology ponds and grassland, Allow is prepared to negotiate with you to permit such planting and/or the creation of ecology ponds and grassland to take place on land to the east of the proposed alignment in its ownership.</p> <p>Allow requests that the proposed DCO proposals are amended to</p>			

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>exclude from the proposed compulsory acquisition powers those parts of plots 5/2, 4/20c and 4/20g shown as being used for woodland and/or tree planting and/or the creation of ecology ponds and/or grassland, and that part of plot 5/4 north west of The Shrubbery. Allow will continue to object to the DCO, and to the taking of all its interests in the land shown on the Proposed DCO plans. Allow is prepared to negotiate with you to sell by agreement land required for the alignment of the proposed highway itself, and, if proved to be necessary, to permit woodland and/or tree planting and/or the creation of ecology ponds and/or grassland on land lying to the east of the proposed route alignment.</p>			
Use of land for environmental	<p>Comments related to the offer of alternative land for environmental mitigation - principally that to the</p>	Allow Ltd	N	<p>Mitigation to the east of the Link Road has been considered. However, woodland planting cannot be undertaken at this location as this</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
mitigation	east of the link road			would result in further adverse impacts on Hilton Park historic parkland, degrading the setting of historic listed buildings. Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner through design development to minimise impact on The Shrubbery as far as reasonably practicable.
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Finally, we are unsure why woodland at plot 6/5 is being included as this additional land take appears excessive.	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. The block of woodland plot 6/5 is understood to be ancient woodland. Only a small proportion of this land is required for the construction of the link road. The remainder of the land parcel would be acquired to maintain and provide enhancements to the ancient woodland. Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner with the view to return the land to original ownership, subject to agreement.</p> <p>The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Environmental Mitigation Our clients raised at the previous consultation that this proposed environmental mitigation is taking a significant amount of Grade 2 arable land out of agricultural production. We have not been provided with a formal justification to demonstrate why this environmental mitigation is required in this area (and also to justify the extent of the land that is required).	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. Essential mitigation in the form of woodland planting is proposed at this location to provide visual screening for the properties on Hilton Lane as well as users of the public right of way to the east. Tree planting adjacent to carriageways is required to facilitate crossing by bats.</p> <p>The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	Proposed Woods to Embankments – We are confused as to your environmental strategy which proposes that the embankments to the new road should be species rich grassland. On the M54 and M6 motorways, the embankments have subsequently been planted to	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. Planting in this area has been considered, however, the steepness of the engineered slopes of embankments and cuttings are not conducive with the successful establishment of planting. This is due to the level of compaction required to stabilise the earthworks. The steepness of these slopes (1:3), have been designed to minimise the footprint of the scheme, but would present</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>create wooded areas. In contrast, your current proposals are to provide wooded areas beyond the embankments, thus increasing the permanent land take required by your proposals. We would therefore propose that the land take is decreased by providing the woods on the embankments which are currently earmarked for 'species rich grassland'. This would ensure that environmental mitigation for the scheme is still provided whilst reducing the land take required (and hence the impact on our clients holding). This approach would also improve the mitigation to reduce the visual impact of the proposals on the surrounding area.</p>			<p>additional health and safety risks during the maintenance of any woodland planting, which must be considered when identifying areas for mitigation across the scheme.</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>Precise boundaries of the permanent land take – Your permanent and temporary land take as currently proposed would leave awkward field boundaries.</p>	W2	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge the concerns raised by the landowner with regard to the usability of their land post construction. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>We propose that these are rationalised or 'rounded off' as highlighted on the attached plan. This would improve the efficiency of the agricultural holding and would also mean that environmental mitigation currently proposed elsewhere could be offset by utilising these areas to provide alternative environmental mitigation.</p>			<p>landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner regarding the potential for minor amendments to the location of essential mitigation, if possible, as the design develops.</p> <p>The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>
Use of land for environmental mitigation	<p>This should be reviewed to reduce the impact on the permanent land take by:</p> <p>a) Upgrading the species rich grassland on the embankments to woodland (as is a common approach throughout the country, and indeed, on the nearby M6 and M54 motorways); and</p>	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. The landscape assessment for the scheme has identified locations requiring planting for visual screening and included planting to reduce visual impacts where ever possible. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting is significant and the proposed area is adjacent to the woodland loss and located to most appropriately achieve ecological mitigation, however species rich grassland also</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>b) Relocating this environmental mitigation to alternative areas in order to reduce the impact of the proposed land take on our holding. We have marked suggested locations on the plan with the number 9. These comprise 'awkward' areas which would be difficult to farm (but could provide areas of environmental mitigation.</p> <p>In particular, this area of mitigation could be reduced by ensuring that appropriate mitigation is provided on both sides of the motorway in this location (as highlighted at O2). This approach would have the added advantage of reducing the visual impact of the proposals when viewed from Shareshill and Saredon, as well as providing</p>			<p>provides biodiversity value and areas of grassland, such as have been identified at this location, have been included in the landscape design.</p> <p>The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	environmental mitigation.			
Certainty of retaining of land used for environmental mitigation post construction	<p>We strongly object to you taking our land on a permanent basis.</p> <p>We have always been open and honest regarding our intentions for our land. All through the consultation period we have stated that we would like to retain any land that would not be used for the road and if you required our land on a temporary basis we would have it back once you have completed your work.</p> <p>The land in question has been in the family for approximately 100 years and as you can understand holds a lot of memories and sentimental value. Our objection had nothing to do with financial gain as we have no intention to sell the land for development regardless of price. It has always been our intention to</p>	W6	N	<p>Comment noted. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. This land is required for essential mitigation in the form of woodland planting to mitigate the loss of habitat as well as woodland lost within Brookfield Farm Site of Biological Importance (SBI). Highways England recognises that the mitigation proposed in this area, mirrors the intentions of the landowner and will continue to engage with the landowner with the view to return the land to original ownership, as much as possible and subject to agreement.</p> <p>The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land			
Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
<p>create sustainable woodland on the site, as a legacy which we can pass onto our daughter and future generations.</p> <p>The project has been put on a 'back burner' awaiting you to decide where the road would be situated. It was our understanding that up until your last correspondence only a small fraction of our land would be needed permanently, the remainder to be part of a temporary site. Therefore it has come as a great shock to us all; to see that you intention is to acquire the whole field permanently even though the road will not even cross our land.</p> <p>Although we as a family share a great interest in wildlife and the countryside and our daughter has</p>			

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>a degree in Zoology/Ecology, any scheme that we undertake will be upon the advice and guidance of professional bodies liaising with her. The Woodland trust offers funding under there 'more woods' scheme, where they will help design our woodland and cover a large proportion of the costs associated with planting the trees. The site already hosts mature oak trees and ancient hedge rows and it was our intention to add to these creating our own woodland. We have frequently raised our concerns regarding removing the trees and hedges from our land and have been assured that every effort will be made to retain as much as possible. We were also considering creating a proportion of the land into a meadow or woodland glade. Coronation Meadows who work in conjunction with charities such as Plantlife and the Wildlife Trust and is supported</p>			

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>by Natural England and the Environmental agency offer a full meadow creation service and advice on management. If it is not viable to combine the two then we intend to convert the entire site into deciduous woodland.</p> <p>The land is only a short walking distance from our property and we frequently visit the site. The site gate is a distance from the turning into Mill Lane and its position has no impact on traffic flow. Please note we do not have any association to the car boot sales held on adjacent land. We cannot see any difference in how the land is used now to what you propose other than it being in your ownership and control. As the funding for the road has been greatly reduced it would not be in your interest to incur further unnecessary costs.</p>			

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Loss of agricultural land	<p>The Tower House Farm land which you wish to take for trees would be the only flat land we are left with on the Farm. We don't have issue with a tree belt along the side of the motorway but the hole field to be taken is sheer madness! As you are taking half the holding all ready.</p> <p>As for the land at Mill Lane we had agreed to a site compound but to take the fields for trees afterwards will not serve any purpose what so ever. It does appear to us, ourselves and our adjoining neighbour that we do seem to be taking the blunt of all the tree planting if this goes ahead - all there needs to be is a screen. Maybe someone is using the motorway legislations for another reason and that is not acceptable. Another point is the cost of the land and tree planting seems outrageous. We do question</p>	W8	N	Highways England acknowledge the landowner's concern regarding the use of land at Tower House Farm and Mill Lane and that the scheme design has developed in these areas since initial conversations with the landowner. During construction of the link road, this area of land will contain a construction compound and therefore be cleared of vegetation. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The total area required for planting across the scheme is significant and the proposed area in question is adjacent to the habitat loss and therefore appropriately located for ecological mitigation.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>whether the acquisition of this land for tree planting is permissible with in the compulsory purchase Act. As we believe it is not essential for the Motorway.</p>			
Use of good quality agricultural land for environmental mitigation	<p>Environmental Mitigation Our clients raised at the previous consultation that this proposed environmental mitigation is taking a significant amount of Grade 2 arable land out of agricultural production. We have not been provided with a formal justification to demonstrate why this environmental mitigation is required in this area (and also to justify the extent of the land that is required).</p>	W2	N	<p>Comment noted. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. This land is required for essential mitigation in the form of woodland planting to mitigate the loss of habitat as well as woodland lost within Brookfield Farm Site of Biological Importance (SBI). Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner regarding the potential for minor amendments to the location of essential mitigation, if possible, as the design develops.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Definition of hedgerow planting	Proposed Hedgerows – We note that along some boundaries, hedgerows are proposed adjacent to our client's land holding along the proposed motorway; however, in other areas they are not. To confirm, hedgerows should be provided along all boundaries of the motorway and our holding, in order to assist in providing effective environmental mitigation and reducing the permanent land take necessary for other environmental mitigation. In addition, as a general comment, all boundaries to our holding should be 'stock proof' and where hedges are incorporated, they should be along roads so that they can be maintained appropriately. We have marked on the attached plan where we believe the approach to hedgerows is deficient.	W2	N	Comment noted. Highways England will continue to engage in further discussions regarding the treatment of field boundaries, as much as possible, as part of the ongoing design development.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Definition of woodland planting	Proposed Woodland – There are two classifications of woodland proposed of LE1 EFB/efd and LE1 EFA. Please can you clarify what the difference is, given that you are proposing both types of proposed woodland adjacent to our retained land.	W2	N	Comment noted. LE2.1 refers to woodland planting. EFA, EFB and EFD refer to the function of the environmental mitigation. EFA denotes the provision of visual screening, EFB indicates that the mitigation is for landscape integration and EFD represents mitigation for the purpose of nature conservation and biodiversity. Therefore LE2.1 EFB/efd is woodland planting for the purpose of landscape integration and nature conservation and biodiversity. LE2.1 EFA is woodland planting for the purpose of visual screening.
Baseline assessments	We asked why water quality tests hadn't been taken in our large lake. No answer.	W11	N	Comment noted. Baseline surveys as part of the Environmental Assessment were undertaken at representative points only across the scheme. Ponds were identified for survey based on potential impact with no impacts predicted to the large fishing pond (part of Brookfield fishery) south of Latherford brook. Sampling has captured each watercourse due to be crossed by the Scheme in addition to three ponds that would be physically impacted by the works. The impact of the scheme on local water quality has been assessed and is reported in the Environmental

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				Statement Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment [TR10054/APP/6.1]. Further monitoring will continue to take place during scheme development.
Baseline assessments	We asked why the sound recording hadn't been taken at the club, most nearest point to the proposed project. No answer	W11	N	Comment noted. Noise monitoring has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Assessment and the results of which are reported in Figure 11.1 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.2]. The noise monitoring is used to develop an understanding of the general noise climate in the vicinity of the scheme, and as part of a validation exercise for the prediction model; it is not used to establish baseline conditions for individual receptors. The traffic noise levels and any subsequent change in the traffic noise levels as a result of the scheme are then predicted using the model. In order to quantify traffic noise, we would normally want to avoid siting monitoring equipment near specific known noise sources which might distort the numeric results (e.g. a building which may generate entertainment noise).

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Baseline assessments	We asked if air quality checks had been taken at points of contact with the proposed project. No answer.	W11	N	Comment noted. Based on the affected road network, sufficient monitoring data is available from Highways England and local authority sources to confirm the model performance, without the need for further monitoring at this stage of the design. The assessment on air quality in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [TR10054/APP/6.1] demonstrates that no properties will experience air pollution levels above national air quality objective values post construction. The significant reduction in traffic along the A460 will potentially enable future improvements to the road for pedestrians and cyclists, improve the environment around the road and may contribute positively to the identity of these villages along the route.
Loss of existing woodland	The red line of the project now encompasses Whitgreave Wood on the Southern site of the M54, just West of J1. Could you let me know why this change has been made and what your proposals for this woodland are	W5	N	This is noted. Whitgreaves Wood has now been included in the Order limits. This area has been included at the request of Natural England so that improvements can be made to the ancient woodland to compensate for the impact of the link road on ancient woodland elsewhere. The land is owned by the National Trust and we have been discussing these

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				improvements with them to agree the nature of the works. No works beyond ancient woodland improvements are proposed in this area.
General	The National Trust welcomes the removal of land in its ownership from the area which is proposed to be permanently acquired.	National Trust	N	Comment noted.
Affected business continuity and viability	Concerns raised around the viability of various business activities, including those that cater for those with protected characteristics in the context of the construction and operation of the link road.	W11	N	Highways England acknowledges that there will be impact on individuals' land and property as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme. Where new access provisions are required conversations are ongoing with the affected landowners to discuss individual concerns.
Affected business continuity and viability	Concerns raised around the lack of certainty round the proposals which is affecting the ongoing operation of the affected business	W11	N	The proposals for the link road and its alignment in relation to Brookfield Farm are in the public domain. Highways England is not able to advise on the operation of affected businesses, however further discussion is to be undertaken with the landowner to ensure that adverse impacts due to construction are understood, communicated clearly and

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				<p>mitigated where possible.</p> <p>Proposed working hours are indicated in the Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monday to Friday 8:00 - 18:00 - Saturday 9:00 - 13:00 <p>There will be up to an hour before and after these times for start-up and close down activities (except Sat at 13:00). These hours are subject to change in consultation with the local authority.</p>
Business continuity	<p>Concerns raised by landowner in relation to the logistical running of their operation if their access road (which runs around the building) is affected by the scheme, with particular concerns around access- impacting the turning circle of HGVs accessing site.</p> <p>Health and safety concerns were</p>	Mann+Hummel	N	<p>The Scheme Order Limits were drafted to provide sufficient working room to construct the scheme. Following a meeting with Mann+Hummel, Highways England was made aware of the impact on a small corner of their site. Highways England have reviewed the detail at this location and can confirm that this small section of the site is not required, therefore it is no longer shaded on the Land Plans [TR010054/APP/2.2]</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>also raised in relation to this.</p> <p>Financial penalties for HGVs standing while unloading plus those involved with late deliveries were also of concern.</p>			
Business continuity and disabled access	<p>Secondly we also noticed they proposed to take a small piece of land from us bordering our large fishing lake which has enormous quantity of competitive carp. Normally, this small piece of land would not have caused us any concern. The large fishing pool has been designed for not only able body anglers plus club competitions. Most importantly it has been designed for the access of disabled anglers. In taking this land it has robbed the disabled persons of access. We cannot accept this and strongly object to this proposal.</p>	W11	N	<p>At this location the pond is approximately 13 metres from the edge of highway boundary and the track is approximately 5 metres wide. The proposed land take in this area is 5 metres from the edge of highway boundary to allow for the minor realignment of the A460. This would therefore mean that there is a minimum of 3 metres between the proposed new highway boundary and the back of the existing track. Therefore the existing access track will be unaffected by the works and can continue to be used as per the current scenario. We have no intention of having any impact on the access track around the fishing pool and will continue discussions with you to ensure this is possible.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Clarity around temporary and permanent land take	Concerns raised around changes to the scheme which imply part of their land holding is to be acquired on a permanent basis despite being told previously that land take would be temporary. Concerns around severance effects on their land holding. Request made for a meeting	W11	N	Comment noted. A meeting was held with landowner on 18/11/19 and 02/12/19 to discuss updated Land Interest Schedule and plans and further engagement will continue with the landowner
Clarity around temporary and permanent land take	Comment seeking clarification as to why temporary access rights over 5/11K are required but this has only been permanently taken.	W2	N	The area of land within Plot 5/11k is now part of plot 5/11h.
Commercial development	Our clients' land is included within an area of land being promoted for commercial development by Nurton Developments and it is important that the road scheme is developed in such a way as to be sympathetic to that proposal and we confirm that we are also supportive of the representations made by Nurton dated 5th July	W1	N	Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	and 10th December 2019.			
Commercial development	Our clients' land is included within an area of land being promoted for commercial development by Nurton Developments and it is important that the road scheme is developed in such a way as to be sympathetic to that proposal and we confirm that we are also supportive of the representations made by Nurton dated 5th July and 10th December 2019.	W3	N	Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link scheme, however, meetings have been held with Nurton Developments to inform them of the scheme proposals.
Commercial development	Concerns raised in relation to the schemes provision of an access accommodation bridge which it is felt will add weight to the planning proposals for a large industrial development on a neighbouring site which the landowner opposes.	W11	N	The accommodation bridge was shown on plans issued as part of the Statutory Consultation. It is proposed that the traffic width of the structure is to be 4.5m in order to connect parcels of land severed by the link road, for the purposes of agricultural and maintenance vehicles only. Highways England cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any 3rd party

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				development . Highways England will continue discussions with this landowner.
Drainage discharge	<p>We asked about the quality of the water being discharged into the stream which flows into our first carp pool in front of Brookfield house. We haven't been given any concrete assurances of the quality.</p> <p>We asked about the type of water treatment system they would install. This has never been answered.</p>	W11	N	Measures will be included in the design to ensure that the discharge water quality meets the required standard set out in the Water Framework Directive, this includes features such as Penstock Valves to protect downstream water bodies in the event of a spillage.
Drainage outfall location	We asked where the discharge outlet on their proposed control pool nearest our large carp pool would be. No answer	W11	N	The attenuation ponds will outfall to the adjacent watercourse. Measures will be included in the design to ensure that the discharge water quality meets the required standard set out in the Water Framework Directive, this includes features such as

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				<p>Penstock Valves to protect downstream water bodies in the event of a spillage.</p> <p>Further detail of the drainage outfall location is provided on the Outline Drainage Works plans [TR010054/APP/2.11]</p>
Drainage pond location	We asked why the first overflow pool could not have been sited away from the bungalow at Brookfield. No answer has been given.	W11	N	The pond has been located to the west of the link road due to the direction of flows (to the west). The balancing pond is located at the low point of existing topography close to the existing discharge point of the ditch.
Future access to ecological/drainage pond	We have previously requested HE's confirmation as to whether this proposed pool could be utilised by our fishing business (given that we are losing one established fishing pool under your current proposals. We are still awaiting a formal response on this and would be grateful if you could clarify the position in writing.	W2	N	The pond is required for drainage and ecological purposes so fishing will not be possible as this will be owned and maintained by Highways England. This has been confirmed at a meeting with the landowner.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Guarantee of future land use for environmental mitigation	We have seen land be compulsory purchased before for 'ecological reasons' or landscaping to only be developed into to shopping precincts, service stations and housing estates within a few years. In the interim period they are left overgrown, subjected to fly tipping, anti-social behaviour and a magnet to the travelling community. We can guarantee that this will be the case once you have completed your project and moved on. These issues will then be used as a justification to develop the land. We cannot convey how distressing and disappointing it will be to see our land used in this manner. We are deeply concerned that there is an ulterior motive regarding your need for our land.	W6	N	Comment noted. It is anticipated that all mitigation areas, created as a result of the construction of the link road, will be fenced off to prevent unauthorised access. Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner with the view to return the land to original ownership, subject to agreement.
Inconsistency of mapping	Clarity and Consistency of Consultation Information - There are inconsistencies between the	W2	N	Highways England have met with this landowner to clarify the details of the proposals. The drawings have subsequently

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>draft General Arrangement Plan and the draft Environmental Master Plan. For example, the draft General Arrangement Plan shows an access road which we presume connects our fishing pool car park and the access track to the existing track (to enable us to have access to Hilton Lane). However this proposal is not shown on the Environmental Master Plan. It is therefore difficult to provide comments on these documents as they are inconsistent with each other, and hence we are confused as to what is your precise proposal (and hence the impact it will have on the agricultural holding).</p>			<p>been updated in light of these discussions.</p> <p>The landowner will retain ownership of the access track however Highways England will seek rights of access along the track for periodic maintenance of the balancing pond. This has been discussed with the landowner.</p>
Inconsistency of mapping	<p>The amended Land Interest Schedule dated 11 November 2019 states that the land in its entirety will be acquired on a temporally basis. However, the attached plan suggests (coded</p>	W6	N	<p>Comment noted. A meeting was held with the landowner on 02/12/19 to discuss the updated Land Interest Schedule and plans.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	pink) land to be acquired permanently. HE need to clarify which is correct. We were of the understanding that only a small parcel of the land was required (Area= 120 square metres) and there may be the possibility that the rest of the land would be used on a temporary basis.			
Justification for land required during construction	Extent of Temporary Land – There are some areas of land identified on your Land Interest Plan as 'land that may be required'. We assume that these areas may have been optioned for access and works compounds while the link road is being built but would request that you provide further clarification on the proposed use of land in these areas.	W2	N	The Temporary land as identified on the land plans at this location is required for material storage as part of the construction works of the M54 to M6 Link Road. Any temporary land will be returned in its former condition to the land owner after the construction of the scheme. The use of each identified plot has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Justification for land required during	Can you let me know what purpose the temporary rights are	W10	N	The landowner's representative was contacted to confirm need for parcels. A high-pressure

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
construction	needed for (parcels 4/18;4/17b) and why the parcel 4/17a is needed please?			gas main running through the area needs to be diverted as part of the scheme. The proposed diversion point is anticipated to be immediately east of the A460 however due to the congested nature of the area and the possibility of multiple joints in the pipe at this location, there is the possibility that the diversion will have to be made to the west of the A460. An easement will be required over the gas main as per the current scenario. Parcel 4/17a is required for the diversion of the gas main and associated infrastructure, as detailed above (approximately 1000 metres in length). Temporary rights are required for parcels 4/17B & 4/18 to allow temporary access from the A460 to undertake the works outlined above.
Land ownership and use	Comments around land ownership and access arrangements	W12	N	Comment noted
Access	Comments confirmed current access arrangements, security concerns and questioned if access will be prohibited during	W12	N	Access to this plot of land will be required by the Contractor from the gated access in the layby along the A460. It is anticipated that access to the remaining plots serviced by this

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	construction of the Scheme.			<p>gate will be maintained during construction for landowners however access may be required to be controlled temporarily by the Contractor to avoid interfaces between landowners and any construction activities.</p> <p>The Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] describes how business owners will be notified about ongoing works – the main works contractor shall take reasonable steps to engage with local residents and business owners.</p>
Water Supply	Comments regarding the current water supply and the need for the water supply to be maintained for livestock.	W12	N	<p>Comment noted. If access to the Brook is to be limited during construction, then suitable alternative means of supply will be provided during that period. Works areas set out by the Contractor will be minimised where possible to retain access to the Brook for livestock as much as reasonably practical.</p> <p>The Outline Environmental Management Plan [TR010054/APP/6.11] describes how business owners will be notified about ongoing works –</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				the main works contractor shall take reasonable steps to engage with local residents and business owners.
Fencing	Comments regarding the use of land parcels, and the need for suitable livestock fencing.	W12	N	Suitable fencing will be provided around any working area to protect both livestock and the work force from interactions. Further details are to be provided by the Contractor during construction preparation.
Access	Comments regarding current access arrangements and access for farm machinery.	W12	N	It is anticipated that access to this area of works will be obtained from the A460 or the adjacent land parcel, not from the track to Wolverhampton Road.
Fencing	Comments asked for confirmation of stock proof fencing.	W12	N	Suitable fencing will be provided around any working area to protect both livestock and the work force from interactions. Further details are to be provided by the Contractor during construction preparation.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Future land use	Comments referred to confirmation on the use of land parcels.	W12	N	<p>The A460 is to be widened by a single lane southbound between the M6 Toll Merge and M6 Junction 11. Plot 6/32c is required to accommodate the widened earthworks for the additional lane.</p> <p>The A460 is to be widened by a single lane northbound tapering back to 2 lanes ahead of the M6 Toll Overbridge. Plot 6/32b is required to accommodate the widened earthworks for the additional lane.</p>
Land registry	Comments referred to land ownership and the current uses of the land required for the Scheme.	W13	N	Comment noted.
Access arrangements	Comments referred to the current access arrangements and confirmation of future access	W13	N	Access to this area is required temporarily for construction. Access is anticipated to be from the M6 carriageway or from the adjacent land parcel, not from the current access along Mill Lane.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Fencing	Comments asked for confirmation of stock proof fencing.	W13	N	Suitable fencing will be provided around any working area to protect both livestock and the work force from interactions. Further details are to be provided by the Contractor during construction preparation.
Mill Lane	Support for Mill Lane to remain open.	W13	N	Comment noted. It is proposed that Mill Lane will remain open to traffic.
License and works agreements	Comments referred to license agreements, confirmation of the work to be undertaken and use of equipment.	W13	N	All relevant details have been confirmed with the appointed agent.
Justification for land take	You will be aware of our concerns as set out in our letter of 3rd July 2019. In particular, we noted that you have now reconsulted on the scheme on 20th November. Having reviewed the revised scheme we see no improvement in terms of our client's position and see no justification for entire land take, hence our concerns as set out in July still stand – to assist	W3	N	The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, balancing pond and environmental mitigation. Detail on the land requirements of each plot was provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans. Detailed information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	a copy of our July letter is enclosed.			
Land parcel information and location	This response is made on behalf of Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited ("Nurton") and relates to Highways England's ("HE") supplementary pre-application consultation for the proposed link road between M54 junction 1 and M6 junction 11 ("Scheme"). Nurton is the developer and promoter of a site which is located to the south of M6 junction 11, to the north-east of Featherstone and immediately east of Shareshill. The land is bound to the west by the A460 Cannock Road to the east by the M6 Motorway, and to the south by Hilton Lane (the "Site"). They hold an option on land which is required for a significant proportion of the link road.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Further engagement	We refer to our previous letter dated 5 July 2019 ("our First Letter"), a copy of which is enclosed. Our First Letter provided a response to HE's statutory public pre-application consultation that ran from 24 May 2019 to 5 July 2019. It noted that there was insufficient information at that stage to allow Nurton to make full representations and made several objections based on the information that was available. It also requested further dialogue with HE to explore whether a design solution could be found which would allow for the successful redevelopment of the Site and the delivery of the Scheme. No reply to our First Letter was received.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. Highways England met with Nurton Developments on 2 nd December 2019 to discuss their consultation responses.
Justification of land take	On 11 November 2019 our client received further correspondence from HE which stated that, due to feedback received in response to	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the earlier consultation, there had been revisions to the Scheme which would lead to additional land being required either on a temporary or permanent basis. An updated land interest plan and schedule was enclosed. Also, an updated draft general arrangement plan, and environmental masterplan were uploaded to the Scheme webpage.			
Justification of land take	The updated plans showed that additional areas of land were to be taken within the Site for, primarily, the purposes of providing woodland planting (along part of the eastern boundary of the link road) and for the construction of a large balancing pond (on the western boundary of the link road adjacent to the accommodation bridge). Large areas of land were also to be taken on a temporary basis. No reasons were given to	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future use is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. Each plot is required to construct the link road and provide essential mitigation. Highways England have considered a number of alternative alignments for the Hilton Lane bridge and the accommodation bridge to the south of Brookfield Farm, including combining the bridges to reduce the number of structures. Moving the bridge away from Hilton Lane would require the construction of

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	explain why the additional areas of land take were required. Nor was any evidence provided showing that HE had considered alternative bridging design solutions within the Site.			additional carriageway, resulting in additional cost and environmental impact and land acquisition. The accommodation bridge is proposed as close the alignment of the existing Shareshill 1 Bridleway as possible, whilst maintaining maximum gradients on the approach ramps. It is proposed that the traffic width of the accommodation bridge is to be 4.5m in order to connect parcels of land severed by the link road, for the purposes of agricultural and maintenance vehicles only. In response to the request to provide a wider bridge at this location, Highways England cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any third-party development and therefore cannot seek to relocate the bridge or provide a larger structure that would increase the cost and environmental impact of the Scheme.
Justification of land take	On 14 November 2019 we wrote to HE ("our Second Letter") noting that there remained a lack of detail surrounding the pre-application proposal. We requested justification for the extent of the land take and details of any	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. A meeting was held with Nurton Developments on 2 nd December 2019 to discuss specific concerns.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	alternative road crossing provision within the Site considered by HE. We also repeated our client's earlier requests for a meeting with HE to discuss the proposed Scheme. A copy of our Second Letter is enclosed.			
Engagement	On 20 November 2019, HE responded with an offer to meet with Nurton. That meeting finally took place on 2 December 2019. A copy of the minutes of that meeting are enclosed. In summary, the following was clarified by HE:	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.
Road crossings	In respect of alternative road crossings within the Site, HE claims to have considered three options: (i) a main crossing over Hilton Lane; (ii) a crossing midway between Hilton Lane and the proposed location; (iii) the proposed location. They stated	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. As discussed in the meeting and noted above, alternative road crossing locations and dimensions have been considered and it is proposed to provide an accommodation bridge (at the location indicated on the General Arrangement Plans [TR010054/APP/2.5]) to enable the connectivity of the adjacent land parcels and

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	that there had been an analysis and it was considered that the proposed location was the best balance between not having to divert the bridleway within the Site too much and allowing an appropriate gradient for the ramp up to the accommodation bridge crossing. The details of that assessment are awaited and at present the conclusion reached by HE is not accepted by Nurton.			Shareshill 1 Bridleway.
Accommodation bridge	HE had not carried out a cost and benefits analysis of their proposed two bridge scheme (i.e. separate crossings for Hilton Lane and for accommodation purposes) against Nurton's proposal for one wider accommodation bridge within the Site. However, it was considered that Nurton's proposed design solution would have a significant additional cost and environmental impact. Therefore, it was not being	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. As discussed in the meeting and noted above, the proposed accommodation bridge is adequate for the expected use by private farm machinery, Highways England maintenance vehicles and bridleway users. Highways England cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any third-party development and therefore cannot seek to relocate the bridge or provide a larger structure that would increase the cost and environmental impact of the Scheme.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	pursued.			
Accommodation bridge	Regarding the proposed accommodation bridge within the Site, it would have a roadway width of 4m and a 1m kerb / verge on either side. This was narrower than the width that would be required to serve future development on the Site (namely, a 7.3m wide roadway with 3m footpath/cycleway and 1m verge). Therefore, a new bridge would need to be provided in the future. HE was not able to provide an assurance during the meeting that a new bridge would be allowed. However, they would review internally and aim to provide an assurance regarding the principle of a future bridge as soon as possible.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	It is proposed that the width of the structure is 4.5m as this is sufficient for the required agricultural and maintenance vehicle access. Highways England cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any third-party development.
Woodland planting	Regarding the areas of additional permanent land take, HE clarified	Nurton Developments	N	Comment noted. Highways England confirms that the detail provided at the meeting remains

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	that a significant area was required in order to ensure that there was no bio-diversity deficit caused by the Scheme. Therefore, new woodland planting was required, as shown along the eastern boundary of the link road on the updated plans. HE had carried out a detailed assessment using DEFRA calculations in order to calculate the level of woodland planting required. An environmental statement was in the process of being prepared which would set out the justification for the woodland planting. Further details of this would be provided to Nurton in due course.	(Hilton) Limited		valid. The proposed woodland planting is to provide essential mitigation for environmental impacts, including loss of biodiversity, caused by the Scheme. An Environmental Statement has been prepared as part of the DCO application which provides an assessment of the environmental impact of the Scheme and the required mitigation [TR010054/APP/6.1]
Balancing pond	HE also clarified that the large balancing pond on the western boundary of the link road adjacent to the accommodation bridge crossing was required to deal with run off from the link road. The	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. Highways England agree with this record of the meeting.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>pond would hold, and discharge run off at existing greenfield rates. The balancing pond design was the most efficient shape considering the steep topography of the area. Calculations had been made regarding this and further details would be provided to Nurton in due course. HE confirmed that all the drainage ditches/watercourses on the site will remain the responsibility of the lead local flood authority. HE would not have the power to prevent any future development discharging into those watercourses.</p>			
Temporary land take	<p>Regarding the areas of temporary land take, HE clarified that those areas were required in order to provide a general working and top soil storage & removal area during the construction phase. There would be no site compounds located on that area. The land</p>	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>Comment noted. Highways England agree with this record of the meeting. The main site compounds are not located on this site.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	would be required for the whole construction periods; currently envisaged to be from late 2021 to late 2024.			
Justification for land take and mitigation proposals	<p>At the end of the meeting HE agreed, amongst other matters, to the following action points:</p> <p>To review internally and provide a draft assurance regarding the principle of a future bridge.</p> <p>To provide analysis and costing information in support of the proposed two bridge design solution.</p> <p>To issue a note with detail about the biodiversity and environmental justification for the woodland planting size and location.</p> <p>To issue note on the balancing pond drainage function and the justification for its size and</p>	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>In response to the individual points raised:</p> <p>Highway England cannot give assurance to any third party that a structure over or under its network will be permitted. As part of the planning process, Highways England would be consulted on the application and would be included in discussions related to relevant design standards, suitable arrangements for construction and maintenance of the asset.</p> <p>Highways England have considered a number of alternative alignments for the Hilton Lane bridge and the accommodation bridge to the south of Brookfield Farm, including combining the bridges to reduce the number of structures. As discussed in the meeting, moving the bridge away from Hilton Lane would require the construction of additional carriageway, resulting in additional cost and environmental impact and land acquisition. Highways England</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>location.</p> <p>To provide a CAD format drawing of the link road and permanently taken land.</p> <p>To provide design drawings showing the sections of the proposed accommodation bridge.</p> <p>To review internally and check what information on traffic modelling can be supplied to DTA (Nurton's Transport Consultants). To date, none of the information or assurances listed above have been provided.</p>			<p>cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any third-party development and therefore cannot seek to relocate the bridge or provide a larger structure that would increase the cost and environmental impact of the Scheme.</p> <p>Use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. Each plot is required to construct the link road and provide essential mitigation. An Environmental Statement has been prepared as part of the DCO application, which provides an assessment of the environmental impact of the Scheme and the required mitigation [TR010054/APP/6.1].</p> <p>The drainage strategy for the Scheme is provided in Appendix 13.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Highways England will provide a CAD layout of the scheme.</p> <p>The proposed cross section of the bridge is</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses	Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
			<p>indicated on the Engineering Section Drawings [TR010054/APP/2.10]</p> <p>Forecast traffic information is provided in the Transport Assessment [TR010054/APP/7.4]. Further discussions will be held with Nurton Developments to address queries relating to traffic modelling.</p>
<p>Site redevelopment</p>	<p>The Site can be accessed either via the M6 J10A/M54 J1 or via the M6 J11 and A460. It is considered highly suitable for substantial high-quality employment development serving both local and strategic markets. The Site has been promoted through South Staffordshire District Council ("the Council")'s Local Plan process over many years. The Local Plan Review commenced last year and is progressing well. The Council is currently looking towards autumn 2020 for consultation on the Preferred Options of the new Local Plan. Nurton is preparing to</p>	<p>Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited</p>	<p>N</p> <p>Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan. Given that the site is a greenfield site, in the Green Belt, in close proximity to allocated brownfield employment sites and there is no shortage of employment land in the district, Highways England does not consider that this site has a realistic chance of gaining planning permission or being allocated for employment development in the near future. However, in the event that the site was allocated for employment development in the future, it is considered that the aspirations for the site would be compatible with the site because the development could still take place with a suitable bridge constructed to facilitate connectivity over the site.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	demonstrate the Site's deliverability prior to publication of the Preferred Options.			
Site redevelopment	Further detail on the Site's suitability, strong prospects for future redevelopment and the importance of HE's engagement with Nurton are set out in paragraph 2.1 to 2.10 of our First Letter. We refer to those paragraphs and re-iterate them here.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.
Ongoing Engagement	Nurton welcomes HE's recent engagement and provision of information about the proposed Scheme. The meeting on 2 December 2019 did provide our client with a greater understanding of the justification for the proposed land take and design solution. However, we note that much of the information and assurances listed in paragraph 1.7 above	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	remain outstanding. As such, our client continues to have concerns in respect of the Scheme and the consultation process. These are as set out below.			
Severance	Severance - The Scheme will potentially have an adverse impact in relation to the Site and the redevelopment of it. It is an established principle that in the event that any land with potential development value is severed, the density and/or timing of development on the retained land can be seriously and adversely affected. Representations previously submitted by Bruton Knowles on behalf of the landowners of the Site deal further with this point.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted. The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme.
Justification of land take	Insufficiency of evidence in support of the pre-application proposal - For any consultation to	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	During the statutory consultation in 2019 Highways England provided details of the proposed Scheme, including publishing

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>be lawful, HE must provide enough detail regarding the proposal to allow intelligent consideration and response (see Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council v Highways England [2018] EWHC 3059). In the meeting on 2 December 2019, HE provided some general justification for the proposed Scheme and additional land take. However, no supporting evidence was provided. For example:</p>			<p>preliminary environmental information and plans illustrating the scheme and proposed environmental mitigation. Details of the Scheme were provided in the consultation brochure which set out the background and need for the Scheme; provided a summary of the evolution of the Scheme and options considered; a description of the main elements of the Scheme, potential environmental impacts and measures to mitigate significant effects and a description of the main stages in the DCO process. The brochure also included details of how to respond to the consultation and details of public events where those interested in the proposals could speak to the project team and deposit points where copies of the consultation documents could be viewed.</p>
Bridge design	<p>HE has stated that a costs analysis was undertaken regarding the current two bridge design solution and that several alternatives were considered (as summarised in paragraph 1.6.1 above). However, that analysis</p>	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>Highways England have considered a number of alternative alignments for the Hilton Lane bridge and the accommodation bridge to the south of Brookfield Farm, including combining the bridges to reduce the number of structures. As discussed in the meeting, moving the bridge away from Hilton Lane</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	and costing information has yet to be disclosed. Without that information we are unable to consider whether the proposed Scheme is more economical, or whether a single main bridge design solution within the Site may also be feasible and should be reviewed as an option.			would require the construction of additional carriageway, resulting in additional cost and environmental impact and land acquisition. Highways England cannot provide infrastructure to facilitate any third-party development and therefore cannot seek to relocate the bridge or provide a larger structure that would increase the cost and environmental impact of the Scheme.
Justification of land take	HE has stated that additional land is required on a permanent basis for woodland planting, which will sit predominantly along the eastern boundary of the link road within the Site. HE has stated that supporting environmental analysis has been undertaken. However, that information has yet to be disclosed. Without that information, we are unable to consider whether the proposed woodland planting's size and location is justified or whether	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1]. More information on the woodland planting and the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity can be found in Chapter 8 [TR010054/APP/6.1].

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	alternative areas of woodland planting may also be feasible and should be reviewed as an option.			
Justification of land take	HE has stated that additional land is required on a permanent basis for a balancing pond adjacent to the accommodation bridge. HE has stated that the size and location is necessary in order to capture surface run off from the link road. It has claimed that supporting analysis has been carried out. However, that information has not been disclosed. Without it, we are unable to consider whether the balancing pond's size and location is justified or whether an alternative shape or location may also be feasible and should be reviewed as an option.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	The drainage strategy for the Scheme is provided in Appendix 13.2 of the Environmental Statement [TR010054/APP/6.3].
Environmental impacts	As noted in our First Letter, Preliminary Environmental	Nurton Developments	N	Preliminary environmental information on the Scheme was made available during the

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	Information ("PEI") should also form part of the consultation material at this stage, which is designed to provide information about the potential environmental effects of the Scheme.	(Hilton) Limited		statutory consultation in 2019.
Traffic modelling	Despite repeated requests by DTA, we note that no traffic modelling has been produced as part of the PEI. This is an essential part of the evidence base for the Scheme. The potential inadequacy of the PEI means that it is not possible to provide meaningful commentary on the Scheme and its' potential impacts at this stage. In the meeting on 2 December 2019, HE stated that further information would be provided regarding this. However, that information has yet to be received.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>Preliminary traffic modelling was undertaken in order to inform a preliminary assessment of air quality and noise impacts of the Scheme, as reported in the PEI. This information was made publicly available as part of the Statutory Consultation in 2019. Further traffic modelling work has been undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement. Forecast traffic information is provided in the Transport Assessment [TR010054/APP/7.4].</p> <p>Further discussions will be held with Nurton Developments to address queries relating to traffic modelling.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Further comment and review	In addition, and for the avoidance of doubt, we reserve the right to review and provide further comment as and when the sufficiently detailed material becomes available.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.
Extent of land take	Lack of consultation and consideration of alternatives - We welcome confirmation of the extent of the land required and what land is required on a temporary or permanent basis. However, little supporting evidence has been provided to justify the land take. It is very important to have sight of this evidence; it is fundamental to our ability to review the current proposed Scheme.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].
Further engagement	Furthermore, as noted in our Second Letter and in the meeting on 2 December 2019, our client has concerns about the adequacy	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Highways England have held a number of meetings with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals and will continue to engage with Nurton Developments

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	of HE's engagement to date. Whilst HE has met with the landowners and other stakeholders on several occasions, prior to the meeting on 2 December 2019, Nurton had only been offered a meeting on one occasion.			and other land interests as the design develops.
Further engagement	HE is required to carry out a thorough and effective consultation. So far, HE's consultation has not been sufficiently thorough and important information has not been provided to our client which would allow intelligent consideration and response. We note that HE has indicated that it will be providing further supporting information in due course. Accordingly, we reserve the right to submit further representations as and when such information is provided to allow meaningful engagement.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Highways England have held a number of meetings with Nurton Developments to inform them of the Scheme proposals and will continue to engage with Nurton Developments and other land interests as the design develops.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Bridge crossings	Our client also remains concerned about the level of consideration given to detailed alternatives in terms of the delivery of the Scheme, including bridge crossings. HE has stated that it considered several alternative options for the accommodation bridge and undertook costing analysis. However, a summary of that analysis has not been provided. HE has also admitted that it has not carried out a detailed appraisal of an option involving one wider accommodation bridge with appropriate internal connections.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Highways England is not able to facilitate third-party development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme. The proposed accommodation bridge is adequate for the expected use by private farm machinery, Highways England maintenance vehicles and bridleway users.
Environmental Impact Assessment	We appreciate that HE will be undertaking an environmental impact assessment, as required by the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ("IP EIA Regulations"). The key requirements of this were set out	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	An Environmental Statement has been prepared as part of the DCO [TR010054/APP/6.1]. The Scheme development has included consideration of numerous options as detailed in Chapter 3 – Assessment of Alternatives' of the Environmental Statement

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	in our First Letter and we re-iterate HE's obligation to ensure that the EIA must consider reasonable detailed alternatives in terms of the manner of delivery of the Scheme to avoid any adverse effects on the delivery of the redevelopment of the Site.			[TR010054/APP/6.1].
Justification of land take	Summary - It is in all parties' interests for an acceptable design solution to be found which will allow for the successful redevelopment of the Site and the delivery of the Scheme. From the information provided to date, our client is not convinced that the extent of the land take is justified or that the current design offers the best solution in terms of allowing the future development of the Site and meeting other objectives (i.e. crossing Hilton Lane).	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	<p>The extent of permanent land requirements has been confirmed in plans issued for supplementary consultation and at a subsequent meeting. Each plot is required to construct the link road, or provide essential mitigation, use of plots has been defined and information on each land plot and future uses is provided in the Statement of Reasons [TR010054/APP/4.1].</p> <p>The land in question is not allocated in the Local Plan and does not benefit from planning permission. Highways England is not able to facilitate such development as part of the M54 to M6 Link Scheme.</p>

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Justification of land take	Therefore, until such time as enough information is provided to demonstrate that the land take is justified and that the proposed design solution is most appropriate and viable one, Nurton will continue to object to the Scheme.	Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited	N	Comment noted.
Land interest Schedule	Missing Areas of Land Ownership - Having reviewed the Land Interest Schedule provided and the updated Land Plan, there are several areas which are in our client's ownership but have been missed off your schedule. These areas of land are highlighted on the plan attached and are summarised as follows: 5/11A, 5/11B, 5/11C, 5/11I, 5/11J, 5/6, 5/7, 5/8, 5/12, 5/13, 5/14, 5/15. We would be grateful if you could update your Land Interest schedule accordingly so that we have an accurate understanding of the impact on our client's land	W2		Comment noted. The Land Interest Schedule has been reviewed and updated accordingly.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	ownership which presumably you are proposing to acquire.			
Provision of access	Access from Hilton Lane – We will be losing access from Hilton Lane to this part of the farm and hence an additional access point is provided to us at Point 3 to enable our client to have easy access to this part of the holding from the road (as is currently the case at present).	W2	N	<p>The suggested location of a new Private Means of Access would be immediately after the proposed Hilton Lane structure which has a crest curve that would limit visibility on approach. Due to the increased risk of speeding vehicles colliding with the back of any farm vehicle waiting to access the land parcel, it is not recommended that a new Private Means of Access is provided in this location. There is an existing Private Means of Access approx. 100m further west along Hilton Lane which could be reinstated, this will be discussed in further discussions with the landowner.</p> <p>Access across the link road to this land will remain available via the accommodation bridge.</p>
Provision of access	Access Track – The proposed access track to our clients land to the west of the proposed link road	W2	Y	The proposed Private Means of Access will be extended to the extent of the permanent land take in order to provide the land owner with an

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	needs to be extended, as highlighted in the attached plan, so that they can have access to their land in this area which will not form part of the permanent land take.			access into the severed parcel of land to the west of the Scheme.
Provision of access	Vehicular Right of Way – As highlighted at previous consultation events, our client has a right of vehicular access from Point 13a to the A460 at 13b (off map). Please can you confirm how this right of access will be maintained within your proposals.	W2	N	Comment noted. Highways England are not currently proposing to retain this particular access point and will continue to discuss access arrangements with the landowner
Provision of accommodation bridge	Accommodation Bridge We understand that the proposed specifications for this bridge is for it to be a 4 metre carriageway with 1 metre either side verge. The accommodation bridge will have to provide future access for modern farm machinery and as it is a public bridleway, access for	W2	Y	It is proposed that the traffic width of the structure is increased to 4.5m in order to accommodate the specified farm machinery. The raised verge will be reduced accordingly to retain the overall size of the super structure. Sufficient forward visibility is provided on either side of the structure therefore it is anticipated that users will wait on either side of the

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	<p>equestrian use/horses, pedestrians and other vehicles. Set out below is an exact image of the combine (without header) used on our clients farm:</p> <p>The width of the combine without the header is 3.99 metres which under the current proposal allows 5cm either side kerb to kerb. This on its own renders the current proposed structure insufficient. The width of the structure also needs to allow for the fact that it is a public byway and is therefore frequently used by third parties, if the bridge is of an insufficient width this will have future health and safety implications. In short the accommodation bridge needs to be wider.</p>			structure for the other to pass to eliminate the risk of vehicles and users crossing on the structure causing potential conflicts.
Shared access and	Proposed rights along 'Fishing Pool' – We note that the updated	W2	N	Highways England requires infrequent access to carry out periodic maintenance to the

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
accommodation	Land Plan proposes that HE acquires rights of access (which we assume are vehicular) along the access track to our clients Fishing Pools. We would be grateful if you could clarify what rights you are proposing to acquire in this area? As stressed at previous consultations event by our client, this is currently a private drive the access gate to this will therefore need to be kept locked (and remain locked) in order to secure our fishing pool business and the wider estate. If it is being proposed that this track is being used by HE they will need to upgrade it to an appropriate standard and maintain this in perpetuity. HE will also need to compensate our client for the access rights that you are seeking to acquire here.			attenuation pools required for the link road. The access gate is to be retained to prevent public access. Further discussions will be held with the landowner to agree access arrangements, maintenance rights and appropriate compensation.
Vehicular access	Vehicular Access on Bridleway – As our clients have highlighted to	W2	N	The bridleway and vehicular access will be maintained across the link road via the

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
through Bridleway	HE at previous consultation events, they have a vehicular right of way along the bridleway through Brookfield Farm and out into the A460. We are uncertain, based on your current plans, as to whether this vehicular access will still be feasible at the point marked '12' on your proposals. Please can you demonstrate to us that your proposals do not hinder vehicular access at this point, to ensure that this right of way is not lost.			accommodation bridge. Further discussions will be held with the landowner to understand their access needs.
Public Right of Way diversion	We explained to them the proposed diversion of the public footpath which will be behind our social club would put the security of the club at great risk. We have no control over the use of public access as such leaving the club in easy reach of criminal activity.	W11	N	Any alternative routes for the footpath would require greater land take within Brookfield Farm to provide an accommodation over bridge closer to the existing route. The current location has been decided in order to reduce the land take within the farm and accommodate users onto the new bridge south of Brookfield Farm. This means it is necessary to divert users along the back of Brookfield Farm however suitable fencing will be provided alongside the right of way and details of

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
				boundary features will be discussed with the landowner as part of ongoing dialogue.
Request to relocate affected residential property	We asked if it would be possible to relocate the bungalow still within Brookfields at our expense. Answer this would not be possible. We can't understand why. It would cost the construction of the road "nothing".	W11	N	Comment noted. Relocation of any accommodation building within Brookfields is out of Highways England's scope of works for this project. This would be a decision for the Local Planning Authority to consider.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Comments related to ongoing engagement and the utility of ongoing meetings held with the project team, who responded to queries in a timely manner. Concerns raised around most recent meetings where they felt information was not forthcoming, in particular with regard to the proposals for an accommodation bridge they felt they were not notified about.	W11	N	Comment noted. It is noted that the landowner has been very supportive throughout the consultation process. The proposals for an accommodation bridge (for agricultural vehicle use) and track at this location were presented as part of the Statutory Consultation (24 May 2019 – 5 July 2019).

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Comments related to difficulties when trying to gain information from the project team.	W6	N	Comment noted. Following the consultation, the landowner was contacted by project team on 18/11/19 and a meeting was held between the landowner and project team on 02/12/19.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Comments related to a letter the landowner submitted in July 2019 but received no response to.	W2	N	Comment noted. Following the close of the statutory consultation, Highways England has considered all responses and has subsequently met with these landowners to discuss their concerns further.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Concerns raised around the consultation information hosted online, in particular the size of the files which made it difficult to review the Land Interest Plan.	W2	N	Comment noted. Highways England has provided hard copies of the plans as requested. These were provided at a meeting between Highways England and the landowner on 10/12/19.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Request for a further meeting.	W11	N	Comment noted. Highways England are happy to conduct further meetings with the landowner as required.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to	Landowner commented that they were happy to meet if required.	W13	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land

Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
comment				
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Should a meeting be required to clarify any of the issues raised, we would be happy to discuss this on site on a date to be agreed.	W12	N	Comment noted.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Comments refer to land registry parcels and request further engagement is undertaken with the freeholders.	Wilson Bowden	N	Comment noted. This has been recorded in the Book of Reference [TR010054/APP/4.3]. Highways England are continuing to engage with stakeholders and engagement will continue throughout the detailed design and construction phases.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment	Concerns raised around perceived changes to the Scheme which have implications on the landowner that the landowner feels they were not made aware of.	W11	N	Comment noted. Following the consultation on engagement meetings have been held with the landowner and Highways England will continue to engage with the landowner as the design develops.
Consultation submission	Comments refers to the submission to the statutory consultation - sentiment that the	W1	N	Comment noted. Highways England acknowledge the concerns raised by the landowner regarding their land at this location.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	revised scheme subject to supplementary consultation offers the landowner no improvement.			The entire landholding is required permanently for construction of the new link road, associated balancing pond and environmental mitigation, including ancient woodland compensatory planting. Detail on the land requirements of each plot was provided to the landowner as part of supplementary consultation on revised Land Plans.
Ongoing written correspondence	Comments raised in relation correct correspondence address. Noted request or correct correspondence address	W1	N	Comment noted. Correspondence was sent to the landowner and agent. This has been clarified and confirmed. Engagement will continue with affected landowners.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment through the DCO process	Comments raised welcoming the opportunity to continue to comment on the Scheme through the DCO process. Noted request or correct correspondence address.	W3	N	Comment noted. Correspondence was sent to the landowner and agent. This has been clarified and confirmed. Engagement will continue with affected landowners.
Ongoing engagement and opportunities to comment through the	Response highlighting intention for landowner to participate in the DCO process, intending to object and follow the necessary	Allow Ltd	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
DCO process	subsequent processes			
General	Please find attached our maps that are in the area.	GTC	N	Comment noted. Following review of the information provided, it was established that GTC's assets are unlikely to be affected by the scheme. Highways England will continue to engage with GTC as design progresses.
General	Comments confirm no National Grid Gas apparatus or rights within or in close proximity to the parcels. The respondee suspects any gas assets and rights may be with Cadent Gas Limited who now own and manage the gas distribution network in this area.	National Grid	N	Comment noted.
General	Response in support of the proposed changes to the red line boundary- subject to contract	W5	N	Comment noted.
General	Comment regarding the landowners' general support for	Mann+Hummel	N	Comment noted.

Supplementary consultation and additional consultation carried out with regard to s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land				
Topic Area and Consultation Responses		Prescribed Consultee(s)	Change (Y/N):	Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response)
	the scheme, outlining their concerns with regard to specific elements of the plans			
General	Comment welcomes changes to the proposed scheme, in particular removal of grassland planting on their land and changes to an access which was proposed on their land holding.	W2	N	Comment noted.