

M54 to M6 Link Road

Procedural Deadline B: Written responses to matters discussed at Preliminary Meeting Part 1

Contents

Councillor Bob Cope.....	2
Will Thomas representing Nurton Developments (Hilton) Ltd.....	3
Chris Lambart representing National Trust.....	4

Councillor Bob Cope

Having watched matters discussed at the Preliminary Meeting Part 1, I note towards the end of the meeting that Miss Weston on behalf of Highways spoke about the several design changes,, having spoken to the Parish Councils of Featherstone, Hilton and Shareshill it is our understanding that there will be no direct footpath/cycle link from the existing A460 to the Strategic Employment Site of Hilton Cross, if this is correct and there is no design change to connect the community directly through the proposed highway link workings this will seriously disadvantage the residents of my ward when attempting to get to work or seeking future job opportunities available at Hilton Cross, not all our residents have access to a car and the last bus service finishes at 5.30 pm, this is a considerable oversight and needs an additional design change to the scheme to sustain residents amenity and access to job opportunities.

Will Thomas representing Nurton Developments (Hilton) Limited

We have not had sight of the design changes which we understand the Applicant has recently submitted. We therefore note and agree with the comments made at the Preliminary Meeting Part 1 that the timetable may need to be amended to allow us to consider and provide meaningful comment on those changes. In addition, we have only just received (on 8 October) the draft Statement of Common Ground from the Applicant. There are a number of points to discuss on the draft Statement of Common Ground before it can be submitted. Therefore, further time may also be required in order to finalise and submit that document.

Chris Lambart representing National Trust

The National Trust wishes to comment on the draft examination timetable, as set out in Annex D of the Rule 6 letter, specifically in relation to site inspections, which were discussed under agenda item 7 of the Preliminary Meeting on 1st October. Our point comes down to a question of whether the Examining Inspectors wish to visit the interior of Moseley Old Hall and, if so, whether the practicalities of access to the Hall would have the result that this would constitute an accompanied site inspection. We envisage that the Examining Authority will wish to visit National Trust land proposed for temporary possession (plots 3/7a, 3/7b, 3/7c & 4/2). Facilitated access to these areas would be achievable. We envisage that the Examining Authority may also wish to visit Moseley Old Hall and its gardens and grounds. Facilitated access would be achievable for access to the gardens and grounds of Moseley Old Hall. We can provide access to the interior of Moseley Old Hall but are unclear whether this would amount to facilitated access or an accompanied site inspection. For security and safety reasons someone from the National Trust would need to meet the Examining Inspectors to let them onto the property and then provide entry into the building. We would also need to direct them to specific rooms, ensure that they reach the correct rooms and ensure that they get out again before re-securing the building. Information about the rooms and events in them during the time that Charles II was at Moseley Old Hall could be provided in advance. The draft timetable identifies 1st and 2nd December as dates reserved for accompanied site inspections. Moseley Old Hall is closed to visitors on both days but we would be able to accommodate an accompanied site inspection on either day. If we have any choice Wednesday 2nd December would be better.