

Q No.	To:	Question	Response
1.0.4	SCC	Development Plan a) Could SCC please provide all minerals and waste plans applicable to the Application site along with any relevant plans necessary for interpretation. b) Are any of these plans subject to review? c) If so, at what stage has it/have they reached? d) Does this have any implications for the Proposed Development?	<p>a) Please see links below to:  <a href="#">The Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan (2010 – 2026)</a>; and  <a href="#">The Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire (2015 – 2030)</a> – adopted 16/2/17</p> <p>b) No updates to the above Plans have been identified as yet so there are no programmes for Plan review.</p> <p>c) n/a</p> <p>d) n/a</p>
1.0.11	The Applicant SCC WCC	Outline Environmental Management Plan a) Paragraph 1.1.12 of the OEMP [APP-218] states that once the Proposed Development has been completed some of its components may be maintained by SCC or WCC. It is not explained which components this might be or whether this approach has been agreed with these Councils. Can the Applicant identify the likely relevant components of the Proposed Development and confirm the level of agreement to this approach to-date with SCC and WCC? b) Can the Applicant explain if these components relate to the proposed environmental mitigation? c) If so, could the Applicant explain how? d) Could SCC and WCC provide their response to this approach?	It is accepted that some elements of the scheme where they relate to realigned sections of the local road network will be maintained by SCC. However, the precise extents and details have yet to be fully agreed.
1.0.12	The Applicant SCC SSC EA Natural England Forestry Commission	Outline Environmental Management Plan a) Table 4.1 of the OEMP [APP-218] set out Consents and permissions that may be required as at January 2020. Is this Table up-to-date? b) If not, could it please be amended as necessary. c) Could those bodies referred to in the table, that is Natural England, SCC, the EA, SSDC and The Forestry Commission please advise as to their current understandings of the various situations?	All ecology licences are for NE to advise on

1.3.1.	SSC SCC	Clarification Could SCC and SSC please explain the relationship between them in relation to the provision of advice relating to biodiversity in the determination of planning applications and applications for development consent?	For regular planning applications, SCC provides advice to SSC on ecology matters. For DCO matters, we provide advice directly to the examination on behalf of SCC
1.5.4	SCC ShC WCC	Article 2(1) a) Could SCC, ShC and WCC please confirm whether they consider the definition of “maintain” is appropriate in all circumstances and whether it is drawn either too narrowly or too widely. b) Definition of Special Road page 6 requires closing bracket second line.	a) Appropriate.
1.5.7.	SCC SSC ShC WCC NE EA	Article 3(2) This article utilises the term “adjacent land”, and this term is used elsewhere. However, this is not defined in the dDCO. a) Should it be so defined? b) If so, what should this definition be?	
1.5.8	The Applicant SCC SSC ShC WCC	Article 3(3) This Article caveats various works from the effect of pre-commencement Requirements. However, various Requirements in Schedule 2 require the approval of such schemes (for example R9). a) Could the Applicant please reconcile these provisions? b) Are the Councils content with the intention behind these provisions?	b) the Article and R9 need to be reconciled, however we are content with the general intention of the provisions
1.5.10	The Applicant SCC	Article 11(7) a) Is there any particular reason why the PRoWs to be constructed are unlikely not to be open for use by the opening to traffic of the road? b) Are there different considerations in relation to different PRoWs? c) Should there be a back-stop? d) Are there any PRoWs which should be completed and open prior to the one it is to replace being closed?	a) There should be no reason why the realigned PROW's should not be open and available for the public to use by the time the new road is open. This is ultimately an issue for the developer. b) Yes, public footpath's are available for pedestrians only whereas public bridleway's have to be safe for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. In view of this the design specifications for the surface, bridge (in the case of Bridleway No 1 Shareshill) and path furniture will be different.

			<p>c) Await applicant position.</p> <p>d) Yes, unless routes are subject to temporary closure then all of the newly diverted existing routes should be open prior to the closure of the existing routes.</p>
1.5.11.	SCC WCC	<p>Article 12(6) a) Do SCC and WCC consider that the 28 day period is appropriate?</p> <p>b) If not, what should it be?</p>	Accepted.
1.5.15.	The Applicant EA SCC	Article 17(8) Could this provision be simplified in the circumstances of this case (are all the bodies required)?	
1.5.16.	The Applicant HBMCE SSC ShC WCC	Article 18 a) Is there a reasonable chance that this provision could apply to works to a listed building? b) If so, are there any particular provisions that should then follow?	Refer to SSDC
1.5.19.	The Applicant Statutory undertakers SCC ShC WCC	Article 23(6) This provision allows the undertaker to create right for third parties. However, this appears to be very widely drawn and does not specify which third parties and thus could apply to any legal person. Could the parties consider whether this should be more tightly drawn to specify a limit and/or purpose for those third parties?	We await a revised draft from the applicant to consider.
1.5.32.	The Applicant SCC	Schedule 1, Work 61 a) Could the Applicant please clarify the extent and nature of the separation of the (temporary) bridleway from the carriageway during the construction period? b) Is SCC content with this?	We await the response of the applicant before being able to confirm acceptance.
1.5.43	The Applicant SCC SSC ShC WCC EA NE Any	Schedule 2, Requirement 13 a) While the explanation for not complying with the consultees request is given to the SoS, how is the consultee to know that the undertaker has rejected its reasoning? b) Would it be sensible that, at the same time as sending to the SoS the application	We maintain that matters of detailed design where they relate to the local highway, Archaeology etc could be approved locally by the relevant authority. However, should the provision remain for the SoS to approve all matters of detailed design then we would agree with

	other interested party	for approval of the detailed design, the undertaker is required to send to any consultee who made representation a copy of the report explaining why it came to the conclusion that it so did? This would allow the consultee, if it felt that the consultation exercise had been deficient, or there was some matter which the Applicant had not fully appreciated, to make simultaneous representations to the SoS which the SoS would take into account in making the final decision.	the ExA suggestion that consultees should be informed of submission to the SoS and allowed to make representations to be taken into account in the final decision.																		
1.5.51.	The Applicant SCC	<p>Schedule 7, as set out in following Table</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="472 587 1294 1007"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Plot reference Number shown on Land Plans</i></th> <th><i>Purpose for temporary possess may be taken</i></th> <th><i>Relevant part of authorised development</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4/1e and 4/9a</td> <td>Required for alignment of the existing A460 into the M54 Junction 1 south roundabout</td> <td>Work No. 7 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/1i</td> <td>Required for the stopping up of the existing A460 and construction of a turning head facility</td> <td>Work No. 11 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/22</td> <td>Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane</td> <td>Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5/1</td> <td>Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane</td> <td>Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6/17h, 6/17i, 6/17j, 6/17k, 6/17m, 6/32a and 6/36</td> <td>Required for the realignment and widening by a single lane of the A460 southbound and northbound</td> <td>Work No. 39 as shown on sheet 6 of the works plans</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In each case, the land is to be used as highway in perpetuity thereby depriving, effectively the landowner of beneficial use of the land. Is the use of TP powers appropriate in each and every case?</p>	<i>Plot reference Number shown on Land Plans</i>	<i>Purpose for temporary possess may be taken</i>	<i>Relevant part of authorised development</i>	4/1e and 4/9a	Required for alignment of the existing A460 into the M54 Junction 1 south roundabout	Work No. 7 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans	4/1i	Required for the stopping up of the existing A460 and construction of a turning head facility	Work No. 11 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans	4/22	Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane	Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans	5/1	Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane	Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans	6/17h, 6/17i, 6/17j, 6/17k, 6/17m, 6/32a and 6/36	Required for the realignment and widening by a single lane of the A460 southbound and northbound	Work No. 39 as shown on sheet 6 of the works plans	The plans are unclear in that they do not clarify which parcels of land will be highway and laid out as such. The Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans are ambiguous and contain the following note on the side of the drawings; “note 6. areas of existing carriageway to be removed are shown for information only. these areas are not to be stopped up as they will remain within the public highway boundary and in some cases directly replaced with new highway alignments”. SCC do not want unnecessary areas to maintain that are not for the benefit of the public using the highway such are long driveways to individual properties or uses.
<i>Plot reference Number shown on Land Plans</i>	<i>Purpose for temporary possess may be taken</i>	<i>Relevant part of authorised development</i>																			
4/1e and 4/9a	Required for alignment of the existing A460 into the M54 Junction 1 south roundabout	Work No. 7 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans																			
4/1i	Required for the stopping up of the existing A460 and construction of a turning head facility	Work No. 11 as shown on sheet 4 of the works plans																			
4/22	Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane	Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans																			
5/1	Required for the modification of an existing junction and removal of a right turn prohibition into Dark Lane	Work No. 73 as shown on sheets 4 and 5 of the works plans																			
6/17h, 6/17i, 6/17j, 6/17k, 6/17m, 6/32a and 6/36	Required for the realignment and widening by a single lane of the A460 southbound and northbound	Work No. 39 as shown on sheet 6 of the works plans																			
1.6.2.	SSC SCC	Organisational relationship Could SC and SSC please explain the relationship between them in relation to the provision of cultural heritage services in the determination of planning applications and applications for development consent	For regular planning applications, SCC provides advice to SSC on archaeology/historic environment matters. For DCO matters, we provide advice directly to the examination on behalf of SCC																		

1.6.6.	The Applicant HBMCE SSC SSC	Heritage Assessment effects The Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723) indicates that within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated. In light of this, are there any nuances that parties would like to make as to the extent of harm that they consider would be occasioned to any heritage asset or their settings.	The impact of carriageway lighting and views of signage gantries from Hilton Park and Hall should be considered in more detail and incorporated into the detailed design. Night time views and impact on tranquillity and dark skies should also be considered in relation to Hilton Park.
1.6.10.	The Applicant HBMCE SSC SCC	Archaeology/Trial Trenching a) Paragraph 6.2.23 of the ES [APP-045] indicates that trial trenching “should be undertaken after the submission of the DCO”. It is not clear whether this has now happened, or it programmed for the future. If it has happened could the Applicant please provide the results? b) If it is for the future, could this precisely be identified when in the process this is to take place and how would it be secured? c) If it is for the future, how can the SoS assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected (NPSNN, paragraph 5.128) if there is no available evidence on this. d) If it is for the future, could HBMCE, SSC and SCC confirm whether they are content with this approach.	Given the archaeological potential of the development area, as informed by the archaeological desk-based assessment, archaeological watching brief during geotechnical investigations, and geophysical survey, the SCC County Archaeologist (SCCCA) advised that a further stage of archaeological evaluation, in the form of trial trenching, should be carried out. It was advised that ideally this work should be carried out pre-submission of DCO. However, following discussions with the applicant, it was agreed, given the level of potential and the likely significance of any archaeological features that would be encountered by the trial trenching (as informed by the previous stages of evaluation), that this further stage of evaluation could be carried out post DCO submission once the detailed design was in progress. This would allow for a more focussed approach to be developed in terms of the trenching requirements based on the actual required land-take/footprint for/of the scheme. It was cautioned at the time that such an approach could have potential impacts in terms of programme and design should significant archaeological features be encountered, and it was agreed that the trial trenching

			<p>should be carried out as early in the programme as possible to help mitigate this.</p> <p>SCCCA sought further clarity as to what 'early in the programme' meant specifically and Paragraph 6.8.4 of the ES was amended to specify that the trial trenching would take place once the 'detailed design is in progress' and 'before the details of the design are finalised and prior to the commencement of any phase of construction, to allow the development and implementation of mitigation measures'.</p> <p>In terms of a) it is our understanding that the trial trenching has not happened to date. Further details about the proposed methodology can be found in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy included in the OEMP, including the requirement for the applicant's contractor to submit a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the trial trenching for the approval of the SCCCA. The SCCCA has yet to receive or approve such a WSI and no discussions have been had in terms of the amount, location or layout of trenches.</p> <p>b) The applicant should be able to advise as to when it is their intention to carry out the trial trenching. As noted above, this work should take place once the 'detailed design is in progress' and 'before the details of the design are finalised and prior to the commencement of any phase of construction, to allow the development and implementation of mitigation measures'. It is recommended that this timetable is better reflected in the Archaeological Mitigation</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Strategy- for example Section 2.4 does not include the clarifications provided in Par 6.8.4 of the ES.</p> <p>c) Pre-DCO evaluation comprising archaeological desk-based assessment, archaeological watching brief during geotechnical investigations, and geophysical survey has provided a strong baseline in terms of understanding the archaeological potential of the development site and the potential significance of any previously unknown heritage assets that may be encountered during the trial trenching. Should something unexpected arise during the trial trenching exercise, the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy outlines the potential for considering preservation in situ as an option and also outlines what pre-construction and construction phase archaeological works will be required. Decisions as to the nature and extent of the above will be determined in consultation with the SCCCA.</p> <p>d) The SCCCA is content with this approach so long as the applicant can be more specific about when they intend to carry out the trial trenching and the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy is updated accordingly.</p>
1.6.13	The Applicant SCC	Hilton Park a) Paragraph 6.6.82 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-045] refers to former areas of the Hilton Hall park being covered by gravel pits. Are these areas subject to restoration, either under planning conditions or ROMP	

		provisions of the Environment Act 1995 (as amended)? b) If so, what restoration, if any, is proposed for these areas? c) Do these provisions have any implications for the consideration of this matter?	
1.7.1.	SSC SCC	Clarification Could SC and SSC please explain the relationship between them in relation to the provision of advice relating to landscape and visual effects in the determination of planning applications and applications for development consent?	There is no relationship. SCC's advice is currently provided by an external contractor and there is no scope in this arrangement for conferring with SSC.
1.7.6	SCC SSC NE Interested parties	General Approach: Is the assessment undertaken against a baseline conclusion that the receiving landscape is of low landscape value – is this reasonable and agreed position by all parties?	The baseline landscape character assessment is accurate and fairly described. There may be locally valued landscapes affected which the local community have made representations about- detailed design should review these comments and mitigate where possible.
1.7.7.	SSC SCC Interested Parties	Representative viewpoints a) The Applicant has set out a series of viewpoints in Figures 7.5 to 7.25 [APP-088 to APP-108] which it sees as representative. Do the parties consider that any additional viewpoints, not covered by the representative viewpoints, should be considered? b) If so, please provide details of the additional viewpoint(s), preferably on an Ordnance Survey base, explain why that viewpoint has not been already represented by one of the existing viewpoints and why it is important. It may be that rather than produce photographs the ExA may be able to visit the viewpoint as part of one of the Site Inspections	The viewpoints are representative and they cover the whole study area. As discussed in 1.7.6 above there may be locally valued viewpoints as highlighted by the local community which have not been considered to date. Detailed design should review any community representations on landscape views and attempt to address and mitigate the impacts.
1.7.8.	SCC SSC	Vegetation Growth rates a) Do the parties agree that the vegetation growth rates set out in paragraph 7.4.6 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-046] are reasonable? b) If not,	Growth rates as described are reasonable in normal growing conditions. Monitoring and review of maintenance and management post completion should measure growth rates against the predicted values and

		what growth rates should be used. Please justify your answer along with evidence to support such a view.	should propose remedial work or replacement planting with more mature stock in sensitive areas where screening has not been effective.
1.7.17	The Applicant SSC SCC	Landscape value In Table 7.7 Factors in determining landscape value of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-046] 'Conservation Interests' again identified as 'low' however there are grade I listed buildings Grade II* listed buildings and numerous Grade II listed buildings as well as a local designated HLA why does this not elevate the value above 'low'?	The significance of Hilton Park as an 18 <sup>th</sup> century historic parkland is acknowledged in the ES as a rare example in the landscape and visual impact assessments, however overall the value of the feature is classed as Low. <i>The parkland at Hilton Park is a feature which is not found elsewhere within the study area and is considered to be relatively rare. However, there are no other rare elements within the study area.</i> This argument did strike me as being flawed as if the generally low conservation interests 'water down' the rare example at Hilton Park.
1.9.3	NE SCC SSC ShC WCC	Best and Most Versatile Land a) In considering the loss of the BMV agricultural land the Applicant has assessed this against the quanta of the various categories in the National Character Area of the application site. Do the interested parties consider that this is a valid approach, or should some other metric be utilised? b) If another metric is to be used, what should this be and what would be the value judgement of this loss?	N/A
1.9.4.	The Applicant SCC	Land Stability a) Table 9.7 in Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-048] indicates a possible encroachment between the scheme and former underground workings associated with Hilton Main Colliery. Could the Applicant produce a plan showing the extent of known workings with the Proposed Development (including associated development) imposed. b) Could an assessment be	a) n/a b) Ground stability risks associated with former underground mining of coal is a matter to refer to the Coal Authority. The Coal Authority will be able to advise on any stability assessments produced by the applicant

		undertaken of the risks associated with the proximity of these workings in both the construction and operational periods?	
1.10.4	SSC SCC ShC WCC	Cumulative effects of new development a) Paragraph 4.3.13 of the Transport Assessment [APP-222] indicates that the traffic model for future years only includes additional sites for over 150 dwellings. Do the Councils consider that utilising this threshold is reasonable, particularly taking into account the allocations and housing trajectories in their local plans? b) If not, could the parties please identify why they do not consider that this is reasonable. c) What, if any, alternative threshold should be utilised, explaining why that is appropriate? d) Could the Councils provide details of those sites which they consider should also be included, along with whether they consider that they are committed, more than likely, reasonably foreseeable or hypothetical, explaining why they consider that they should be included.	This threshold seems reasonable and is accepted by SCC. We were not consulted on the uncertainty log but understand that LPAs were, and have returned comments. SCC would not raise this threshold as an issue.
1.10.5.	WCC SSC SCC	Cumulative effects of new development a) Do the parties consider that the long list and short list of other developments (applications and allocations) and assessment for potential significant cumulative effects set out in Table 15.1.1 of Appendix 15.1 [APP-210] is appropriate? b) Are there any other applications and allocations that should have been included, and on which list should they have been included? c) Are any applications and allocations identified on the long list that should have been included on the short list? d) Is the Cumulative assessment with other development (applications and allocations) (Stage	The modelling has been undertaken in accordance with appropriate WebTag guidance. SCC considers this modelling has been undertaken correctly and due to timing RoF Featherstone was excluded as no planning permission was in place and therefore no accompanying Transport Assessment available. This has been confirmed by South Staffordshire District Council.

		4) set out in Table 15.1.2 considered appropriate? e) If not, please explain your reasoning.	
1.10.7.	The Applicant SCC	Traffic on existing Cannock Road a) The Applicant indicates in paragraph 4.6.7 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222] that in the event that traffic flows on the existing A460 were to remain high, it would instigate a 'Monitor and Manage' approach. What would this consist of, beyond a generalised "traffic regulation order"? b) How is this to be triggered and secured?	<p>We have considered the proposal set out in TA paragraph 4.6.7 with the applicant in detail. We have concluded it is not practical and fails to address the fundamental issue raised. Further, it is unclear how such an approach would be secured and delivered.</p> <p>It is SCC's position that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in the form of a 7.5T environmental weight restriction Order should be provided through the DCO to restrict usage of the existing A460 by HGV through traffic post scheme opening. This is detailed further in our Written Representation.</p>
1.10.8.	The Applicant SCC	Junction 11 of M6 a) Table 4.7 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222] sets out the LinSig Assessment Results for 2039. Given that the DoS figures for 2039 are only marginally below 90% (and at 90% if further rounded), this gives little 'margin for error' for the calculations. Given this lack of margin for error, what analysis of alternative approaches was undertaken to ensure that the design approach is robust? b) What alternative strategies, tactics or interventions would be possible should the DoS in practice exceed 90%? c) How would these be secured if necessary?	<p>The 90% degree of saturation is considered acceptable in 2039, although this is really a question for HE as they will maintain/manage the junction. 90-100% DoS is considered to provide enough margin for error. Sensitivity tests within the HE modelling with high/low growth scenarios should be able to test the robustness of this approach. Going forward if capacity issues are experienced then traffic signal settings could be adjusted and localised engineering modifications introduced</p>
1.10.12.	The Applicant SCC WCC	Effect on NMUs a) It is understood that non-motorised users (NMUs) will not be prevented from using the new link road. Is this correct? b) If this is the case, should they be so prevented (except in an emergency), and how should this be secured? c) Or, should only certain categories of users be prevented? d) In any event, NMUs will not be able to use the slip roads to/from the	<p>There are no details of facilities for NMUs on the new link road, although there are no proposals to restrict its usage by NMUs. Facilities have been proposed for NMUs at M54 J1 and M6 J11 and for improved links to Cheslyn Hay which SCC supports. Given that no designated facilities have been proposed along the new link road it would be most appropriate to consider</p>

		<p>motorways which does not appear to be the case in Figures 6.1 to 6.7 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222]. Could this be clarified</p>	<p>provision of upgraded facilities along the existing A460 where traffic levels are forecast to be significantly reduced, encouraging sustainable travel. These facilities would offer greater connectivity for local communities. Such improvements could include shared-use walk/cycle facilities, safe crossing points and links to the National Cycle Network. Further investigation would be required to define exact locations but consideration should be given to provision in the vicinity of Hilton Lane, Church Road, New Road and The Avenue junctions</p>
1.10.14.	The Applicant SCC	<p>Bus Stops a) Figure 7.3 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222] indicates that there would be two new bus stops on Cannock Road. How are these to be secured? b) Have the relevant Bus companies been engaged in any proposed changes to Bus routing? c) Have they indicated no issue? d) Are the applicants funding the new bus stops that could be provided or funding the replacement of those to be lost?</p>	<p>Figure 7.3 indicates that only 1 new stop is proposed however we are unsure how this would be secured unless it is provided by the applicant. We are not aware of whether Arriva has been consulted on the proposed route changes required for their service 70. This will be likely to make access to Featherstone slightly more awkward from the Wolverhampton direction, so maintaining a service in Featherstone will be an important consideration. However, if the turning for buses left from the new road onto the existing A460 is suitable this should not be an issue.</p> <p>The applicant should seek the views of Arriva and Select Bus who provide local services including school buses to Cheslyn Hay High School.</p> <p>Figure 7.3 also shows two bus stops to be removed when there is only one to be removed (southbound) as there is no northbound stop in the location identified. If the removed stop could be replaced to the north of The Avenue junction this may not cause any issues for bus</p>

			<p>patrons. There are also some stops identified in figure 7.3 which do not exist on site, including the last stop westbound on The Avenue prior to the A460.</p> <p>A more significant issue may involve routings of school buses in the Featherstone area which could cause greater issues than with local service buses. This may not be an issue if the access from Featherstone towards the north and Cheslyn Hay High School is maintained.</p>
1.10.15.	The Applicant SCC	Bus Timings Paragraph 7.2.7 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222] makes an assessment of effects on journey times to Bus Route 70 as a result of the Proposed Development. Could this assessment be quantified in terms of minutes and seconds?	In terms of timing issues we are unable to quantify this but can confirm that service 70 does experience delays due to queuing traffic at present and thus reduced traffic pressures on the existing route will be likely to lead to more reliable journey times and reduced delays despite a longer route.
1.11.2.	EA SCC	Fluvial Flood Risk a) Table 3.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-200] sets out the summary of fluvial flood risk by watercourse. Do the EA and SCC as LLFA agree with the flood risks set out in this Table? b) If not, what should they be? Please justify your answer.	<p>EA to comment regarding Latherford Brook (watercourse 5) due to associated Flood Zones.</p> <p>LLFA Response: Table 3.1 alone oversimplifies the picture of flood risk, and 'Low' flood risk is not defined. Both risks to and impacts of the Scheme need to be considered.</p> <p>The detail in the full report is important, including remediation of identified issues, ongoing maintenance, and key considerations in the detailed design.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Lower Pool (watercourse 3) has a significant impact on the flood risk downstream at the Dark Lane culvert and A460 culvert (Hydraulic Model Report 5.3.4). "It is important that the Lower</p>

			<p>Pool is retained as an online feature, as it provides flood protection downstream” (5.3.8). “Despite the Scheme reducing the area of the Lower Pool pond from 13200m<sup>2</sup> to 8723m<sup>2</sup> (approximate values), this does not increase flood risk to properties downstream. However, further sensitivity testing concerning the pond size and weir design should be considered at the detailed design stage” (5.3.9).</p> <p>The detailed design should ensure that flood risk downstream is not increased, and preferably include measures to reduce it. The detailed design of Lower Pool and weir could provide an opportunity for improvement.</p> <p>4.1.3 to 4.1.7 identifies an existing flood risk to the A460 at watercourse 2 and potential for minor improvement to that existing risk, but it was not deemed significant enough to include given the increase in Scheme costs. However this is not further justified.</p> <p>“Different alignments of the watercourse were tested as part of the development of the design. Iterations of this have included the testing of a pond storage area between the main and minor culvert. Whilst this did have a minor impact on water levels at the existing A460 culvert, it was not deemed significant enough to include in the design given the increase in Scheme costs.”</p> <p>Ongoing maintenance will be key to managing flood risk for the lifetime of the development. 5.1.2 states:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>“A maintenance plan will need to be developed at detailed design stage to describe the ownership, frequency of and techniques for site drainage maintenance.”</p> <p>Another potential source of flood risk is where discharge of surface water is discharged via existing systems, and it is vital that replacements or upgrades identified at the detailed design stage are fully implemented. The drainage strategy (3.1.3) states:</p> <p>“The Scheme drainage survey commenced w/c 17th June 2019 to further understand the existing drainage infrastructure. The initial results of the received indicative drainage survey indicate the existing drainage is in poor condition and would need replacement / upgrade. A full detailed review of the survey will be undertaken as part of detailed design. Nothing has been identified from the initial survey results that would change the approach in the drainage strategy.”</p>
1.11.7.	EA SCC	<p>Groundwater Flood Risk Paragraph 3.6.9 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-200] in that the results of the borehole for BH12 show groundwater levels higher than the level of construction in close proximity. The Applicant considers that this does not result in a risk to the scheme as Lower Pool, which is nearby, is to be lost. Do the EA and SCC agree with this analysis?</p>	<p>EA Groundwater Team has advised it is considered that the shallow groundwater levels in this location are due to perched waters on top of a localised area of lower lying, thicker clay deposits (hence the adjacent pool too). However, the next nearest borehole has a much deeper water level already, so it is expected that whereas excavation near BH12 will lead to some groundwater ingress and the planned loss of Lower Pool, this will be of limited amount and can be readily controlled by sump and pump extraction methods</p>

			(under the appropriate EA exemption or abstraction permit). We would not consider this an unusual or detrimental construction event and not pose an impact to the wider area
1.11.13.	EA SCC	Greenfield run-off rate a) Can the EA and SCC confirm whether they are content with the 5 l/s/ha for the greenfield run-off rate as set out in paragraph 4.4.6 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-200]? b) If not, what rate should be utilised? Can this alternative figure be justified?	Proposed greenfield runoff rate of 5 l/s/ha is acceptable.
1.11.14.	EA SCC	Cutting under Hilton Lane Overbridge a) Paragraphs 4.5.4 to 4.5.8 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-200] conclude that the risk of groundwater flooding from the cutting is low? Do the EA and SCC concur with this analysis? b) If not, please explain your reasoning.	Regarding the future cutting beneath Hilton Lane Overbridge, it does appear that active drainage will be needed to lower the groundwater level and maintain the groundwater below the road level. However, any such intercepted water will only be from a relatively small area and will subsequently be discharged to the main natural receptor (Watercourse 4) again, so it is indeed considered that the impact on the flow in that stream would only be minor, if any. They will have to design the drainage runs to allow for max. groundwater levels measured to date plus future climate change impacts, so that at all times the system will cope and no groundwater will ever flood the highway.
1.12.1.	SCC	Minerals a) It is understood that the Proposed Development passes through a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for Sand and Gravel and part of a MSA for Brick Clay. Does SCC consider that these designations have any implications for the consideration of this matter? b) If so, what are these implications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Yes.</li> <li>b) There should be an assessment on whether 1) sand and gravel that would be sterilised could be used within the scheme as construction aggregate (not just as fill material); and 2) the extent of sterilised sand and gravel that could be otherwise extracted from Hilton Park Quarry.</li> </ul>

1.12.3.	The Applicant SSC SCC	M6 Diesel M6 Diesel are concerned that powers sought under Article 16 of the dDCO could be used to introduce restrictions on the current A460 passing their site and that this could result in significant detriment to their business (if for example HGV's were restricted). Can the Applicant confirm its position in respect of potential restrictions on the A460 and whether the host Authorities and Highway Authorities are in agreement with their position?	Please see response to 1.10.7 and our Written Representation. The restriction sought by SCC and supported by SSDC and local residents would provide for access to/from M6 Diesel from M6 junction 11, via the new link road. This will ensure access by HGVs to the filling station is restricted to the length of the A460 where it will have minimal impact on local residents. The proposed restriction seeks only to prevent HGV's leaving the M54 at Junction 1 to then re-join the motorway network at M6 junction 11 and vice versa i.e. through traffic motorway to motorway. This aligns with the stated scheme objectives 1-3
1.12.12.	The Applicant SCC ShC WCC	Recycled aggregates a) Paragraph 3.3.68 of Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-042] in it is indicated that a target of 27% of secondary and recycled aggregates had been set, and this is in accordance with Regional Guidelines. Can these Guidelines and the relevant reference be precisely identified? b) Given that the location of the Proposed Development is relatively close to large sources of secondary and recycled aggregate what consideration has been given to setting a higher, realisable, target? c) Could a higher target be reasonably achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the target is derived from <u>National and Regional Guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005 to 2020</u>. Of the aggregate to be produced in the West Midlands (not including imports), the assumption made in table 1 of the guidelines is that approximately 29% of aggregate would be derived from "alternative sources" i.e. recycled aggregate and secondary materials.</li> <li>b) The aforementioned guidelines were published in 2009 but more recent data produced by the Mineral Products Association "<u>From Waste To Resource</u>" suggests that 30% of all aggregate demand is now supplied from non primary sources, mainly recycled sources.</li> <li>c) The applicant should assess the availability of recycled waste and secondary material sources within the locality as part of the earthworks strategy and materials management plan.</li> </ul>