

## **Application by Highways England for M54 to M6 Link Road**

### **The Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)**

**Issued on 4 December 2020**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [M54toM6LinkRoad@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:M54toM6LinkRoad@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'M54 to M6 Link Road ExQ2' in the subject line of your email.

A date for responses is **Deadline 4** (Friday 8 January 2021).

Please note: The ExA is not setting out questions on matters that it wishes to discuss at the Issue Specific and Compulsory Acquisition Hearings where Agendas have already been published. Should any party not at the Hearings wish to make

representations following the Hearing, for example having reviewed the video recording, then they should do so by **Deadline 4** (Friday 8 January 2021) as part of the Post December 2020 Hearing submissions.

### Abbreviations used

<b>PA2008</b>	<i>The Planning Act 2008</i>	<b>NMU</b>	<i>Non-Motorised User</i>
<b>Art</b>	<i>Article</i>	<b>NE</b>	<i>Natural England</i>
<b>ALA 1981</b>	<i>Acquisition of Land Act 1981</i>	<b>NPPF</b>	<i>National Planning Policy Framework</i>
<b>BoR</b>	<i>Book of Reference</i>	<b>NSIP</b>	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
<b>BMV</b>	<i>Best and Most Versatile Land</i>	<b>NPSNN</b>	<i>National Policy Statement for National Networks</i>
<b>CA</b>	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	<b>PA2008</b>	<i>Planning Act 2008 (as amended)</i>
<b>CPO</b>	<i>Compulsory purchase order</i>	<b>PRoW</b>	<i>Public Right of Way</i>
<b>dDCO</b>	<i>Draft DCO</i>	<b>R</b>	<i>Requirement</i>
<b>EA</b>	<i>Environment Agency</i>	<b>SI</b>	<i>Statutory Instrument</i>
<b>EM</b>	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>	<b>SCC</b>	<i>Staffordshire County Council</i>
<b>ES</b>	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	<b>ShC</b>	<i>Shropshire Council</i>
<b>ExA</b>	<i>Examining authority</i>	<b>SSC</b>	<i>South Staffordshire Council</i>
<b>HBMCE</b>	<i>Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (generally known as Historic England)</i>	<b>SoS</b>	<i>Secretary of State</i>
<b>LIR</b>	<i>Local Impact Report</i>	<b>TP</b>	<i>Temporary Possession</i>
<b>LPA</b>	<i>Local planning authority</i>	<b>WCC</b>	<i>Wolverhampton City Council</i>
		<b>WCH</b>	<i>Walker, Cyclist, Horserider</i>

### The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained at this [link](#).

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

### **Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ2.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

<b>ExQ2</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>General and Cross-topic Questions</b>	
2.0.1	Interested Parties	<p><b>The effects of the Proposed Development</b> In its response to ExQ1.0.6 [REP1-036] the Applicant has set out what it considers to be the main benefits and adverse effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>(a) Do the Interested Parties agree with these lists? (b) If not, please set out what you consider them to be, and provide justification for your view.</p> <p>Please note: This question does not relate to issues of Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession and responses should not address these matters.</p>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Green Belt</b>	
2.1.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Proposed Signage</b> In its response to ExQ1.1.2 [REP1-036] the Applicant indicates that final location and dimensions of proposed signage is subject to detailed design. However, could the Applicant please provide a standard specification for such signs, that is verge and gantry mounted signs so that the sizes can be estimated.</p>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Air Quality and Emissions</b>	
2.2.1		The ExA has no questions at this time.
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment</b> (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
2.3.1	The Applicant Allow Limited	<p><b>Base data</b> Could the Applicant and Allow Limited please include as part of their Statement of Common Ground information as to the areas of the various habitats and species. This should be provided on drawings based on survey or Ordnance Survey data, setting out clearly the areas where there is agreement and the areas where there is disagreement. This should be accompanied with a schedule explaining the differences and why the parties hold the view they do.</p>
2.3.2	The Applicant	<b>Habitats Regulations Assessment</b>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Applicant has submitted revised documentation in respect of the Accepted Changes setting out the various effects. However, no new document "Habitats Regulations Assessment: No Significant Effects Report" to update/amend the existing document [APP-216] has been submitted.</p> <p>(a) Can the Applicant please confirm whether it considers the existing document to be up-to-date?</p> <p>(b) If not, can a revised document please be submitted?</p>
2.3.3	Natural England Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	<p><b>Effects on ancient woodland from nitrogen deposition</b></p> <p>(a) Do Natural England and the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust consider that the 1:1 ratio for planting of replacement woodland habitat to compensate for the effects on ancient woodland from nitrogen deposition (see paragraphs 2.4.10 and 2.4.11 of the document entitled Environmental Mitigation Approach [REP1-057]) is appropriate?</p> <p>(b) If not, can you please explain why, and what other metric should be used?</p>
2.3.4	Highways England National Trust	<p><b>Effects on ancient woodland</b></p> <p>It is stated that Highways England and National Trust have entered into an agreement to carry out a woodland scheme. Can Highways England provide a copy of that agreement into the examination.</p>
2.3.5	The Applicant	<p><b>ES Figure 8.18</b></p> <p>The Guide to the Application [REP3-002/REP3-003] indicates that Environmental Statement Figure 8.18: Bat Baseline - Transect Activity Survey Results (2018 and 2019) [APP-122] has six sheets. However, the submitted document only has three sheets. Could this be clarified?</p>
2.3.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Biodiversity metric</b></p> <p>The ExA thanks the Applicant for undertaking the Defra 2.0 Biodiversity metric. It is understood that the final version of the Defra metric is to be published shortly. Could the Applicant please undertake an analysis of the scheme against this metric</p>

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		when it has been published.
2.3.7	SSC	<p><b>Compliance with NPSNN</b></p> <p>(a) In the draft SoCG with SSC [REP1-059] indicates that SSC considers that the scheme does not reference paragraph 5.33 of the NPSNN, which highlights the need to consider whether biodiversity opportunities have been maximised, including via planning obligations. Could SSC indicate whether it considers biodiversity opportunities have been maximised.</p> <p>(b) If not, what additional measures need to be included?</p>
2.3.8	NE	<p><b>Effects on Priority Habitats</b></p> <p>(a) In the draft SoCG with NE [REP1-028] the Applicant considers that NE is requesting an 'in combination' assessment for Priority habitats. Is this in fact correct?</p> <p>(b) If so, could the NE please explain under what policy indication or legal obligation should such an assessment be made.</p> <p>(c) If not, could NE please indicate in greater detail the concerns that it is seeking to make.</p>
2.3.9	The Applicant SSC NE	<p><b>Veteran Trees</b></p> <p>Could the parties ensure that agreement or otherwise that all veteran trees are identified in the documentation is recorded in the relevant Statements of Common Ground.</p>
2.3.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Dry Swale</b></p> <p>What would be the disadvantages of providing a linear dry swale instead of a pond north of the new road next to the accommodation bridge as has been suggested?</p>
<b>2.4</b>		<b>Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b>
2.4.1	The Applicant	<p><b>CA and TP Negotiations</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant please provide an update of the current situation of negotiations with affected landowners and occupiers over potential acquisition by agreement?</p>

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please complete Annex B with this information.
2.4.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Land surrounded by Plot 4/20c</b></p> <p>(a) Could the Applicant explain how this land is to be accessed by the existing landowner both during the construction period and afterwards?</p> <p>(b) How is to be secured in the DCO?</p>
2.4.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Plots 5/2</b></p> <p>(a) Could the Applicant explain how this land is to be accessed by the existing landowner at the end of the Temporary Possession period?</p> <p>(b) How is to be secured in the DCO?</p>
2.4.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Plot 5/26</b></p> <p>(a) The Land Plans [AS-065] do not show this designation. It is understood that this is a narrow 'L' shaped piece of land between Cannock Road and Plot 5/2. Could this please be clarified?</p> <p>(b) Further, could the Applicant explain how that the interests, including the Human Rights, of those with an interest of the land are to be protected in this examination process?</p>
2.4.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Statutory Undertakers</b></p> <p>(a) Can the latest position of the Utilities be updated and in particular with regard to the protective provisions?</p> <p>(b) Could the Applicant also set out the current progress on Statements of Common Ground?</p>
2.4.6	The Applicant Cadent Gas	<p><b>High Pressure Gas Main (Work 68)</b></p> <p>Should this also be that any redundant equipment be removed, rather than abandoned, so that there is overall no change in effects? (see also question 2.5.4).</p>
2.4.7	The Applicant Affected Persons	<p><b>Long-term maintenance of mitigation</b></p> <p>(a) Various Affected Persons have made the point that they are being deprived of more land than may be justified on the basis that some of the land sought for</p>

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Compulsory Acquisition, having been used for mitigation, may be available for return to the original owner under the Crichel Down rules, but with restricted covenants and/or legal agreements to ensure the necessary maintenance of the mitigation. Could the Applicant set out its response to this proposition, both generally and in relation to the specific locations where this may occur.</p> <p>(b) How does this affect consideration of alternatives, and of the compelling case in the public interest?</p>
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-018]</b>	
2.5.1	The Applicant	<p><b>The Draft DCO</b> Could the Applicant please ensure that as well as submitting clean and tracked change versions of all future versions of the draft DCO as .pdf they are also submitted as .docx documents as well.</p>
2.5.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2(1)</b> (a) Should 'relevant planning authority' and 'relevant local highway authority' be defined? (b) Is there a particular reason why these terms are used rather than 'local planning authority' and 'local highway authority' respectively?</p>
2.5.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 15(1)</b> Following the deletion at D3 there is an extra comma after "roads" in the third line which should also be deleted.</p>
2.5.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1, Work 68</b> (a) This work would involve the relocation of an existing high pressure gas main. Given the location and the effect on the remaining land holding, should any redundant gas main be removed from the site, rather than abandoned? (b) If so, how is this to be secured?</p>
2.5.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – comment on consultation</b> In its response to ExQ1.5.37 [REP1-036] the Applicant indicates that details of</p>



<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		consultation with various parties, including the British Horse Society, will be provided in the REAC in the OEMP. Could the ExA be directed to precisely where this is secured.
2.5.6	Natural England	<b>Schedule 2, Requirements 4 and 5</b> In its response at D2 in relation to ExQ1.5.39 [REP2-009], the Applicant indicates that Natural England is content with the mitigation measures relating to soil storage. Could Natural England confirm its position.
2.5.7	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 2, Requirement 6</b> The ExA notes the Applicant's response to ExQ1.5.40 [REP1-036] but considers that for certainty "and programme" should be added at the end of paragraph 6(3), and asks the Applicant so to do.
2.5.8	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 2, Requirement 11</b> The ExA notes the Applicant's response to ExQ1.5.42 [REP1-036] and accepts a fence will be necessary. However, the ExA has difficulty in understanding why the standard has to be in the Requirement. This does not meet the tests for requirements – in particular that of relevance to planning. Consequently, it should be deleted from the dDCO and included in the OEMP.
2.5.9	The Applicant Statutory Undertakers	<b>Schedule 9</b> Could the Applicant and all Statutory Undertakers who would have apparatus covered by the Protective Provisions set out their latest understandings of negotiations on any necessary text.
2.5.10	The Applicant	<b>Engineering Section Drawings</b> Can an additional drawing be provided showing where the sections are in plan, along with chainage markers (every 50m would be sufficient to avoid clutter)?
<b>2.6</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	
2.6.1	The Applicant	<b>Kettle Holes</b> Can the applicant confirm whether the potential for kettle holes and sediment/peat

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		accumulations has been considered and the extent to whether investigations/ sampling is required?
2.6.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Portobello Tower</b> It is noted that the Applicant is looking for designated funds to undertake an assessment of the Portobello Tower but makes clear that is outside the DCO process. Can the Applicant please explain this position in relation to paragraph 5.130 of the NPSNN which states: "The Secretary of State should take into account the desirability of sustaining and, where appropriate, enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the contribution of their settings and the positive contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities – including their economic vitality"?</p>
2.6.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Mile Wall</b> The Applicant has indicated that part of Mile Wall that is to be demolished will be re-provided in an alternative location. Can the Applicant show where this to be secured?</p>
2.6.4	Allow Limited	<p><b>Planting in vicinity of Lower Pool</b> (a) In their representations at D3A [REP3A-001] Allow Limited state "It is asserted that visual screening can be achieved with less planting in 4/20c and that the area of woodland mitigation on plot 4/20c should be reduced." Could Allow Limited please evidence this assertion, taking into account that the Applicant is of the view that the reasoning for the mitigation is multi-faceted and not just for ecological or cultural heritage reasons. (b) Could Allow Limited and the Applicant in their joint draft Statement of Common Ground please set out the differences between the two parties both described and in drawings.</p>
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual</b>	
2.7.1	The Applicant	<b>Photomontages and additional visual mitigation</b>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Additional photomontages have been requested for a southerly view of Dark Lane with additional tree planting to mitigate the impact on views and additional tree planting to the west of the road as it rises to junction 11 of M6 with a photomontage to demonstrate the effect. Can the applicant consider these additional mitigation and representative views and either provide or confirm why they are not necessary/ appropriate?
2.7.2	The Applicant Allow Limited	<b>Replace metal fencing</b> Residents have requested that action is taken to remove/replace the existing metal fence in the vicinity of Lower Pool and Dark Lane. Has this been considered and assessed and any impediments identified to improve the appearance of the area?
2.7.3	The Applicant	<b>Landscape value</b> (a) If the landscape value of the area was considered to be "medium" what would be the outcome for the assessment of effects and impacts and would this significantly change the identified effect? (b) What impact would this have on the overall conclusions?
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	
2.8.1	The Applicant	<b>Additional noise protection</b> It has been suggested that additional acoustic boarding in the vicinity of The Shrubbery and surrounding cottages could reduce the effect of noise on the occupants of those properties. What is the Applicant's response as to the effectiveness and potential for such additional measures?
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Geology and Soils</b>	
2.9.1	The Applicant	<b>Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land</b> Natural England in its response to ExQ1.9.3 [REP1-012] indicates that the percentage of BMV should be compared with the national breakdown of BMV. In light of this could the Applicant please undertake a review of its analysis utilising this approach?

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
2.9.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Use of Soils and Gravel on site</b> SCC in its response to ExQ1.12.1 [REP1-006] indicates that “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”. Could the Applicant please undertake these analyses.</p>
2.9.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Minerals and Waste</b> SCC in its LiR it is stated there would be additional demand placed on the provision of construction aggregates and it is difficult to assess the impact on available permitted reserves. It is recommended that a materials audit is provided by the applicant. Can the Applicant please provide such an audit?</p>
2.9.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Recycled Aggregates</b> SSC in its response to EXQ 1.12.12 highlights that more recent data produced by the Mineral Products Association “From Waste To Resource” suggests that 30% of all aggregate demand is now supplied from non-primary sources, mainly recycled sources. It is suggested the availability of recycled waste and secondary material sources within the locality should be assessed as part of the earthworks strategy and materials management plan. Can the applicant update this to reflect this request?</p>
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Traffic and Transport</b>	
2.10.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Transport Assessment Report</b> In their response to ExQ1.10.10 [REP1-036] the Applicant asks whether there are any specific queries.</p> <p>Annex A shows information which has been extracted from the Tables 4.9 to 4.17 of the Transport Assessment Report [APP-222]. However, it is displayed by route rather than by time of day. It is appreciated that the Transport Assessment Report</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>have been updated at [REP3-035/REP3-036] but, it is understood that these figures have not changed.</p> <p><u>Route 1 – Southbound</u></p> <p>The figures in 2039 for the 0800-0900, 1800-1900 and ON periods appear potentially anomalous, as these all estimate increases in journey time, when the others are reductions.</p> <p><u>Route 2 Southbound</u></p> <p>In looking at AM1, when compared to the time saving predictions for overnight and AM2 (and the rest of the day) these look anomalous. The issue is that that are no time savings overnight, when traffic would be expected to be lightest, but greatest time savings in the AM1 peak when traffic should be starting to increase from the overnight, but less thereafter.</p> <p><u>Route 4 Eastbound and Westbound</u></p> <p>Same query as Route 2 Southbound for the AM1. There are greater time savings in AM1 compared with overnight; this may be anomalous.</p> <p>Could these please be checked and an explanation given if these figures are correct.</p>
2.10.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Transport Assessment Report</b></p> <p>In his D2 response [REP2-014] Mr Williams sets out various figures which are said to be taken from the Technical Appendix 13.5 – Operational Noise Assessment (TA13.5) information submitted with the application for the West Midlands Interchange Development Consent Order.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:																				
		<p>While it is appreciated that the data in that Report utilises 2016 figures and that in the submitted Transport Assessment Report [AS-113/AS-114] (the TAR) utilises 2015 figures there does appear to be material differences between the figures reported. It is also appreciated that the TAR utilises AADT figures and the TA13.5 utilises AAWT figures and therefore the AAWT would tend to be higher.</p> <p>The ExA does not have any information as to the veracity of the WMI report (Table A13.5.1), notwithstanding this there do appear to be differences between that report and the TAR (Figures 3.13 and 3.15).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="808 746 1767 970"> <thead> <tr> <th>Route</th> <th>Source</th> <th>TAR</th> <th>TA13.5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (NB)</td> <td></td> <td>5,930</td> <td>9,228</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (SB)</td> <td></td> <td>5,910</td> <td>9,695</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (NB)</td> <td></td> <td>9,520</td> <td>11,536</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (SB)</td> <td></td> <td>8,930</td> <td>11,637</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is clear these figures are measuring different matters, and the ExA is not reconsidering whether the information in the WMI report is robust. However, the ExA would be grateful if the Applicant could explain these discrepancies as the ExA is interested as to whether the TAR provides a robust assessment in support of the Case for the Proposed Development.</p>	Route	Source	TAR	TA13.5	A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (NB)		5,930	9,228	A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (SB)		5,910	9,695	A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (NB)		9,520	11,536	A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (SB)		8,930	11,637
Route	Source	TAR	TA13.5																			
A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (NB)		5,930	9,228																			
A449 between A5 and Gravelley Way (SB)		5,910	9,695																			
A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (NB)		9,520	11,536																			
A449 north of Jct 2 of M54 (SB)		8,930	11,637																			
2.10.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Off-site effects</b></p> <p>In its response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) from Staffordshire County Council at D3 [REP3-037] the applicant does not respond to paragraph 6.6 in the LIR. Could the Applicant please set out its position, particularly into the case that further off-</p>																				

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		site mitigations may be necessary.
2.10.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Facilities for horse riders around M54 Jct 1</b></p> <p>(a) In the draft SoCG with SCC it is indicated “due to the cross-section restriction through [M54 Jct 1], separate [NMU] facilities have been discounted”. Could this please be demonstrated?</p> <p>(b) What would be needed to achieve separate facilities?</p>
2.10.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Facilities for horse riders around M6 Jct 11</b></p> <p>(a) In the draft SoCG with SCC it is indicated “due to the cross-section restriction through [M6 Jct 11], separate [NMU] facilities have been discounted”.</p> <p>(b) Could this please be demonstrated?</p> <p>(c) What would be needed to achieve separate facilities?</p>
2.10.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Diversion of Public Footpath No 8 Saredon</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please explain how it is intended to link Public Footpath No 8 Saredon with the footway at junction 11 of the M6 given the change in levels and the need to ensure that it is accessible for all members of the community at all times. For example, this is not shown on the Indicative Traffic Management Layouts at Appendix E of the Outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-115/AS-115], and pedestrians form part of the ‘traffic’ of the junction.</p>
2.10.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Diversion of Bridleway No 13 Saredon</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please explain how it is intended to link Bridleway No 13 Saredon with the carriageway at junction 11 of the M6 given the need to ensure that it is accessible for all members of the community at all times. For example, this is not shown on the Indicative Traffic Management Layouts at Appendix E of the Outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-115/AS-115], and WCH users form part of the ‘traffic’ of the junction.</p>
2.10.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Compliance with NPSNN</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.17 of the NPSNN indicates “The Government also expects applicants to</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.”</p> <p>In the draft SoCG with SCC it is recorded as stating “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.”</p> <p>Could the Applicant please explain how it has sought to comply with paragraph 3.17 of the NPSNN given the statement in the draft SoCG that “The scheme does not include proposals to improve NMU facilities along the existing A460 corridor”?</p> <p>The response to this question should consider all corridors which would be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>
2.10.9	SCC	<p><b>Shareshill lay-by</b></p> <p>(a) Could SCC confirm whether there are currently waiting/parking restrictions?</p> <p>(b) If so, what effect have they?</p>
2.10.10	The Applicant SCC	<p><b>Maintenance Plans</b></p> <p>While the ExA appreciates that they are draft, and would not form a certified document, it would ease the ExA’s understanding if it could be provided with the draft Maintenance Plans, ie those showing which highways would be the responsibility of Highways England and of SCC.</p>
2.10.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Routings</b></p> <p>(a) Could the Applicant please provide information on the distances involved for a</p>



ExQ2	Question to:	Question:										
		<p>NMU both in the existing and proposed situations. If it is anticipated that any class of user, for example equestrians, would be required to use different routing then this should be reported separately. The marks are taken from the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 528 1995 788"> <thead> <tr> <th>Start Point</th> <th>Finish Point</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4/2</td> <td>A/4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/2</td> <td>Junction of The Avenue with Cannock Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/2</td> <td>4/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Junction of Shareshill 5 footpath with Shareshill 3 footpath</td> <td>Junction of Shareshill Footpath 5 with Hilton Lane.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(b) Could the Applicant please show these routings on a plan.</p>	Start Point	Finish Point	4/2	A/4	4/2	Junction of The Avenue with Cannock Road	4/2	4/10	Junction of Shareshill 5 footpath with Shareshill 3 footpath	Junction of Shareshill Footpath 5 with Hilton Lane.
Start Point	Finish Point											
4/2	A/4											
4/2	Junction of The Avenue with Cannock Road											
4/2	4/10											
Junction of Shareshill 5 footpath with Shareshill 3 footpath	Junction of Shareshill Footpath 5 with Hilton Lane.											
2.10.12	Interested parties	<p><b>Walking speed</b></p> <p>(a) In their response at D3 [REP3-037] to Cllr Cope’s Written Representation the Applicant utilises an “average walking speed of 4 mph” for measuring time effects. Do the interested parties consider that this is realistic given the nature of the environment which WCH would be travelling through?</p> <p>(b) If not, what speed should be utilised?</p>										
<b>2.11</b>	<b>Water Environment and Flood risk</b>											
2.11.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Latherford Brook (Watercourse 5)</b></p> <p>In its response to ExQ1.11.2 [REP1-072] the Environment Agency considers that the Latherford Brook should be considered as having a medium/high risk for the reasons set out. Could the Applicant please set out its response to this, if necessary on a without prejudice basis in the alternative, on the basis of medium/high risk was considered by the ExA to be appropriate.</p>										

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
2.11.2	The Applicant	<b>Cutting under Hilton Lane Overbridge</b> In the D2 response to the D1 submission [REP2-009] the Applicant indicates that necessary measures to ensure that there is no flooding impact on the carriageway will be the subject of the detailed designs. Could the Applicant please indicate where this will be secured?
2.11.3	The Applicant	<b>Abstraction rate for borrow pit</b> (a) It is suggested that the abstraction rate for dewatering the borrow pit at the M6 junction should be limited to 20 m <sup>3</sup> /d. Is the abstraction rate for dewatering the borrow pit secured? (b) Could the Applicant please explain how and where this is secured?
2.11.4	The Applicant	<b>Flood Risk improvements</b> The opportunity to improve flood risk down-stream of the Lower Pool is dependent on pond size and weir design. Can design parameters be provided and secured to ensure such improvement is achieved and demonstrated to be effective through sensitivity testing?
<b>2.12</b>	<b>Socio-economic effects</b>	
2.12.1	The Applicant	<b>Minerals</b> In the D2 response to the D1 submission [REP2-009] the Applicant indicates that consideration of site won minerals will take place during the detailed design stage. Could the Applicant please indicate where this will be secured?
2.12.2	Allow Limited	<b>Employment</b> In their Written Representations [REP1-091] paragraph 8.1 to 8.16 Allow Limited have set out what it considers to be the effects on employment. While it has made various comments, it is not clear how many full-time equivalent workers would be affected by the Proposed Development. The ExA requests a precise number, described by where they are employed.
2.12.3	SSC	<b>ROF Featherstone</b>

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Could the precise allocation be identified, that is the quantum, size, use(s) and associated metrics be provided, as well as location on an Ordnance Survey base map.
2.12.4	SSC	<b>i54</b> Could the precise allocation be identified, that is the quantum, size, use(s) and associated metrics be provided, as well as location on an Ordnance Survey base map.
2.12.5	The Applicant	<b>Local Employment Initiatives</b> It has been suggested that jobs should be secured for local people via the local jobs club through a legal mechanism has the Applicant considered local employment initiatives?

**ANNEX A:**

Time predictions for Route 1 Southbound:

	2015		2024				2031				2039		
SB			DM	DS		DM	DS			DM	DS		
0700-0800	19:05		20:08	20:17	00:09	20:58	20:42	-00:16		22:04	21:24	-00:40	
0800-0900	18:53		19:38	20:26	00:48	20:21	20:54	00:33		21:09	21:39	00:30	
0900-1100	19:34		20:11	20:16	00:05	20:11	20:16	00:05		21:15	21:08	-00:07	
IP	18:02		18:47	18:39	-00:08	19:14	18:54	-00:20		20:02	19:25	-00:37	
1600-1700	19:41		20:41	20:59	00:18	21:24	21:16	-00:08		22:31	21:56	-00:35	
1700-1800	19:45		20:27	20:49	00:22	21:06	21:35	00:29		22:12	22:05	-00:07	
1800-1900	17:08		17:41	18:14	00:33	18:00	18:28	00:28		18:31	18:53	00:22	
EV	15:33		15:47	15:51	00:04	15:54	15:54	00:00		16:08	16:02	-00:06	
ON	14:34		14:39	15:08	00:29	14:40	15:09	00:29		14:44	15:09	00:25	

Note: All information in minutes and seconds

Time predications for Route 2 Southbound:

	<b>2015</b>		<b>2024</b>				<b>2031</b>				<b>2039</b>		
			DM	DS			DM	DS			DM	DS	
0700-0800	29:36		30:25	29:45	-00:40		30:48	30:18	-00:30		31:35	31:05	-00:30
0800-0900	29:15		30:00	29:56	-00:04		30:30	30:19	-00:11		31:15	31:00	-00:15
0900-1100	28:16		28:53	28:44	-00:09		29:15	29:07	-00:08		29:54	29:35	-00:19
IP	24:36		25:24	25:13	-00:11		26:07	25:47	-00:20		26:48	26:25	-00:23
1600-1700	29:03		30:05	29:48	-00:17		30:43	30:27	-00:16		31:56	31:58	00:02
1700-1800	28:43		29:31	29:17	-00:14		29:59	29:41	-00:18		30:42	30:28	-00:14
1800-1900	24:46		25:21	25:21	00:00		25:47	25:34	-00:13		26:41	26:14	-00:27
EV	20:31		20:38	20:52	00:14		20:35	20:51	00:16		20:46	21:00	00:14
ON	19:56		19:57	20:11	00:14		19:52	20:06	00:14		19:54	20:09	00:15

Note: All information in minutes and seconds

Time predictions for Route 4 Eastbound and Westbound:

	2015		2024				2031				2039		
EB			DM	DS		DM	DS			DM	DS		
0700-0800	27:46		29:24	27:49	-01:35	30:37	28:22	-02:15		31:39	29:52	-01:47	
0800-0900	26:40		28:11	26:53	-01:18	29:01	27:23	-01:38		30:04	28:04	-02:00	
0900-1100	25:32		26:28	25:29	-00:59	27:21	25:50	-01:31		28:23	26:34	-01:49	
IP	24:55		25:47	24:53	-00:54	26:10	25:03	-01:07		27:00	25:32	-01:28	
1600-1700	27:21		29:08	27:17	-01:51	30:18	27:53	-02:25		31:29	29:14	-02:15	
1700-1800	28:07		29:58	28:12	-01:46	30:59	29:02	-01:57		32:00	30:12	-01:48	
1800-1900	27:47		25:29	24:44	-00:45	25:36	24:51	-00:45		26:02	25:13	-00:49	
EV	23:13		23:30	23:24	-00:06	23:31	23:21	-00:10		23:43	23:28	-00:15	
ON	24:46		22:55	22:54	-00:01	22:55	22:52	-00:03		22:56	22:54	-00:02	
	2015		2024				2031				2039		
WB			DM	DS		DM	DS			DM	DS		
0700-0800	28:11		29:22	27:58	-01:24	29:18	28:10	-01:08		29:41	28:42	-00:59	
0800-0900	28:20		29:05	28:14	-00:51	29:27	28:28	-00:59		29:41	28:43	-00:58	
0900-1100	27:38		28:16	27:15	-01:01	28:30	27:24	-01:06		28:57	27:48	-01:09	
IP	26:27		27:13	26:22	-00:51	27:23	26:31	-00:52		27:54	26:51	-01:03	
1600-1700	27:30		28:25	27:29	-00:56	28:33	27:38	-00:55		29:25	28:26	-00:59	
1700-1800	27:47		28:51	27:50	-01:01	29:00	28:12	-00:48		29:54	29:16	-00:38	
1800-1900	26:10		26:45	26:20	-00:25	26:53	26:25	-00:28		27:17	26:49	-00:28	
EV	24:43		25:02	24:54	-00:08	24:58	24:48	-00:10		25:09	24:57	-00:12	
ON	24:12		24:24	24:23	-00:01	24:21	24:20	-00:01		24:22	24:21	-00:01	

Note: All information in minutes and seconds

## ANNEX B

### M54 to M6 Link

List of all objections to the grant of Compulsory acquisition or Temporary Possession powers (ExQ2: Question [2.4.1])

Obj No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of objection

<sup>i</sup> Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence.

<sup>ii</sup> Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

<sup>iii</sup> Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

<sup>iv</sup> Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

<sup>v</sup> Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

<sup>vi</sup> This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
- Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who "would or might" be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
- Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

<sup>vii</sup> This column indicates whether the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights

<sup>viii</sup> CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is 'yes' if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and National Grid are seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights.