

From: [Councillor Robert Cope](#)
To: [M54 to M6 Link Road](#)
Subject: Deadline 5 [January 20th] response to comments from Deadline 4
Date: 19 January 2021 17:35:28

Attn of Louise Evens Case Manager M54 to M6 link road case team .

Interested Party Ref 20025371

1] My Response to comments from ALLOW LTD.

Allow comment on the loss of the car boot field 5/2, 5/25 and 5/26 and quote "Having to cease the event in the locality would result in both financial losses to the local economy and a loss of local employment associated with the car boot events" I should point out that there are SEVEN other car boot fields in the locality all run by the same operator who also operates the car boot in the field under Allow's ownership, the independent operator GOCARBOOTING runs a website where these other locations are advertised, so there would be no loss to the local economy and employment as the demand would switch to other sites.

I also note Allow's comments on car boot field 5/25 and they propose that the applicant provides provision for an exit into Hilton Lane, this should not be allowed as it will directly impact on the amenity of the residents who live on Hilton Lane, presently the existing exit on Dark Lane does not impact on any housing.

Allow is offering to relocate land from plot 5/2 to the east of the link road and they acknowledge that mitigation to the east side of the link road would result in SOME HARM to the historic parkland, the local parish councils from the outset requested that the new link road should be located closer to Hilton Hall to prevent environmental impacts on the local residents of Hilton village, the applicant said this would not be acceptable to Historic England due to the major impact on the setting of Hilton Hall and its historic parkland, therefore in my view if the harm to the historic landscape is predominant then the alternative offer of land east of the link road should also not be considered acceptable.

The residents of Dark Lane Hilton are also disappointed that Allow will not accept the offer to change the old corrugated boundary fence to a new environmentally friendly green hedge south of Dark Land, reference is made to fly tipping and anti-social behaviour, the only fly tipping in the area occurs at the rear of the car boot site well away from the housing in Dark Lane, due to the presence of the housing opposite the fence and the surveillance of the residents we feel the point about fly tipping and anti-social behaviour is unfounded and should not be accepted for not cooperating with the applicant's good will offer in attempting to improve the visual amenity for the residents and the area.

2] Shoosmiths Letter on behalf of Nurton Developments. Re; Assurance Regarding the principle of a Future Bridge.

Highways England have NOT given a written assurance that it will not object to a future bridge over the link road in order to future proof access to Nurton's development interests and on behalf of my local community I support this position, it is obvious Nurton would like the inspectors to instruct the applicant to change their position regards issuing a bridge assurance

statement, I don't feel this is an outcome that the inspectors should consider as it is not within the remit of this enquiry, any proposals for employment land release within greenbelt will be decided by the local authority when it considers its future employment land needs in its local plan review, South Staffs District Council presently has an excess of employment land due to the grant of permission for the West Midlands Interchange and is presently awaiting further policy emulating from the latest government white paper therefore any assurance given at this enquiry would be premature.

3] Weight Restriction on the A460.

Together with the District and County Council I and my community support a weight restriction on the A460 beyond the M6 Diesel Station, ROF Featherstone in the area is a strategic employment site which will provide 4000 jobs, all the HGV traffic heading to this employment hub which is part of the Midland Growth Engine needs to remain on the link road and by enforcing a weight restriction on the A460 this will ensure that the right traffic is kept on the right roads thus protecting the local communities, cyclists and horse riders from unnecessary HGV impacts, there are several large Horse stables in the area and they are looking forward to the day when they can cross the A460 without concern about heavy HGV's travelling along the A460.

4] Community request for the shortest direct route from the junction with the Avenue to join the north and south of the existing A460.

It can be seen from the bus route of the No 70 in figure 7.5 that the applicants preferred route is a much longer journey for residential walkers and wheelchair users to negotiate, In 2.10.12 [interested parties] I was asked if I consider an average walking speed of 4 mph to be realistic, my answer to that is No, the ramblers association states that 4 KM per hour is a realistic average walking speed, speed will vary between a fit 20 year old to a 60 plus less mobile person and wheelchair users also need to be considered, I note the applicant has considered this group when dismissing an overhead bridge over the M54 link workings.

I suggested using 4 KM per hour at the hearing in December but the applicant chose to ignore my comments preferring to use a walking speed of 4 mph and stating that their route would only take 13 minutes and 30 seconds to walk their proposed route, having to cross an un-controlled carriageway crossing which is acknowledged by the applicant as a MAJOR IMPACT under the design manual for roads and bridges LA 112 [para 2.2.6 applicants response] under my proposed 4 KM per hour calculation the journey referred to above would take 21 minutes using the applicants previously stated distances and times which the applicant has stated as being undesirable [2.4.6] and is far too long compared with the present journey time of 8 to 10 minutes and it could well be reduced once the M54 slip roads onto the A460 are removed when the scheme is implemented.

I am confused that the applicant persists in comparing their preferred route with the existing situation on the A460 route, when if my proposal for a direct route using underpasses would eliminate having to cross the M54 slip roads because they would no longer be in existence once the scheme is built and therefore would have NO MAJOR effect, My proposal should include a well-lit walking and cycling path and access for wheelchair users in order to access the employment facilities at Hilton Cross, it would be the shortest journey time of 8 minutes and

prevent having to use a motor car in order to travel the applicants alternative route of 21 minutes.

I note the applicant says that an underpass would be 100 M in length however the walkway would have to pass under two connecting roads to the scheme together with and the main M54 above which is what pedestrians have to negotiate at the moment, I would therefore like to request a digital virtual design showing how the three underpasses could work in my proposal and the 100 M underpass suggested by the applicant so that the designs can be scrutinised.

Cllr Bob Cope.

District Councillor and Chairman of Shareshill Parish Council.

Representing the interests of the Parish Councils of Featherstone, Hilton and Shareshill.

Robert Cope

Councillor

Members

South Staffordshire Council

Tel: 01922414420

Have you visited our website? <http://www.sstaffs.gov.uk>

This transmission is confidential and may be privileged. This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please contact the sender at:

r.cope@sstaffs.gov.uk

All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

In the interest of sustainability think about your use of energy and paper, please do not print this message unless absolutely necessary.