

**M54 to M6 Link Road  
TR010054**

**8.8 LA(A) Draft Statement of Common  
Ground with Staffordshire County  
Council**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 8

February 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

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

---

**8.8 LA(A) Draft Statement of Common Ground with  
Staffordshire County Council**

---

<b>Regulation Number</b>	Regulation 5(2)(q)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010054
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	8.8 LA(A)
<b>Author</b>	M54 to M6 Link Road Project Team and Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
1(P02)	November 2020	Issue to ExA for Deadline 1
2(P03)	January 2021	Second issue to SCC
3(P04)	January 2021	Issue to ExA for Deadline 4
4(P05)	February 2021	Third issue to SCC
5(P06)	February 2021	Issue to ExA for Deadline 6

## STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Staffordshire County Council.**

Signed.....

**Andrew Kelly**

**Project Manager**

**on behalf of Highways England**

**Date: [DATE]**

Signed.....

**[NAME]**

**[POSITION]**

**on behalf of Staffordshire County Council**

**Date: [DATE]**

DRAFT

## Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose of this document .....	1
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground.....	1
1.3 Terminology.....	2
2. Record of Engagement.....	3
3. Issues .....	22
3.1 Introduction and General Matters.....	22
3.2 Issues.....	23

### List of Tables

Table 2.1: Record of Engagement .....	3
Table 3.1: Issues .....	23

### List of Appendices

Appendix A: Personnel and organisations referenced in this SoCG

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of an application for a Development Consent Order ('the Application') under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ('PA 2008') for the proposed M54 to M6 Link Road ('the Scheme') made by Highways England Company Limited ('Highways England' or 'HE') to the Secretary of State for Transport ('Secretary of State').
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the Examination.
- 1.1.4 **This SoCG has been drafted by Highways England based on correspondence with Staffordshire County Council (SCC) during the development of the Scheme and records the matters agreed and not agreed. The first draft was provided to SCC on 25 October 2020. Comments were received on 3 November 2020 and were incorporated into the draft submitted at Deadline 1. Further discussions have been ongoing on a number of issues, with a revised draft issued to SCC on 4 January 2021. Comments were received from SCC on 7 January 2021 and have been incorporated into the draft submitted at Deadline 4. Following correspondence on matters remaining, a third draft was provided to SCC on 10 February 2021. A meeting was held with SCC on 12 February 2021 and comments received from SCC on 12 February 2021. This draft incorporates comments received on 12 February 2021 but not all discussions held on 12 February due to the meeting being held on the date of Deadline 6..**
- 1.1.5 **Highways England will continue to work to finalise the contents of this SoCG at the earliest opportunity as the Application proceeds through the Examination process.**

## 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Staffordshire County Council (SCC).

- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 SCC is the upper-tier local authority for the non-metropolitan county of Staffordshire. It is the local highways authority for the area in which Scheme is located and the decision-maker on planning applications considered 'county matters', primarily applications for minerals and waste developments.

### 1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG, 'Not Agreed' indicates a final position. 'Under discussion' indicates where points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. 'Agreed' indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to SCC, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to SCC.

## 2. Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and SCC in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 2.1. A list of the initials, names, role and organisation of the people mentioned in the Table is included at Appendix A.

**Table 2.1: Record of Engagement**

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
16/10/2018	Email from SG (Amey) to SL (SCC) and follow up on 16/11/2018	Seeking a meeting on 22/10/2018 to discuss potential impact on Lower Pool Site of Biological Importance (SBI). Follow up reiterating above for meeting on 23/11/2018.
25/10/2018	Email from HMac (AECOM) to SBI (SCC)	Draft Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the Ground Investigation (GI) sent to SCC for review.
02/11/2018	Email from SK (SCC) to HMac (AECOM)	Regarding SCC charges for input on DCO applications.
14/11/2018	Email from LB (AECOM) to JB (SCC)	Requesting comments on proposed viewpoint locations for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).
14/11/2018	Email from JB (SCC) to LB (AECOM)	Confirmation from SCC that viewpoint locations for the LVIA are acceptable and suggesting an additional one.
16/11/2018	Email from SL (SCC) to GS (Amey)	Agreement to meeting on 23/11/2018.
16/11/2018	Email from GS (Amey) to SL (SCC)	Advising that Amey is currently undertaking surveys and requesting a meeting re potential impacts on the Lower Pool SBI.
19/11/2018	Email from TB (Amey) to JC (SCC)	Requesting technical meeting with SCC / HE on 14/12/2018.
23/11/2018	Meeting with SL, DC (SCC) & AS (AECOM)	Informal discussion re initial scoping of topics.
28/11/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to HMac (AECOM)	SK has reviewed the WSI for archaeological monitoring of GI trial pits and is satisfied with the methodology and approach proposed. Also provides advice re SCC charges.
14/12/2018	Meeting with SCC, HE, Amey and AECOM including PM's, Highways, Environment, Ecology, Heritage, Landscape and Traffic	Technical progress update on timeline for project, surveys, design details. Outline of key elements of scheme and potential environmental issues relating to heritage, ecology, landscape and archaeology. AECOM requested contact information and other information to assist data collection. JC confirmed he is the SCC main point of contact for the project. Discussion of Highways matters but no agreements reached at this stage.
04/01/2019	Email from SG (Amey) to SL (SCC)	Advising that method statement for GI in preparation and asking whether SCC requires notification of intent to carry out works.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
13/01/2019	Meeting between HE and SCC	Meeting between HE and SCC traffic modelling teams.
14/01/2019	Email from JK (SCC) to NP (AECOM)	Requesting update on Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) sign off.
15/01/2019	Email from NP (AECOM) to JK (SCC)	Confirming LMVR had been signed off. NP to send to JK via WeTransfer.
15/01/2019	Email from JK (SCC) to NP (AECOM)	Confirming receipt of LMVR sent on 15/01/2019.
15/01/2019	Email from NP (AECOM) to ND (SCC)	Providing meeting minutes from modelling team meeting on 13/01/2019.
24/01/2019	Email from SL (SCC) to SG (Amey)	Enquiring about the possibility of including a Crayfish Ark site within the scheme.
05/02/2019	Email from FL (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching WSI for review and comment.
05/02/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to FL (AECOM)	Acknowledging request in previous email and information re SCC's time charges.
08/02/2019	Emails from SK (SCC) to FL (AECOM)	Has looked at WSI and plans and is 'generally happy' with proposals. Asking for clarity on why there are 'blank spots' within the red line not covered by the survey. Follow up email requesting a monitoring visit asap.
08/02/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to KH (SCC) & RR (AECOM)	Sending draft SoCC for review prior to meeting.
11/02/2019	Email from FL (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Response to SK's email of 08/02/2019. WSI will be updated and plan annotated to explain 'blank spots'.
12/02/2018	Email from TB (Amey) to KH (SCC)	Presentation for Cabinet attached for SoCC meeting arranged for 12/12/18.
14/02/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to HMac (AECOM)	Asking for thoughts and how to proceed re utilising designated funds. Two suggestions put forward: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Works to Portobello Tower</li> <li>2. Conservation and remediation of historic milemarkers</li> </ol>
05/03/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to TB (Amey)	To acknowledge meeting on 13/03/2019 and asking if 'minerals' is to be covered by Geology.
13/03/2019	Meeting with SCC, AECOM and Amey, including PMs, highways, ecology, archaeology, geology, traffic and environmental	Update on survey work. Requests for information from SCC on geology/contaminated sites. SCC confirmed their contacts. Ecologist confirmed mammal crossings to be included.  A designated funds session to be arranged. Discussed scoping report comments, legacy works for A460 – gateway features idea approved by SCC, and highways matters including possible weight restriction for HGVs to be included in DCO (this will be



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		raised at the Examination if not). Agreed to internal discussions on both sides before meeting. AECOM advised TRO work to be progressed after DCO, at detailed design stage. Potential stop-up of Mill Lane discussed.
18/03/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Request for CA's email address to consult on approach to flood risk assessment.
18/03/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Attaching FEH Catchment Map. Request for meeting to discuss approach to construction of hydraulic HEC-RAS models to understand potential flood risk.
19/03/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JCa (SCC)	Advising that statutory public consultation will run from late May-July 2019. Looking to involve LEP in consultation engagement.
20/03/2019	Email from FL (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching final version of updated WSI. Informing that geophysical survey will begin on site on 25/03/2019 using a MACE where suitable. Offer to SK to visit site.
20/03/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to AMcN, TP, AS, HH (AECOM), JC, SH, SL, SK, WS (SCC)	Attaching meeting minutes from 13/03/2019.
20/03/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to TB (Amey)	Inviting TB to a District Director's Group Meeting (20 min slot). LEP and CoC also attend.
26/03/2018	Email from TB (Amey) to JC (SCC)	Asking if a slot could be allocated at the District Director's Group Meeting for TB on 03/05/19.
02/04/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JC (SCC)	Advising that informal consultation taken place with SSC regarding the SoCC and formal consultation will take place wb. 08/04/2019 with SCC, SSC and WCC. Also suggesting a time for a meeting with SCC re A460/ Legacy Works and HGV usage of A460 (M6 Diesel).
03/04/2019	Email from JC(SCC) to TB (Amey) and ND (SCC)	SCC has discussed HGV usage of A460 (M6 Diesel) internally and have concerns that need addressing in a meeting tba. Suggested HE be present and a planning/legal adviser to give advice on what can/ cannot be provided under the scope of the DCO.
03/04/2019	Letter from AK (HE) to Dr Harling (SCC Dir. of Health)	Requesting comments on methodology and study area relating to Human Health Assessment section of ES. Requesting information on local health issues.
04/04/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching above letter to Dr Harling for JC to pass on to him. Also attaching a noise location plan and PINS scoping comments (SCC only). Email includes a table of topics to be included in ES which includes PINS scoping comments. Requesting SCC contacts information for consultation purposes.
10/04/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JC (SCC)	With ref. to email of 03/04/19 re meeting to discuss A460 legacy works, suggesting a meeting after the District Directors meeting on 03/05/2019.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
11/04/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JC, ND, WS (SCC)	Confirming meeting on 03/05/2019 to discuss/understand key concerns raised in previous meeting re A460 legacy works and HGV usage – also, to confirm SCC views ie. support or opposition of the scheme before statutory consultation at end of May.
12/04/2019	Email from JFr (S&S LEP) to TB (Amey)	Asking for confirmation of Executive Board meeting on 16/04/2019.
16/04/2019	Meeting at Chase Chamber of Commerce attended by TB (Amey) and DB (AECOM)	Presentation of proposals and update on timescales for scheme.
17/04/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Reiterating question re whether SCC require to be consulted as per email of 18/03/2019.
18/04/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JFr/JCa (S&S LEP)	Asking for minutes of Board meeting and any other details. Also seeking to ascertain if the LEP will assist in promoting statutory consultation on their internal/external website.
18/04/2019	Email from Chase CoC to TB (Amey)	Attaching minutes of Board meeting for comment.
22/04/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Attaching map showing modelling approach, coverage and indicative drainage strategy drawing. Asking for further thoughts.
23/04/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to various at SCC Highways and TK (HE)	Draft of the M54 to M6 Link Road, Parish Councillor Q&A document (following the previous Parish Councillor Forum (No 2) held on 6/3/2019). Scheme plan being finalised so not attached. Q&A to form part of the Agenda of PC Forum (No 3) on 24/04/19 - focus on explaining the upcoming Statutory Consultation.
24/04/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Attaching information from Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Air Quality project 2018-20 for AECOM to utilise. Email also responds to letter of 03/04/2019. Health Lead requires crime reduction and community safety to be addressed in ES. Agrees there are clear community safety benefits in removing traffic from A460. Methodology on Human Health Determinants is supported. Active Travel Plans are essential as is awareness raising and behaviour changes. SCC can support this.
01/05/2019	Email from GH (SCC) to AK (HE)	Email regarding limits of responsibility between SCC and HE regarding street lighting. Query on proposals for A460 street lighting post construction of the Scheme.
03/05/2019	Presentation then Meeting with JC and WS (SCC), GL (HE) and TB (Amey)	Project update to Staffs Growth Development meeting. SCC meeting included updates re meetings, receipt of information. SCC to pass on traffic count information. JC requested weight limit on A460 to remove HGV post project. GL agreed to consider – not currently part of proposals. Discussion on land ownership.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
13/05/2019	Email from DT (Amey) to DV (SCC)	Email requesting confirmation that the use of low noise surfacing is acceptable to SCC.
15/05/2019	Email from DV (SCC) to DT (Amey)	Confirmation of surfacing requirements from SCC.
10/05/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC Flood team)	Advising of EA meeting and need consult SCC re FRA and surface water drainage strategy. Asking for a response to previous emails dated 13/03/2019 and 17/04/2019.
10/05/2019	Email from CA (SCC) to HH (AECOM)	Response to previous emails suggesting a call/meeting.
17/05/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Requesting a meeting at end of May 2019.
20/05/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Acknowledging email of 24/04/2019 and agreeing to content of Health assessment. Requesting SCC contacts for landscape and water quality.
21/05/2019	Email from CA (SCC) to HH (AECOM)	Confirming a meeting date of 10/06/2019 and requesting outline plans/information in advance.
22/05/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA(SCC)	Attaching map showing modelling approach and coverage and the indicative drainage strategy drawing, and meeting agenda.
22/05/2019	Letter from AK (HE) to JC (SCC)	Letter attaching a response to SCC comments on the SoCC comprising a change to a typo.
23/05/2019	Letter from AK (HE) to SCC	Letter providing notice of the statutory consultation from 24 May 2019 to 5 July 2019.
06/06/2019	Email from TB (Amey) to JC (SCC)	Attached WCHAR assessment for review and comment. Another technical meeting requested to go through current details, post consultation.
07/06/2019	Email from DT (Amey) to SH, JC (SCC) & TB(Amey) & AW (HE)	Requested meeting to discuss the scheme re: highway alignment/ junction design for the main line and side roads. Once constructed, main line will remain part of the HE's SRN. Some of new highways (tbd) will revert back to the LA. Requested whether a Staffordshire Highway Design Guide and Standards exists. Current scheme designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.
10/06/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to DT (Amey)	Confirmation that Hilton Lane should be designed to DMRB standards.
10/06/2019	Meeting with LLFA including CA (SCC), HH, TP & SB (AECOM)	Initial meeting with lead local flood authority (LLFA) to discuss approach to flood modelling and drainage design. SCC confirmed consents required for culverts. LLFA need to review FRA report and drainage strategy. LLFA pleased with 40% climate change allowance on all pond design. EA will review HAWRAT, not LLFA.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
13/06/2019	Email from FL (AECOM) to SK (SCC), TP (AECOM), TB(Amey) & HM (Tyler Grange)	Advising that archaeological assessment works are ongoing. Sending a geophysical survey of area for review and comment. Request for a meeting to discuss next phase of work and any comments re EIA. GI results will be available by then.
14/06/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to FL (AECOM)	Arranging a telephone meeting.
18/06/2019	Meeting with AECOM/Amey, HE and SCC	Meeting to review current signage design for the scheme including; extents of Motorway Regs, A449 and A460 works, Name of link, Featherstone or "local traffic only", Signing of M6 Toll and Amendments to signage at M6 J11 and 12.
25/06/2019	Meeting with SCC, AECOM and HE, including PM's and Highways	Discussed speed limit reduction and lighting on Hilton Lane; closure of Dark Lane and potential impacts; A460 link to Featherstone tie in – various options; Potential closure of Mill Lane; PRoW – Dark Lane, Brookfield Farm, land north of Moseley Old Hall; possible weight restriction on sections of A460 raised.
27/06/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to FL (AECOM)	Confirmation of call to discuss geophysical survey.
27/06/2019	Conference call with SK (SCC), FL & HMac (AECOM)	Call to discuss the results of the geophysical survey. Notes following on are in email of 24/7/2019 from HMac to SK.
05/07/2019	Letter from SCC to HE	Letter from Cllr Mark Winnington providing SCC's statutory consultation response
14/07/2019	E-mail from FL (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Summary e-mail of conference call on 27/06/2019.
15/07/2019	Email from MW (SCC) to PA (HE)	Comments on PIER received.
15/07/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA(SCC)	Attaching meeting minutes from 10/06/2019 and images of the culvert survey. Advising that AECOM are to meet with EA. Request for information on the A460 culvert re policy requirements for freeboard margin.
18/07/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA, JCo and SCC Flood Team (SCC)	Referring to AECOM's meeting with EA and need to arrange a joint LLFA and EA meeting asap prior to Design Fix 3b.
22/07/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC), JCo (EA), TP (AECOM) & TB (Amey)	With ref to email 18/07/19, EA has offered a meeting room for a joint LLFA and EA meeting. List of dates and times offered.
23/07/2019	Email from HM (Tyler Grange) to SL (SCC) & TB (Amey)	Introduction advising that HM will be new project co-ordinator of ecological inputs for the Environmental Statement (ES). With TP Suggested it may be useful to attend a joint EA and LLFA meeting wc 5 <sup>th</sup> August and requesting a pre-meeting to discuss progress re ecology.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
24/07/2019	Email from HMac (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Reasoning for deferring evaluation trenching until post-consent stage. In light of the low archaeological potential and planned future refinement of the scheme design, written agreement to this is requested.
25/07/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to HMac (AECOM)	Confirmation from the County Archaeologist that evaluation trenching can be postponed until the post-consent stage. Reminder that works should be carried out as early as possible in the post-consent process in order to enable the development and execution of additional mitigation works should these be deemed appropriate and necessary based on the results of the evaluation.
26/07/2019	Email from AS (AECOM) to JF (EA), CA & SL (SCC), HM, TP, HH (AECOM) & TB (Amey)	Attached agenda/attendees list for the M54-M6 Scheme Watercourse crossing meeting on 06/08/2019. AECOM require opinion of either the EA or LLFA hydromorphologist (if SCC have an equivalent person?). Queries can be addressed by EA if sent in advance of the meeting.
29/07/2019	Email from RW (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Query regarding additional viewpoints and the inclusion of night time views. Arranging a meeting to discuss the viewpoints and environmental mitigation.
30/07/2019	Meeting with DT (Amey), JC & SH (SCC), AK (HE) & AMcN (AECOM)	Meeting to discuss the highway maintenance boundary between HE and SCC following the construction of the new link.
30/07/2019	Emails from SB (SCC) to RW (AECOM)	Arranging a meeting to discuss the viewpoints and environmental mitigation.
01/08/2019	Email from RW (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Arranging a meeting to discuss the viewpoints and environmental mitigation.
02/08/2019	Meeting with SL, HP (SCC), RW, TP & AS (AECOM) & HM (Tyler Grange)	Agreement reached on new landscape viewpoints and also to include heritage viewpoints in Cultural Heritage Chapter providing liaison on mitigation occurs. Agreement to scope out assessment of Hazel Dormouse. Update on species surveys and discussions with Natural England. Agreed to circulate Environmental aspects of SCC SoCG to JC & SL (SCC). SCC require HEGS assessment for those hedgerows being lost.
02/08/2019	Email from AS (AECOM) to JF (EA), SL, CA (SCC), TP (AECOM) & TB (Amey)	Sending presentation slide with details of watercourse crossing for discussion at meeting on 06/08/2019.
05/08/2019	Meeting with BK, JT (HEng), SK (SCC), AK, JH (HE) & HMac, KK, TP, AS (AECOM)	Progress update on archaeology, cultural heritage, mitigation design and Dark Lane Alignment. No agreements reached at this stage.
06/08/2019	Meeting JF et al (EA), SL, CA (SCC), HH,	Detailed update on watercourse crossing design proposals. SCC require model scenarios. Update on ecology and provision for



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	AMc, TP, AS (AECOM) & HM (Tyler Grange)	mammals resulting from watercourse changes. Update on Flood Risk.
13/08/2019	Meeting with SCC and AECOM, including PM's and Highways	To discuss possible highway boundary positions following the opening of the new link road; access for Hilton Lane and Dark Lane during construction; A460 link to Featherstone tie in and old A460 south of The Avenue.
13/08/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching M54 built heritage technical note for information.
28/08/2019	Email from AS (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Attaching minutes from ecology meeting on 02/08/19.
28/08/2019	Email from AS (AECOM) to SL & CA (SCC)	Attaching minutes and slides from EA/ LLFA meeting re watercourse crossings on 06/08/19 requesting comments.
31/10/2019	Email from RW (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Emails to SCC asking if there are any areas of tranquillity in proximity to the scheme that require consideration.
02/09/2019	Email from RW (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Requesting information on any quiet or public areas around the scheme, valued for the tranquillity, acoustic and landscape quality.
30/09/2019	Email from AMa (AECOM) to JC (SCC) and GM (SSC)	Spreadsheet of long list of developments to be considered in the cumulative assessment. Shapefile send and a request for a review of the allocations and applications listed to ensure no developments have been missed. Further details on construction timescales were also requested.
09/09/2019	Meeting with TB, AL, JH (AECOM) and JC (SCC)	Meeting to provide project update post statutory consultation and provide handover of SCC relationship from TB to AL.
16/09/2019	Email from DT (Amey) to JC (SCC)	Providing minutes of meeting on 13/08/19 and existing maintenance boundary plan.
30/09/2019	Email from AMa (AECOM) to JC (SCC) and GM (SSC)	Spreadsheet of long list of developments to be considered in the cumulative assessment. Shapefile sent and a request for a review of the allocations and applications listed to ensure no developments have been missed. Further details on construction timescales were also requested.
11/10/2019	Email from MG (SCC) to AMa (AECOM)	Provision of detail for mineral applications within 4 km of the Scheme.
14/10/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC).	To propose dates and times for future meeting. AL suggested workshop between 10:30-15:00 either on 22 <sup>nd</sup> or 24 <sup>th</sup> October 2019.
15/10/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM).	Requesting later dates to be proposed. Suggested phone call in meeting in meantime.
15/10/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC).	AL suggested alternative dates w/b 4 <sup>th</sup> November (excluding 05.11.19). Agreed phone call in meantime.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
16/10/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC).	Follow up from phone call and attached agenda for upcoming meeting. AL requested phone number for person to speak to re traffic modelling.
16/10/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM).	To confirm date of 06.11.19 for meeting and proposing outline agenda/timings. JC to speak to SCC modelling expert.
17/10/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM).	Informing AL of discussion with SCC colleague Nick Dawson re modelling issues.
31/10/2019	Email from RW (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Requesting information on the quiet and public areas around the scheme which are valued for their tranquillity, acoustic and landscape quality/environment. Following request from Public Health England to consider tranquillity in greater detail.
31/10/2019	Email from RW to SB (SCC)	Requesting information on the quiet and public areas around the scheme which are valued for their tranquillity, acoustic and landscape quality/environment. Following request from Public Health England to consider tranquillity in greater detail.
06/11/2019	Meeting with RR, AL, NP, AMcN (AECOM), SB (BAM), JC, SH, WS (SCC), AK & SC (HE)	<p>Minor changes to draft order limits advised and revised areas of land acquisition are being/will be consulted on.</p> <p>AL confirmed that HE was not intending to include a weight restriction in the DCO application because the Scheme significantly reduced HGV traffic and the traffic modelling did not suggest a need for one .</p> <p>AL proposed legal agreement to monitor HGV traffic on A460 post construction. This was offered as a compromise so that action could be taken should the HGV traffic along the A460 be greater than predicted to the extent that action is necessary. HE &amp; SCC to consider a usage threshold to trigger management response.</p> <p>SCC supported de-classification of existing A460 as part of DCO if possible.</p> <p>Meeting to discuss legacy works through designated funds tba. SCC agreed there are no expectations that problems on A460 Lodge Link Lane will be resolved by scheme.</p> <p>Clarity to be provided to SCC on long-term road/drainage pond ownership/management. SCC to provide existing TROs. SCC happy with proposed approach re TMP. SCC wish to comment on DCO prior to submission and approve design of works which will be handed over to them.</p>
11/11/2019	Letter from HE to SCC	Letter notifying of non-statutory supplementary consultation, 11 November 2019 – 11 December 2019.
12/11/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Advising that a full list of meetings and correspondence with SCC is being compiled and advising that AECOM and SCC traffic team are meeting to discuss the traffic model.
12/11/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Advising that previously for other DCO schemes, SCC has been in a more advanced position eg. having input into the wording of the draft Order to a point of local approval, having draft EIA

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		chapters and an advanced SoCG. He will liaise with colleagues and reflect.
13/11/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching draft minutes of meeting on 06/11/2019 for comment. Advised that a draft DCO can be made available at an appropriate time to avoid repeat reviews. Also, ES chapters will be shared when ready for review, once approved for issue by HE. Liaison has been taking place with the SCC Ecologist, Archaeologist, Landscape and LLFA on approach.
14/11/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching the draft DCO for comment.
18/11/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM).	Confirming receipt of draft DCO. JC asked AL to liaise with Heather in SCC legal team re cost undertaking.
18/11/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM).	Requesting one of the project team to liaise with Anthony Bamsey (SCC Skills and Further Learning Manager) re employment and/or training benefits/opportunities.
19/11/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching minutes of meetings with Historic England in August for review. Advised that Heritage chapter will be sent for review by end of week – delay due to incomplete noise modelling. Review requested by 13/12/2019.
20/11/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Advising that draft EIA completed and attaching draft FRA for review by 11/12/2019.
20/11/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Agreement on minutes from Historic England meetings and to 3-week review period for Heritage chapter.
22/11/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching Heritage chapter and appendices for review and comment by 13/12/2019.
22/11/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Attaching an amended version of the 06/11/2019 meeting minutes and a summary of a telecon with AL re: level of agreement and understanding of broader scheme elements; weight restriction on A460; further discussion needed re approval of detailed design by SoS; facilitating agreement where possible prior to Examination and full understanding of mitigation package. SCC will continue to update Members on the Scheme.
25/11/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC, SH, WS (SCC), AK, SC (HE), RR, AMc, NP (AECOM), SBe (Link-Connex)	Attaching final minutes for workshop meeting on 06/11/2019 and summary of agreed actions
26/11/2019	Email from SC (HE) to JC, SH, WS (SCC), AK (HE), AL, RR, AMcN, NP (AECOM), SBe (Link-Connex)	Advising that the Midlands Interchange will submit a DCO application in February 2020.



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
26/11/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC, SH, WS (SCC), AK, SC (HE), RR, AMcN, NP (AECOM), SBe (Link-Connex)	Advising that the DCO application for West Midlands Interchange (WMI) Examination has finished and may be due to be determined in February 2020, rather than being submitted. Also clarifying an action from the meeting.
26/11/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to SC, AK (HE), AL, RR, AMc, NP (AECOM), SH, WS (SCC), SBe (Link-Connex)	Advising that HE's development management team undertook an assessment of the WMI application and TA in liaison with SCC Highways.
26/11/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Attaching preliminary Water Framework Directive for review by 17/12/2019.
26/11/2019	Email from CA (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Advising that CA will liaise with the EA regarding the WFD and FRA.
10/12/2019	Email from JC (SCC) to HE	Response to non-statutory supplementary consultation.
12/12/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Response to draft Cultural Heritage Chapter of ES stating satisfaction that most of his comments and queries arising from scoping have been addressed. Requesting clarity that preservation in situ has not been discounted and when the evaluation trenching will be carried out. Happy with built environment and landscape but defer to Historic England. Note noise modelling is outstanding. Seeking further review from SCC's Landscape Advisor. Seeking clarity as to whether SCC's Conservation Officer has been consulted.
16/12/2019	Email from SK (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Attaching additional comments from the landscape advisor re the potential impact of the proposals on the historic landscape.
17/12/2019	Email from HH (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Requesting a timescale for receipt of comments on the FRA and WFDa. Requesting a meeting in the New Year re abstraction licences for dewatering and groundwater for the Scheme.
17/12/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to SL (SSC)	Attaching draft Landscape and Visual chapter of ES, the Masterplan overview and outline Environmental Management Plan for comment. Advised Biodiversity chapter to follow.
18/12/2019	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching a draft Heads of Terms re monitoring vehicular use of the A460 Cannock Road post construction for review and comment. Requesting details of SCC's solicitor re liaison on agreement.
18/12/2019	Email from AMc (AECOM) to JC, SH (SSC)	Attaching proposed maintenance boundaries between strategic and local road networks for discussion proposing the strategic network is maintained by HE and the local network and continuation of Cannock Road by SCC.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
20/12/2019	Email from TP (AECOM) to SL (SCC)	Attaching Biodiversity Chapter of ES for review and comment. Asking if SCC wish to see the noise and air quality chapters, which are being sent out to SSC and CWC.
31/12/2019	Emailed from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Requesting clarification on the form of 'agreement' for Head of Terms and how it will be presented in the application for ExA. Confirmed SCC's position remained the same, that a weight limit on the A460 should form an integral part of the overall scheme and be included in the DCO.
07/01/2020	Email from AW (AECOM) to CA (SCC) & OT, SBa (AECOM)	Seeking a meeting to review a list of water consents, licences & permits required for construction of the Scheme. Also chasing comments on the draft FRA, pWFDa and hydraulic models by 14.01.2020 prior to submission.
09/01/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	To suggest a phone call for an update on SCC review of all documents. AL responded to previous queries re proposal for Heads of Terms.
09/01/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Providing contact details for Heather Morgan (SCC solicitor), requesting the AECOM solicitor contact HM directly to discuss what form of 'agreement' is being considered.
09/01/2020	Telephone call between AL (AECOM) and JC (SCC)	Re working together. JC emphasised that SCC is fully supportive of the Scheme and do not wish to be in disagreement at Examination. He stated SCC wish to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- review (revised) draft DCO</li> <li>- resolve the weight restriction issue prior to exam</li> <li>- meet re HE carrying out works on SCC roads</li> <li>- meet to discuss weight restriction TN and legal agreement</li> <li>- comment on maintenance</li> <li>- continue to comment on draft ES chapters</li> </ul>
09/01/2020	Email from S-PG (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching draft copies of protected provisions relating to statutory undertakers.
13/01/2020	Email from NP (AECOM) to ND (SCC)	Advising that he will be sending a cordoned version of the Link Road Stage 3 Model, providing some details and caveats and asking for confirmation that the caveats are acceptable.
13/01/2020	Email from ND (SCC) to NP (AECOM)	Confirming successful receipt of above and that he is happy to accept the information on the terms offered and previously discussed.
14/01/2020	Email from JK (SCC) to NP (AECOM) and ND (SCC)	Asking if the LMVR has been signed off yet.
14/01/2020	Email from CA (SCC) to AW (AECOM)	Requesting a copy of the water and drainage consents register re consents under S23 of the Land Drainage Act.
14/01/2020	Email from CA (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	SCC comments on the FRA and the EA comments on the pWFDa.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
14/01/2020	Email from AW (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Seeking a meeting as per email of 07/01/2020 for 21 Jan 20.
15/01/2020	Email from AW (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Attaching the water and drainage consents register for review. Requesting confirmation of the suggested meeting on 21/01/2020.
15/01/2020	Email from NP (AECOM) to JK, ND (SCC)	Confirming that the LMVR has been signed off and advising a copy will be sent.
16/01/2020	Email from TP (AECOM) to SK (SCC)	Attaching the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy for comment.
16/01/2020	Email from SK (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Agreeing to provide comments on the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy by 23/01/20
21/01/2020	Conference call between OT (AECOM) and CA (SCC)	Discussion re the water and drainage consents register.
21/01/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching the revised draft DCO for review or SCC, noting that submission version will be available by 30 January so review to await that version. Drawing attention to Article 10 provisions and Schedule 2 requirements 3,4,9 and 10, in response to previous concerns. Requesting a response from SCC legal representative to discuss the monitor & manage legal agreement and referring to previous discussion on ways to maximise benefits to the local areas.
21/01/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Confirming liaison regarding reviewing the draft DCO and asked for confirmation on who would be dealing with legal matters. Agreeing to a meeting in early February to discuss the weight restriction matter to conclude a position and asked AL to suggest some dates.
21/01/2020	Emails between AL (AECOM) and JC (SCC)	Making arrangements for meeting in February. AL confirmation that Gowlings are dealing with all legal matters on behalf of HE.
22/01/2020	Email from SK (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Including minor amendments to the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.
22/01/2020	Email from OT (AECOM) to CA (SCC)	Summary of points discussed re future drainage consents required. Requesting agreement in order to update draft SoCG.
27/01/2020	Letter emailed from SL (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Comments on ecology, archaeology – generally in agreement with the provisions in the Draft OEMP re ecology and archaeology, though some points on the REAC tables are noted and suggestions made for amendments & Landscape – overall the methodology and contents of Chapter 7 of the ES appear to conform with DRMB LA107 (2019) requirements and provide and accurate assessment of LVI.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
27/01/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AMc (AECOM)	Providing results of traffic modelling for the proposed highways maintenance boundaries. JC requested relevant plans and associated documents to be sent accordingly.
05/02/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Issuing a formal revised Notification of Development. AL requested email address for John Henderson or other appropriate address to send GIS Order limit files to.
06/02/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Providing email address for John Henderson and confirming GIS is the appropriate format for Order limits to be sent. JC asked whether AK would be attending the next meeting and who his line manager is.
12/02/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Requesting confirmation of SCC attendees at meeting on 24/02/20. AL confirmed that AK would attend and requested representation from SCC highways and legal teams to be present to discuss the legal agreement on the monitor and manage approach.
13/02/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Confirming SCC highways and legal representation will be present at meeting on 24/02/20. JC raised main points SCC wished to discuss, including highway adoption and future maintenance responsibilities; prospective provisions for SCC as a highway authority; and the impact at Churchbridge junctions.
14/02/2020	Email from RR (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Providing Technical Note setting out proposed monitor and manage approach and proposed agenda for meeting on 24/02/2020
24/02/2020	Meeting with AK (HE); RR, AL, DE, AB (AECOM); JC, WS, SH, TE (SCC); and TW (Gowlings)	Meeting to discuss DCO submission and concerns regarding weight restriction technical note, the monitor and management approach, future maintenance responsibilities, Churchbridge junctions and the West and Shire permit scheme.
09/03/2020	Letter from HE to SCC	Letter and section 56 notice provided to SCC.
10/03/20	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Attaching draft meeting minutes from meeting on 24/02/20. AL requested SCC review and comment on minutes and forward to Trish Evans. AL also requested SCC comments on the weight restriction technical note, HoT and an indicative cost estimate for weight restriction.
20/03/20	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Providing review of Technical Note and HoT as part of actions from meeting on 24/02/20. Main concerns relating to residual HGV traffic on the A460, post scheme.
27/03/2020	Email from TP (AECOM) to CA (SCC) and PG (SSC)	Notified CA and PG that the Scheme had been accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate. Responses to comments on draft FRA and WFDa and how these were addressed prior to submission of the draft DCO. These responses are provided in a draft SoCG (specifically with the LLFA). A four week period for review of the draft SoCG was requested. The LLFA SoCG has been incorporated into this wider SoCG.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
08/04/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to RR and AL	Requesting an update on the future maintenance responsibility at M54 Junction 1 and previous proposals for the HGV agreement, to inform LIR and Written Representations. JC also provided SCC's comments on the Transport Assessment and traffic model.
09/04/2020	Phone call JC and AL	AL notified JC that HE is extending the Relevant Representations (RR) period until 18/05/2020. AL asked whether SCC would mind HE putting up posters on closed deposit points doors stating that the deposit points were closed and providing the webpage address for accessing application documents (AL noted that the SCC reception desk had stated HE could not because they may attract people to the building). JC agreed to ask colleagues as a closure poster would not attract visitors. AL and JC agreed that it would be good to address SCC's comments on the TA before Examination. AL notified JC that HE had not received any communication on how the Examination might be affected from PINS but had agreed the extension to the RR period with them.
09/04/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Notifying JC that posters would be erected on posts rather than SCC property as consent had not been provided by SCC.
17/04/2020	Letter from HE to SCC	Letter notifying of extension to RR period due to Covid-19
27/04/2020	Email from TP to CA (SCC) and PG (EA)	Requested review and comment on draft LLFA SoCG submitted on 26/03/20. Notified CA and PG that HE are extending the relevant representations period until 18/05/2020. TP requested early site of relevant representations if possible.
27/04/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to TP (AECOM)	Advised that SCC have submitted a RR with a bullet list of themes SCC are interested in.
06/05/2020	Email from ND (SCC) to NP (AECOM)	Requesting a copy of the forecasting report, with particular interest in the Uncertainty Log.
06/05/2020	Email from AK (HE) to ND (SCC)	Requesting clarification on why SCC have asked for a copy of the forecasting report.
06/05/2020	Email from ND (SCC) to AK (HE)	Confirming that SCC are working alongside SSC with St Francis Group who are promoting the former ROF Featherstone Site for employment purposes and SSC required clarification on whether the ROF site should be included explicitly in the forecasting for the M54 M6 link road.
07/05/2020	Email from AK (HE) to ND (SCC)	Confirming the team would respond to the query regarding ROF Featherstone forecasting whilst AK was on annual leave.
12/05/2020	Email from BB (HE) to ND (SCC)	Clarifying the status of the ROF Featherstone site regarding its inclusion within the traffic forecasts and confirming the status of ROF Featherstone site in the Uncertainty Logs. BB confirmed that ROF Featherstone had not been included in the 'Core Scenario' set of traffic forecasts (for either the 'Do-Minimum' or 'Do-Something' cases); and provided justification for this conclusion.



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
29/05/2020	Email from TP (AECOM) to SL and SK (SCC)	Providing responses to comments on the draft ES and Outline Environmental Management Plan and how these were addressed in the final submission. Request for a review of these responses and provision of additional comments if appropriate.
24/06/20	Email from TP (AECOM) to CA (SCC) and PG (EA)	Request review and comment on the draft LLFA SoCG sent on 27/03/20. HE are looking to reach an agreement as far as possible prior to the examination. Offered to set up a conference call to discuss any areas where an agreement has yet to be reached with the relevant specialists.
23/07/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Providing a Technical Note responding to SCC queries raised on TAR and traffic modelling (08/04/2020). AL provided responses for SCC queries raised between 20/03/2020 and 08/04/2020. Responses included queries on the following: maintenance boundaries; enforcement of diversion routes; protective provisions; and HGV traffic along the A460, how M6 Diesel is dealt with in the traffic model and potential threshold for HGVs and figure in HE's risk pot.
05/08/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Providing notification of design change and requesting input to confirm if the proposed approach to consultation on the scheme changes is deemed adequate.
13/08/2020	Email from TP to SL (SCC)	Requesting SCC's input regarding the acceptability of a potential design change to allow a landowner to retain an area of their land.
18/08/2020	Meeting with AK (HE); RR, AMc (AECOM); BS (Linkconnex); JC, WS (SCC); and TW (Gowling)	Meeting to provide an update on DCO process and notification of design changes in advance of the formal consultation on proposed changes starting on 24/08/2020.
19/08/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC and WS (SCC)	Providing minutes for notification of design changes and DCO meeting held on 18/08/2020. Minutes for review. AL suggested dates for next meeting.
24/08/2020	Letter from HE to SCC	Letter notifying SCC of consultation on proposed DCO changes.
25/08/2020	Email from AL to JC and WS (SCC)	Confirming the proposed design changes animation is live on citizenspace.
26/08/2020	Email from JH (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	To request a direct contact for Four Ashes Ltd and Kilbride Limited.
26/08/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to JH (AECOM)	Providing requested contact details for Four Ashes Ltd and Kilbride Limited.
09/09/2020	Meeting with AK, GK (HE); RR, AL (AECOM); SBe (Linkconnex); JC, WS, ND (SCC); KH, SP	Meeting to provide update on ROF Featherstone, DCO progress and proposed scheme changes.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	(SSC); AP (SFG); and SE (i-transport)	
15/09/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC, WS and ND (SCC)	Providing minutes and actions from meeting on 09/09/2020 for review.
15/09/2020	Email from JC (SCC) to AL (AECOM)	Forwarding queries raised by the cabinet member for Highways, and request for the layby on the A460 at Sharesill be removed as part of the scheme. JC asked for the query be discussed in upcoming meeting (17/09/2020).
15/09/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Providing an initial response to the queries raised by the cabinet member for highways, forwarded by JC on 15/09/2020. AL confirmed the request for the removal of the layby on the A460 at Sharesill would not be incorporated within the Scheme and provided justification. AL happy to still discuss in meeting.
16/09/2020	Email from AL (AECOM) to JC (SCC)	Summarising the response to previous SCC query regarding how the DCO secures the reclassification of the existing A460 and the colour coding on the classification of road plans; ahead of meeting on 17/09/2020.
17/09/2020	Meeting with AK (HE); SB (Linkconnex); RR, DE, AMcN, SH (AECOM); JC, WS, ND (SCC); KH, SP (SSC); TW (Gowling)	Meeting to discuss outstanding matters regarding changes to the DCO and protective provisions.
18/09/2020	Email from JC to AK	Response to consultation on DCO changes.
25/10/2020	Email from AL to JC	Draft SoCG provided for comment.
03/11/2020	Email from JC to AL	Comment provided on draft SoCG.
20/11/2020	Meeting with RR, AMcN, (AECOM); JC, WS, SH (SSC)	Meeting to discuss outstanding highways related matters.
02/12/2020	Email from ND to AL (cc JC and WS)	Requesting written reassurance from HE that HE will not seek contributions to improve M54 Junction 2 from the developers of ROF Featherstone where those improvements are not caused by the development.
02/12/2020	Email from AL to ND (cc JC, WD and RR)	Providing reassurance above, also now contained in the agreed points in table 3.1.
02/12/2020	Email from ND to AL (cc JC, WS, RR)	Confirming the above reassurance is sufficient and requesting written confirmation from HE directly.
02/12/2020	Email AL to JC	Requesting SCC's view on trial trenching issue.
03/12/2020	Phone call AL and JC	Discussing trial trenching and SCC's likely response on the issue at the Hearings.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
03/12/2020	Email AL to JC	Providing RPS report (from Allow Ltd) on heritage and copy of SK's e-mail agreeing the trial trenching did not need to be completed post consent. To inform Hearings and SoCG.
07/12/2020	Email from GK to ND (cc JC, WS, RR and AK)	Confirming HE's agreement to the form of words provided by AL on 02/12/2020.
16/12/2020	Email from AL to JC	Asking for SCC's view on Allow's proposal to move woodland planting to the east of the alignment rather than the west.
18/12/2020	Email from SL to TP (cc JC)	E-mail seeking HE's view on the 10% net gain target set by DEFRA agencies and whether further off-site habitat improvements can be delivered using a S106 agreement.
23/12/2020	Email from TP to CA (cc AS, JH, EB, SL, JC, AL & AW)	E-mail providing a copy of the draft Consents and Agreements Position Statement (version for submission at D4) to Chris Archer as he had commented that he had not seen it.
04/01/2021	Email from AL to JC	E-mail providing revised copy of the SoCG for comment.
16/01/2021	Correspondence between AL and JC	Correspondence to organise a meeting between the two parties on 13 January 2021 to discuss matters that will not be resolved in this iteration of the SoCG.
07/01/2021	Email from JC to AL	E-mail providing SCC's comments on the SoCG provided on 04/01/2021.
12/01/21	Email from AM to SH, JC & WS	Local Roads Departures from Standard Report re-submitted to SCC.
13/01/21	Virtual meeting between RR, AL, AM, TP, AK, JC, WS, SL, SH and TW.	Meeting to discuss outstanding matters in the SoCG including ecology, draft DCO, highways design, construction traffic management, maintenance boundaries & PRoW.
18/01/21	Email from LH to MG	E-mail providing responses to queries raised on minerals and waste in SCC's comments on the last draft SoCG.
20/01/21	Email from JC to AL	E-mail noting that the DCO submitted at D4 was prior to the meeting on 13/01/21 so did not incorporate any changes discussed. Noting that it is standard practice when new highway is constructed that the developer is responsible for repair of any defect that may occur for a period of 12 months, effectively a warranty for the works and requesting whether this can be explicit in the DCO.
26/01/21	Email from AL to JC	E-mail providing draft minutes of meeting on 13/01/21
28/01/21	Email from JC to AL	E-mail providing SCC's comments on the minutes of the meeting on 13/01/21 and requesting further discussion on draft DCO points.
28/01/21	Email from JC to AL	E-mail providing SCC's comments on the SoCG issues relating to SCC's role as LLFA.



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
29/01/21	Email from TP to SL	E-mail providing amended text from SoCG regarding woodland mitigation for comment or approval.
01/02/21	Email from SL to TP	E-mail confirming approval of SoCG text regarding woodland mitigation.
01/02/21	Email from MG to LH	E-mail providing a response to LH's e-mail on minerals and waste points in the SoCG.
04/02/21	Email from TP to JC and CA	E-mail requesting SCC's comments as LLFA on under discussion issues in SoCG.
10/02/21	Email from AL to JC	Issuing third draft SoCG
12/02/21	Virtual meeting between AM, RR, JH, SH and JC	Discussion on highways design matters
12/02/21	Email from JC to AL	Providing comments on SoCG and requesting programme for meetings to close out remaining matters.

- 2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Highways England and (2) SCC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

### 3. Issues

#### 3.1 Introduction and General Matters

- 3.1.1 This chapter sets out the 'issues' which are agreed, not agreed, or are under discussion between SCC and Highways England.
- 3.1.2 The letter provided to Highways England by the Planning Inspectorate on the 20 August 2020 under Section 88 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 6 (hereafter referred to as the 'Rule 6 Letter'), sets out the issues that the Planning Inspectorate want Highways England and the relevant parties to address in their SoCG. Specifically, Annex F sets out the parties that the Planning Inspectorate wants Highways England to produce a SoCG with and the issues that they want to see addressed, namely:
1. The effect of minerals and waste.
  2. Transport and traffic effects including the appropriateness of the traffic modelling and inputs.
  3. The effect on Non-motorised Users.
  4. Water environment effects, including any permits required from SSC as LLFA.
  5. Socio-economic effects.
  6. The draft DCO provisions and requirements including future procedures for approval of details.
- 3.1.3 Table 3.1 has been organised to address each of these issues in turn, with a preceding section on the principle of the Scheme and a final section on 'other' issues related to agreement on topics presented in the ES.

## 3.2 Issues

3.2.1 The table below shows those matters which have been agreed or yet to be agreed by the parties. The document reference column is included where the matter pertains to a specific section of a document submitted as part of the Application or following submission.

**Table 3.1: Issues**

Document	Subject	SCC Comments	Highways England Response	Status	Agreement likely <sup>1</sup>
<b>General considerations</b>					
N/A	Need for the Scheme	The parties agree that there is a need for the Scheme to provide a good strategic link between the M54 and the M6, reducing congestion in the surrounding area. SCC is supportive of the Scheme in principle and notes the positive impact the Scheme would have on the County. SCC is supportive of the Development Consent Order being made.		Agreed	Agreed
Case for the Scheme <b>[AS-037/7.2]</b>	Policies for consideration	It is agreed that the submitted Case for the Scheme and the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) accordance table <b>[AS-037/7.2]</b> provides a comprehensive assessment of the policies that are relevant and important for decision making on the Application.		Agreed	Agreed
	Compliance with the NPSNN	The parties are satisfied that the proposals are compliant with the NPSNN as set out within Appendix A of the CftS <b>[APP-220/7.2]</b> .		Agreed	Agreed
	Compliance with Local Planning Policy	The parties agree that the local plan policies identified within Section 8.3 of the Case for the Scheme <b>[AS-037/7.2]</b> are comprehensive and comprise those relevant and important for decision making. SCC agrees with the local planning policy assessment provided within Appendix B of the CftS <b>[AS-037/7.2]</b> . It is agreed that the		Agreed	Agreed

<sup>1</sup> Indication on likelihood that the matter will be agreed by the close of the Examination period as rate by the applicant and the Interested Party. Dark green = agreed, light green = high likelihood of agreement, orange = medium likelihood of agreement, pink = low likelihood of agreement, red = not agreed.

		Scheme is compliant with local planning policies and will support the delivery of the Local Plan through providing better highway links and relieving congestion to support delivery of nearby allocated sites.		
	Allocations and designations	<p>It is agreed that, to the best of SCC's knowledge, the Scheme would not adversely affect any allocations in the Local Plan. It is likely that the link road will facilitate delivery of employment sites in the area (see traffic and transport section below).</p> <p>The parties agree that the Scheme is located within the South Staffordshire Green Belt. Whilst the Scheme will impact on the openness and permanence of the Green Belt it is agreed that impacts have been limited wherever possible as part of Scheme design. Whilst there will be harm to the Green Belt, it is agreed that 'Very Special Circumstances' (VSC) exist and are appropriately justified within Section 8.6 of the CftS. It is agreed that the VSC outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
Environmental Statement	Alternatives	<p>It is agreed that Highways England has adequately considered and assessed suitable reasonable alternatives in accordance with the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU and the requirements of the DMRB.</p> <p>The selection of the final route is understood and has been clearly communicated to SCC.</p> <p>SCC agrees that the Council does not have any legal compliance concerns in respect of route selection.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
	ES Conclusions	<p>SCC is continuing discussions with Highways England on biodiversity net gain, with this issue discussed more in the 'other considerations related to the ES' section below. With the exception of this issue, there are no objections to the findings of the ES, including the proposed study areas (in relation to all technical disciplines); the limits of deviation (i.e. the Rochdale Envelope parameters); the assigned sensitivity of receptors; the assigned magnitude of impacts; the significance of residual effects (in relation to all technical disciplines) the proposed mitigation measures; and the application of expert judgements and assumptions.</p>	Agreed	Agreed

Permits, Consents and Licences	Permits, Consents and Licences	<p>SCC does not see any impediment to the grant of any permits, consents or licences that may be required outside the DCO as listed in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (CAPS) <b>[APP-020/3.3]</b>. To the best of SCC's knowledge, no consents are required beyond the DCO and the consents listed in the CAPS.</p> <p>SCC does not object to the inclusion of any powers within the DCO that are proposed to be included.</p> <p>SCC has comments on the draft DCO but these are not expected to be an impediment to the grant of consent. These comments are explored further in section 6 of this table.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<b>1/ The effect on minerals and waste</b>				
Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste	Appendix 10.1: Mineral Safeguarding Report	<p>SCC noted the absence of an assessment to address the requirements of Policy 3 of the Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire i.e. the existence, quantity, quality and value of the underlying or adjacent mineral resource.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects on the Minerals Safeguarding Area was appended to the ES.</p> <p>This addresses SCC's comment.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
		<p>The mineral safeguarding assessment identifies that between 0.4Mt to 1.0Mt of sand and gravel is affected by the proposal (4.3.5) but the applicant should also indicate the amount of resource that could be recovered from proposed earthworks and could be used within the proposed construction scheme (as fill or concrete making material).</p> <p>Following a review of the results of the Ground Investigation undertaken in 2019 it is considered that due to the underlying geology and depth of excavations required for the Scheme no safeguarded minerals would be extracted during construction of the Scheme and therefore no materials would be available for reuse within the Scheme. A supplementary Ground Investigation will be undertaken as part of the detailed design of the Scheme in 2021.</p>	Under discussion	High

			<p>Following the results of this further consideration will be given to the reuse of safeguarded sand and gravel materials within the Scheme. The reuse of an such materials, if required, will be covered in the Materials Management Plan (covering all site won materials) which is to be produced as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan to discharge Requirement 4 on the draft DCO [TR010054/APP/3.1].</p>		
		<p>SCC require consideration to be given to the impact of the Scheme on the nearby permitted Hilton Park quarry. The mineral safeguarding assessment considers the impact on the permitted Hilton Park Quarry and refers to mitigation in terms of providing an alternative access to the public highway. Figure 1 to the mineral safeguarding assessment indicates that the proposal would affect potential resource to the west of the permitted quarry. Clarification should be provided as to whether the existing underpass connecting the two</p>	<p>An assessment of the effects on the Minerals Safeguarding Area is appended to the ES. As set out in Appendix 10.1 of the ES [APP-193/6.3] Hilton Park has been non-operational for many years, but there remain permitted reserves. Planning permission for bedrock sand and gravel extraction was originally granted in 1955 and expires in 2042. Appendix 10.1 concludes that <i>"it has been demonstrated that the Scheme would not unduly restrict the mineral operations at the Hilton Park site should operations recommence at some point in the future. The requirements of MLP Policy 3 relating to safeguarding mineral infrastructure sites (specifically Policy 3.2 (b) and Policy 3.5 (a)) have been met."</i> Therefore, the</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		<p>parts of the permitted quarry would be affected.</p> <p>Confirmation should be provided that an alternative access agreeable to all parties is deliverable.</p>	<p>Scheme would not sterilise minerals within Hilton Park Quarry.</p> <p>As set out above consideration will be given to the use of site won materials during the construction phase, where appropriate, including bedrock sand. This will be considered in greater detail during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The underpass connecting the two parts of the permitted quarry either side of the M54 would not be affected by the Scheme.</p> <p>Hanson have rights to access Hilton Park Quarry via an existing access track which would be severed by the Scheme. A new access track off the eastern roundabout of the M54 Junction 1 would be provided as part of the Scheme and Highways England will provide rights over the new access to Hanson. However, as there is no current proposals for the extracting of minerals in this location the access track will not be constructed to withstand the movement of numerous heavy vehicles that would be anticipated as part of quarrying operations. Should Hanson seek planning to commence quarrying operations it is expected that they would need to provide suitable infrastructure to facilitate this as part of the planning process.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--



	Baseline conditions	SCC states that 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.	An assessment of material assets and waste is reported in Chapter 10. Material Assets and Waste, of the ES. This has been undertaken in accordance with the recently published Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11. Environmental Assessment, Section 3 Part 13 Material Assets and Waste (LA 110). Appended to the ES (Appendix 10.1) is an assessment of impacts on mineral safeguarding. The reduction or alteration in the regional capacity of landfill as a result of accommodating waste from the Scheme is included in the assessment.	Agreed	Agreed
	Potential Impacts	The ES should estimate the quantity of aggregate material required for the Scheme and identify the potential sources for such materials (on and off-site), noting that paragraph 2.3.9 of the PEIR Summary indicates an initial deficit of 90,000m <sup>3</sup> of fill material. A primary resource assessment associated with the project should be provided taking into account alternative aggregates that can be used. Large infrastructure schemes are monitored as part of the Mineral Planning Authority's	This matter was considered within the submitted Chapter 10. Material Assets and Waste of the ES [APP-049/6.1]. Section 10, paragraph 10.7.9 confirms that " <i>such materials required for the Scheme could be sourced locally in order to minimise travel distances.</i> " Highways England notes that the proposed Scheme changes submitted in October 2020, as set out within the ES Addendum: Proposed Scheme Changes October 2020 [AS-118/8.7], do not change the previous conclusions of the original Chapter 10 assessment.	Under discussion	High



		responsibility to produce an annual local aggregate assessment (this information then supports the work of the Aggregate Working Parties (refer to para 207 of the NPPF) and is important to assessing the requirement for additional aggregate reserves. Estimates for the amount of aggregate required should be assessed in terms of the uses of aggregate e.g. concrete, roadstone, fill.	<p>The final cut fill balance will be revisited continually through the detailed design process and construction to achieve as close to a balance as possible but no further information is proposed to be submitted for the purpose of determining the Application.</p> <p>Highways England will review Table 10.8 'Estimated main types and quantities of materials used during Scheme construction' of the ES following the completion of the Scheme. Information on whether aggregates are sourced from quarries within Staffordshire and/ or further afield as well as the contribution made from recycled/ secondary aggregate sources will be noted. In addition, details of the primary aggregates used in the Scheme, by type i.e. crushed rock or sand and gravel, will be recorded and submitted to SCC post construction. This commitment will be set out in the OEMP following agreement from SCC, with a revised OEMP submitted at Deadline 7.</p>		
Chapter 9 Geology and Soils	Essential Mitigation	SCC asks whether a materials management plan be produced to identify where excavated waste can be deposited within the scheme	HE confirms that a Materials Management Plan will be produced as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan to discharge Requirement 4 on the draft DCO <b>[TR010054/APP/3.1]</b> .	Agreed	Agreed

		to avoid off-site disposal?			
		<p>Fill requirements are one aspect of the material requirements of the scheme and #10.7.8 of the ES states: predicted cut and fill for the Scheme is likely to be imbalanced and disposal of material will be required. Table 10.8 indicates the requirements for roadstone and concrete.</p> <p>It is recommended that the materials management plan (recommendation 4 of the draft DCO) includes reviews of these material requirements and how these can be sustainably sourced in terms of using recycled/secondary sources as well as materials locally sourced.</p>	<p>The re-use of excavated materials shall be governed by a Materials Management Plan developed by the preliminary works contractor in accordance with the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice allowing the re-use of excavated ground materials during construction. This will allow the re-use of excavated materials without the need to obtain an Environmental Permit or an exemption to an Environmental Permit.</p> <p>The sourcing of material off-site does not form part of the Materials Management Plan.</p> <p>The Site Waste Management Plan would include procedures for monitoring the overall construction waste recovery rate and the proportion of secondary and recycled aggregate used in the Scheme, in order to confirm the assessment of materials impacts.</p>	Under discussion	High
<b>2/ Transport and traffic effects including the appropriateness of the traffic modelling and inputs</b>					
Discussion on this topic throughout 2019-2020 in	Traffic model	SCC and HE agree that the traffic model used to inform the DCO application is robust and the methodologies used are correct.		Agreed	Agreed

consultation responses, e-mails and meetings.	Traffic along the existing A460 post construction, a weight restriction and M6 Diesel	The parties agree that the Scheme will deliver a significant reduction in traffic along the existing A460, including a significant reduction in HGV use. This would deliver benefits for the surrounding properties.		Agreed	Agreed
		SCC requested clarity on how M6 Diesel was considered in the traffic model (phone call between JC and AL on 9 April 2020).	M6 Diesel has not been modelled as a specific local model zone for two reasons: 1/ It is standard traffic modelling practice to assume that all trips to fuel filling station businesses are 'passing trips' because it would be unusual for a fuel filling station to have a large enough business draw to 'generate' its own trips over the long-term period. 2/ The number of vehicles using the filling station was surveyed by SCC as 680 vehicles over a 24-hour period, which, when converted to the one-hour modelled periods, is equivalent to 28 vehicles per hour. This is far too low to be considered as a zone in its own right in the Scheme's Base Year traffic model. The DfT's latest (May 2020) transport appraisal guidance (TAG) suggests that smallest zones in the Detailed Model Area should represent about 200 to 300 vehicles per hour. This means that the M6 Diesel site might have been allocated its own zone if it had been 10 times bigger; notwithstanding that customers are likely to be passing	Agreed	Agreed

		trips and therefore excluded by consideration 1 above. (HE response by email on 23 July 2020).			
		HE and SCC agree that M6 Diesel should not have been modelled as a specific zone due to its size being far below that specified in the guidance as being appropriate for this purpose. HE and SCC agree that no additional traffic modelling is required to/ would be likely to resolve the discussion on HGV use of the A460.		Agreed	Agreed
		SCC is of the view that HGV movements along the A460 post construction could exceed that forecast in the traffic model because vehicles may continue to use the fuel station M6 Diesel, resulting in greater number of vehicles using the A460 along its entire length than predicted in the model.	HE recognises that traffic modelling does have uncertainties associated with it but disagrees that M6 Diesel is likely to be a big enough attractor to divert significant numbers of vehicles from the new link road when constructed. HE notes and appreciates SCC's comments regarding the traffic model above.	Not Agreed	Not Agreed
Email from JC on 20 March 2020. HE response provided in email from AL on 23 July 2020		SCC requested detail on the proposals for enforcing the signed diversion route (A5/A449) if the new link is closed, with a particular emphasis on HGV traffic. SCC is concerned that traffic may use the A460 when there is an incident on the link road. HE responded that all incidents on the trunk road and motorway network result in a certain amount of disruption, with drivers seeking to find alternative available routes, including local highways. In such events, tactical diversion routes (using symbols on the corners of ADS signs) can be implemented at the discretion of the Police but alternative routes cannot be enforced unless there are existing Traffic Regulations in place on them. In the event of an incident on the new M54 to M6 link road, resulting in a closure, it is proposed that the		Not Agreed	Not Agreed

	<p>existing strategic message equipment on the M54 and M6 would be used to encourage traffic to use the A449/A5 route.</p> <p>The parties agree that the diversion route is appropriate but disagree on how this should be enforced.</p> <p>SCC's position is a weight restriction should be applied to the A460 Cannock Road to discourage HGVs from using Cannock Road in the event of an incident on the new link road. Any restriction would include advance signage at the Motorway junctions to allow drivers to utilise the junction to avoid entering the restriction if they were not aware of it.</p> <p>HE does not think there is sufficient justification for a weight restriction for one to be included in the Scheme. Furthermore, it is HE's view that enforcement of a weight restriction during a major incident would be difficult and potentially more disruptive to people in the local area.</p>		
<p>Discussion on this topic throughout 2019-2020 in consultation responses, e-mails and meetings.</p> <p>Meeting 17/09/2020 (agreed the 'not agreed' position) as presented.</p>	<p>The DCO application should include a weight restriction on the existing A460. This would safeguard against future use of the A460 by HGVs and ensure measures can be implemented to improve the village feel of the road.</p> <p>The weight restriction should potentially extend from south of M6 Diesel south to Dark Lane.</p> <p>SCC's concern is not about whether the amount of HGV traffic on the A460 post construction would be acceptable. SCC's position is that an aim of the Scheme is to reduce HGV traffic along</p>	<p>HE's position is that the DCO application should not include this provision because:</p> <p>1/ The Scheme will achieve its aim because it will result in a significant reduction in the number of HGVs using the A460.</p> <p>The Scheme results in a significant reduction in the number of HGVs using the A460. Without the Scheme in place there is forecast to be 3,114 HGVs per 12-hour day on the A460 stretch through Hilton in 2024. The traffic model forecasts that this would reduce to 279 HGVs over a 12-hour day in 2024 with the Scheme in operation. Given this very significant (90%) reduction in HGV use resulting from the</p>	<p>Not agreed</p> <p>Not agreed</p>

		<p>the existing A460 and a weight restriction would increase the effectiveness of the Scheme in achieving that aim.</p> <p>SCC stated (17/09/20) that the parties should agree to disagree on this point.</p>	<p>construction of the link road, HE does not agree that it is necessary for the DCO application to also incorporate a weight restriction along the A460.</p> <p>2/ When considering the traffic using M6 Diesel and a 'worst case scenario' in terms of future HGV use of the A460, traffic is still very significantly lower than at present. HE notes that SCC has agreed that the traffic model is robust and does not challenge its conclusions. Nor has SCC provided any evidence to back up their assertion that HGVs will continue to use the existing A460 to a greater degree than predicted.</p> <p>At SCC's request, HE reviewed data on HGV use of the fuel station, M6 Diesel. This data showed that the two-way HGV flow between the M6 Diesel depot and the A460 south is 373 HGVs per day (24 hour period). Even in the highly unlikely event that none of this traffic is accounted for within the 279 HGVs forecast to use the A460 in 2024, <i>and</i> that the traffic using the M6 Diesel remains as it is currently with the link road in place, this would still only result in a total of 652 HGVs using the stretch of the A460 south of M6 Diesel. Even in that scenario, the Scheme would</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

			<p>lead to a 79% reduction in HGVs along the current A460.</p> <p>3/ No evidence or rationale has been provided on why the residual HGV use of the A460 would be unacceptable.</p> <p>This evidence has not been provided for the level of HGV traffic predicted in the traffic model, or any specific increase in this amount.</p> <p>4/ No evidence has been provided to conclude that the weight restriction as proposed (or any alternative) would be effective or that it would not cause unintended adverse effects.</p> <p>There are a number of weight restrictions already in the area and care would need to be taken over the implementation of any weight restriction to ensure a restriction did not have undesirable effects by routing HGVs onto more minor surrounding roads.</p> <p>5/ The A460 is a road operated by SCC.</p> <p>The length of the A460 between the M54 and the M6 is maintained by SCC as the Local Highway Authority (LHA). Once the strategic trips have been removed from this length of the A460 through Featherstone and Shareshill, the LHA will have more potential options for the control of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--



			HGV movements. However, this seems like a measure that could be planned and implemented by the LHA at some future date if deemed necessary and appropriate.		
Discussions November 2019- September 2020	Proposal to monitor and, if necessary, manage the use of the A460 by HGVS post opening of the Scheme	At a meeting on 17/09/20 SCC reported that SCC does not think the monitor and manage approach delivers sufficient benefits to warrant proceeding to agree terms for a legal agreement. There were also concerns that the proposed arrangement was to sit outside of the DCO.	In November 2019 HE offered a compromise to resolve the disagreement over the need for a weight restriction on the A460. HE proposed that a legal agreement could be signed by the two parties, whereby HE would agree to monitor HGV use of the existing A460 post construction of the Scheme and work with SCC to take action if the HGV traffic unacceptably exceeds that predicted in the traffic model. Discussions have been held since that time on how this might operate, potential thresholds for this agreement and funds available to implement solutions. However, SCC reported on 17/09/20 that it no longer wishes to proceed with this approach. HE agreed not to proceed with this approach.	Agreed not to proceed	Agreed
Correspondence Sept 2020	Lay-by A460	SCC asked whether the layby on the A460 at Sharesill would be removed when the M54 to M6 Link Road goes ahead. SCC has agreed to provide draft provisions in a form which could be inserted into	HE is not intending to incorporate the removal of the Sharesill layby into the Scheme. The removal of a layby used by HGVs could shift the problem to elsewhere on the network and could exacerbate the problem in the area rather than resolve it.	Under discussion	Medium



		<p>the draft DCO for the closure of Shareshill layby to the Examining Authority by Deadline 4 (8 January 2021). SCC believe the layby will act as a further trip attractor for HGVs to leave the trunk road network.</p>	<p>The existing A460 is operated by SCC and is not a HE road. HGV parking along local authority maintained roads is not an issue that HE would aim to address unless it was to mitigate an impact of the Scheme. In this case, the M54 to M6 link road will significantly reduce HGV traffic along the A460 and does not reduce HGV parking elsewhere so would not appear to have an impact on the use of the layby. It is possible that the reduced HGV use of the A460 will reduce use of the layby, thereby reducing the problem such that removal of the layby has little/ no benefit. HE's understanding is that there is a Traffic Regulation Order on the layby providing a midnight to 6am ban on parking and a 1 hour max parking. If vehicles are parking for longer than these periods, this is likely to be an enforcement issue rather than a development issue.</p> <p>As agreed at the meeting on 13 January 2021, HE has considered the information provided on the layby from SCC at Deadline 4 and whether anything further can be done as part of the Scheme. Highways England does not consider the closure of the Shareshill layby to be necessary or potentially beneficial. The use of the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			layby is already restricted and the current issues identified with use of the layby may be more associated with the enforcement of current restrictions than the nature of them. If the ExA was minded to agree with SCC that a change to the current restrictions which apply to the layby then this could be secured by way of a variation to the existing traffic regulation order which applies to the layby.		
Classification of Roads Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.9]</b>	Classification of the A460 post construction	<p>SCC requested that the DCO re-classifies the existing A460 so that is no longer an A or B road.</p> <p>HE agreed to this request and has incorporated the re-classification of the A460 in the plans for the Scheme to make the existing A460 an an-numbered C road. The road will retain the name 'Cannock Road'.</p> <p>SCC requested that HE updated the National Street Gazetteer as part of the reclassification. HE is looking into the feasibility of this before confirming.</p>		Under discussion	High
Traffic Assessment Report (TAR) <b>[TR010054/APP/7.4]</b>	Churchbridge improvement works	No mention is made in paragraph 4.3.4. of the TAR improvement works at Churchbridge, SCC queried whether these should have been included.	At the meeting with SCC on 24/02/2020, SCC recognised that improvements at Churchbridge Junction could not be included in the M54 to M6 link road scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
Meeting 09/09/2020	ROF Featherstone/ i54	SCC understands that HE did not include ROF Featherstone in the traffic model and understands that this is because the site was not yet subject to a planning application and ROF Featherstone was considered by SSC (email from Ed Fox in March 2019) to be dependent development.		Agreed	Agreed

		<p>SCC is in discussion with St Francis Group (the developer) about a forthcoming planning application and the extent to which the ROF Featherstone employment site can be operational before the construction of the M54 to M6 link road. The parties agree that this is a matter for SCC and SSC to determine when considering the application for the ROF Featherstone site rather than a matter for the Examination of the M54 to M6 Link Road.</p> <p>The parties agree that the link road could support delivery of the allocated Strategic Employment Site at ROF Featherstone by alleviating traffic along local routes such as the A460.</p> <p>SCC notes that the traffic model for the Scheme may have slightly underestimated traffic from i54 but that this is not considered to be problematic in the context of a strategic traffic model.</p>		
Meeting 9 September 2020	Requirement for ROF Featherstone to pay for upgrades to M54 Junction 2	<p>A concern was raised by SCC and SSC concerning the potential for traffic from this development to be viewed as adversely impacting upon on the M54 J2 slip road capacity, because ROF Featherstone has not been specifically modelled in the strategic traffic model.</p> <p>SCC/SSC asked whether there was a risk that ROF Featherstone would have to pay for upgrades to the M54 Junction 2 if the cumulative impact of the link road and the development lead to capacity issues in the future. The concern was that if the development had been specifically modelled in the traffic model, ROF Featherstone may have been less likely to be asked for contributions.</p> <p>Highways England agreed that no contribution will be sought from the developers of ROF Featherstone for any improvements to M54 J2 in the event that St Francis Group's Transport Assessment demonstrates, to the satisfaction of Highways England as highway authority for M54 J2, that there are no issues at the junction in the opening year of the ROF Featherstone development.</p> <p>It is understood from the e-mail from Steve Eggleston (i-transport,, representing St Francis Group) on 17 September 2020 that the ROF</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		<p>Featherstone development is likely to be open in part by 2022, with the M54 to M6 link road construction due to complete in 2024.</p> <p>The parties agree that the assurance given by Highways England resolves SCC's concerns on this issue.</p>			
Discussions 2019	Connection to the M6 Toll	<p>SCC requested clarity on whether future connection to the M6 Toll is possible if finance becomes available.</p>	<p>A future connection to M6 Toll has been considered as part of the Scheme development as set out within the Consultation Report [AS-020/5.1].</p> <p>Although not part of this Scheme, as such a link falls outside of the scope, any connection to the M6 Toll would require stopping up the link road just short of M6 Junction 11 and bypassing the junction with new structures over the M6 and M6 Toll to connect to Junction T8 with free flow slip roads to both the M6 and M6 Toll. This Scheme does not preclude the possibility of a future link to the M6 Toll being built in the future.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
Highways design (General Arrangement Drawings [TR010054/APP/2.5])	Design principles of the affected local highway network	<p>The parties agree with the proposed reduction in speed limit along Hilton Lane, the proposal to retain the connection to Mill Lane and details regarding the A460 – Link to Featherstone tie-in.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
	Avenue/Cannock Road Junction	<p>SCC agreed that a mini roundabout for the vehicle numbers involved seems an over-engineered solution and a simpler option may suffice. JC recommended that the two</p>	<p>The options were presented at a meeting on the 20/11/2020, SCC did not raise any objections to the retention of the existing junction arrangement and not providing a mini roundabout. SH queried</p>	Under discussion	High

		proposals are presented to SCC highways design team for consideration.	<p>whether the through route could be the minor road as this is where the majority of traffic will be heading. However, due to the existing tight road geometry and risk of collisions with this arrangement this has been discounted. Additional signage will be provided to demonstrate the main destinations being in the minor road however the worst case is users have to use the turning head at the end of Cannock Road to turn around to head back to the Avenue.</p> <p>This was discussed with SCC on 12 February 2021. SCC agree with the principle and details will be agreed as part of further discussions..</p>		
	Cannock Road Turning Head	SCC also has concerns with the length of Cannock Road (A460) south of the junction becoming subject to indiscriminate parking due to proximity to M54 Jct 1 and suggest measures be implemented to prevent such activity.	The turning head proposed at the end of the cul-de-sac is not designed to accommodate HGV turning therefore it is anticipated that the likelihood of HGV parking in this area is low as vehicles would be unable to exit without reversing. Furthermore, to discourage 'fly parking' it is anticipated that the existing no waiting restriction will be reinstated along this section of the A460 post completion of the Scheme. Further discussion will be held with the local residents and parish council to address concerns regarding parking at this location and the preferable design solution.	Under discussion	High

	Dark Lane Junction details	SCC agreed to retention of the existing junction layout with no changes as part of the Scheme with the exception of removal of the right turn ban from the A460. Final layout sketches are to be submitted to Simon Hawe for consideration.	Noted and agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
	Dark Lane Turning Head details	SCC confirmed that the details are acceptable and the final layout sketches are to be submitted to Simon Hawe for consideration, with a note to be added to the drawing stating that bridleway street furniture is to be developed and agreed during detailed design.	Further discussions will be held to confirm if illegal parking is a concern at this location and if deemed necessary, waiting restrictions will be applied.	Under discussion	High
	Details of Tie into existing A460	SCC outlined a number of questions in relation to the land between the proposed carriageway and adjacent properties that need to be considered. Will the ad medium filum rule need to come into effect and the land acquired handed back to the adjacent landowner or will SCC be responsible for sections of the driveways? SCC considers the proposed designs in this location lead to	A revised proposal for the land between the proposed carriageway and adjacent properties in the vicinity of the existing Cannock Road has been provided to SCC. This was discussed with SCC on 12 February 2021 and discussions are ongoing to seek to resolve this.	Under discussion	High



		unnecessary additional road space and verge.			
	Local roads departures from standard (including Hilton Lane Width)	Local Road Departures from Standard were provided in Jan 2020. Details to be re-submitted to SCC for consideration.	Under discussion. The Local Road Departures from Standard Report was re-issued to SCC on the 12 Jan 2021.	Under discussion	High
	Incremental speed drop along Hilton Lane	SCC welcomed speed reduction along Hilton Lane however noted that they would prefer to see an incremental speed drop from National to 40 then 30 as this has a higher likelihood of enforcement.	Under discussion.	Under discussion	High
	Existing Traffic Regulation Orders	SCC noted that as part of the representation it was queried whether existing TROs would be implemented again along the A460. The parties agree that as part of the DCO existing TROs would be amended where necessary to provide equivalent restrictions on the existing A460 as currently provided. However, this item remains under discussion.		Under discussion	High
Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>[TR010054/APP/7.5]</b>	Traffic Management	The parties agree that the detail of traffic management proposals will be developed to discharge requirement 10 on the draft DCO <b>[TR010054/APP/3.1]</b> and do not need to be developed in advance of decision making on the DCO Application.		Agreed	Agreed
Outline Traffic Management Plan <b>[TR010054/APP/7.5]</b>	Traffic Management	Management of temporary and permanent traffic impacts during construction and operation resulting from the Scheme need to be developed further in	Discussed and Agreed. Liaison will continue with key stakeholders, including SCC, regarding the construction programme and necessary closures and diversions throughout the construction period.	Under discussion	High

		<p>consultation with SCC (and other parties).</p> <p>This is particularly the case for traffic management around the closure of the M54 Junction 1 should the Scheme changes submitted on 9 October be taken forward.</p>	<p>HE updated the Outline Traffic Management Plan to provide more comfort that this engagement will take place and reflect the changes to traffic management that would occur if the Scheme changes are accepted by the ExA.</p>		
N/A	Signage on the local highway network	<p>SCC has confirmed that they are content to amend signs on their own network using their existing powers, where this is necessary following construction of the Scheme. SCC has suggested this should be subject to funding from HE.</p> <p>Highways England agrees that the request to update signs to reflect the amended road network signage is reasonable, provided that the scope and extent of such signage is clearly defined and agreed.</p> <p>Upon reviewing the existing signage, it is considered that the following signs would need to be updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All directions signs in the vicinity of M54 Junction 1 and M6 Junction 11. These will be replaced/amended as part of the Scheme, therefore no changes to provisions would be required.</li> <li>• Signs on the existing A460 between M54 Junction 1 and M6 Junction 11. These will require minor amendments to reflect the new road status and will be replaced/ amended as required as part of the Scheme, therefore no changes to provisions would be required.</li> <li>• One directional sign on New Road, Featherstone, that requires the text 'A460' removing. This sign is located outside of the Order Limits and the Applicant does not intend to change any part of the current DCO application to facilitate such works.</li> </ul> <p>Highways England and SCC are in discussions regarding this matter and how it might be secured. Highways England has expressed a</p>		Under discussion	High

		willingness to enter into a suitable form of agreement with SCC to allow for funding to be provided. SCC is in agreement with the principle of this approach.		
<p>Maintenance Boundary Drawing: HE514465-ACM-HGN-M54_SW_PR_Z-DR-CH-1009 (Rev P03) Not submitted with the DCO application</p>	Maintenance Boundaries	<p>Discussions have been ongoing with SCC on proposed future maintenance boundaries after construction. Initial plans showing proposed boundaries were shared with SCC at a meeting in November 2019 and by e-mail from AM on 18 December 2020 (drawing HE514465-ACM-HGN-M54_SW_PR_Z-DR-CH-1009). The areas of the Scheme proposed to be maintained by SCC are the A460 south and North of M54 Junction 1, Hilton Lane, Cannock Road, A460 North and A462 at M6 Junction 11. All other areas of the Scheme are proposed to be maintained by Highways England save for potentially some attenuation requirements south of M6 Junction 11 (see below).</p> <p>Previously the links between the Featherstone Junction West Roundabout, Featherstone Junction East Roundabout and M54 Junction 1 South Roundabout were proposed to be maintained by SCC. SCC requested a change to maintenance boundaries at M54 J1 so that HE would maintain the internal connecting roads and three roundabouts rather than SCC. HE agreed to this change.</p> <p>Following amendments made at SSC's request the parties have largely agreed future maintenance responsibilities as set out in the specified plan with the exception of the pond discussed below. Revision P03 of the Maintenance Boundary drawing shows the agreed position.</p> <p>This was discussed with SCC at the meeting on 13 Jan 2021 and discussions are continuing.</p>	Under discussion	High
	Pond near J11	<p>The attenuation pond near Junction 11 would operate to drain sections of both the local and strategic highway networks.</p> <p>In discussions relating to maintenance of highway assets between Highways England and SCC, an issue was raised with the balancing pond identified (Work 60), as it is proposed to receive surface water runoff from a portion of the new link road (strategic road network) and</p>	Under discussion	High

		<p>part of the realigned existing A460 (local road network). Sharing maintenance responsibility for the maintenance of highway assets is undesirable as it does not provide certainty on how the respective bodies share such duties. Further if a spillage were to occur on the highway draining to this pond, both parties would potentially be responsible for any pollution incidents, which has the potential to cause dispute.</p> <p>An interim solution of splitting the pond into two separate ponds (each to be maintained by the authority that maintains the highway draining to it) was discussed between Highways England and SCC. However, a more practical and manageable solution has been identified which involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways England retaining maintenance responsibility of the entire pond and outfall</li> <li>• SCC maintaining all drainage pipes up to the highway boundary, with a pollution control device at the extent of SCC's network to collect any spillages</li> </ul> <p>The details of such an arrangement are to be discussed between Highways England and SCC.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing on the best way to manage this.</p>		
<b>3/ The effect on non-motorised users</b>				
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	The parties agree that the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans reflect the Definitive Map and Statement. SCC will update the Definitive Map and Statement to reflect changes should the DCO be made.		Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Public Bridleway No.1 Shareshill – The route is a cul-de-sac meaning that for equestrians and cyclists it does not connect to another bridleway, although walkers	Public Footpath No 17 Shareshill is outside the Order limits. Any upgrades therefore are currently beyond the scope of the Scheme. The ES Chapter 12 does not deem that there is a significant effect on	Agreed

& ES Chapter 12: Population and Health <b>[TR010054/APP/6.1]</b>		can connect to a number of other footpaths. 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 improvement opportunity for consideration.	access for non-motorised users as a result of the Scheme such that works are required to Public Footpath No. 17 to mitigate the effects of the Scheme.		
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Proposed Paths Sheet 6 of 10 indicates that the proposed diversion of Bridleway No.1 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.	The diverted route of Bridleway No.1 has been revised to keep to the shortest possible route back to the original alignment that will be the desire line of users. This now connects back to Shareshill No. 1 at the end of Shareshill No.3 therefore there is no requirement to upgrade Shareshill No.3 as part of the Scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Clarification required as to whether using Footpath No.5 Shareshill and the realigned Hilton Lane bridge is an alternative. It is considerably further south and only	Footpath Shareshill 5 which would be severed by the scheme has been proposed to be re-routed over Hilton Lane bridge before connecting back into the old alignment, this right of way is currently only suitable for foot	Agreed	Agreed

		available to pedestrians, not equestrians or cyclists.	traffic therefore the alternative is considered acceptable.		
		The information provided re the effect of changes at J11 on Public Footpath No.4 Shareshill is not accurate enough to enable comments to be submitted at this time.	Shareshill No.4 will be locally diverted by a few metres to allow the construction of M6 J11. The level of connectivity will be as per the current scenario.	Agreed	Agreed
		<p>SCC noted that the Public Footpath No.5 Shareshill will be severed by the proposed new road and its western section extinguished. There are no significant concerns about the diversion of the path along a farm track to meet Hilton Lane. 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.</p> <p>As a result of the October 2020 Scheme changes Public Footpath No. 5 Shareshill was altered to be diverted over a shorter length than previously with the western section remaining. It will still be re-routed over Hilton Lane bridge before connecting back into the old alignment.</p> <p>SCC and HE agreed at the meeting on 13 January that both parties were now happy with this diversion. It was noted that representation had been received on the existing PRoW and associated issues with accessing it. SCC acknowledged that this is an existing issue and not a matter for the DCO.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7]	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	A short section of Public Footpath No.8 Saredon will require to be diverted to link to the amended road layout at J11. While in principle there are no particular concerns about this amendment, further details are required about the	Further details regarding the pedestrian layout of M6 J11 have been indicated on the NMU drawings. It is proposed that all crossing points for pedestrians will be under signal control therefore the connectivity through the junction is	Agreed	Agreed



		layout of the new J11 island and whether this route will meet a footway.	anticipated to be significantly improved.		
		The proposals to amend the J11 island will mean Public Footpath No. 1R/2214 Saredon linking the J11 M6 island and Public Footpath No.8 Saredon 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.	This is noted.	Agreed	Agreed
		SCC noted that Public Bridleway No.13 Saredon provides an important off-road access between Saredon Road and the A460. Clarity is needed on 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 Saredon 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 used between both roads that would be a real improvement. HE highlighted that further details regarding the layout of M6 J11 have been indicated on the NMU drawings. It is proposed that Saredon No.13 will be diverted locally to connect into M6 Junction 11 with a layout that meets current standards (ie. removal of steps on Bridleway). There would be the opportunity for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the A460 via the M6 J11 island, however it is not proposed to provide an extension of the bridleway across M6 J11. Further details at detailed design stage. The connectivity through the junction is therefore anticipated to be significantly improved.		Agreed	Agreed

		SCC agreed on 13 January 2021 that they are now happy with the components of the Scheme above.			
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [TR010054/APP/2.7]	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Public Bridleway No.3 Featherstone 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.	This is noted.	Agreed	Agreed
		Public Footpath No 3 Shareshill runs very close to the Scheme. Clarification required on whether it will be affected by the proposed diversion of Public Bridleway No.1 Shareshill or otherwise.	It is anticipated that Shareshill No.3 will not be affected by the Scheme. Please see the comments in relation to No.1 Shareshill.	Agreed	Agreed
		Public Bridleway No.8 Featherstone runs very close to the scheme although the General Arrangement Scheme plan suggests it is not directly affected, given it joins into Featherston No.3, it should be considered.	Noted though it is anticipated that Shareshill No.8 will not be affected by the Scheme.	Agreed	Agreed

Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Public Right of Way application (LM645G)	An application to add footpaths to the Definitive Map under section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, in the vicinity of J1 of the M54, should be considered as part of the ES.	Public Right of Way application LM645G submitted in November 2002 is for the deletion of a footway between South Crescent and Brookhouse Close in Featherstone and was accepted by SCC. This footway no longer appears on the definitive map and has therefore not been considered as part of the ES.	Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	All temporary and permanent alternative footpath/bridleway routes should be open prior to the closure of the legal lines.	As set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan, Public Rights of Way will be maintained throughout the construction period. Some of the PROWs will require minor diversions, these will be suitable and appropriate where implemented. It is therefore considered that all temporary and permanent alternative footpath/bridleway routes will be open prior to the closure of the legal lines.	Agreed	Agreed
	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	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.	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.	Agreed	Agreed
	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	All new path furniture must conform to the British Standard for Gaps, Gates and	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in	Agreed	Agreed

		Stiles (currently BS5709:2018); British Horse Society (BHS) advice and the least restrictive principle (Equality Act 2010).	consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided in the Detailed Design Stage.		
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	Public Footpaths should be a minimum of 3 metres wide and Public Bridleways should be a minimum of 4 metres wide.	Noted, all footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided in the Detailed Design Stage.	Agreed	Agreed
		Standards for overbridges carrying bridleways and rural lanes should be in accordance with the DMRB and BHS standards.	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided at detailed design stage.	Agreed	Agreed
		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.	Noted, all footways/ footpaths and Bridleways are designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided in the Detailed Design Stage.	Agreed	Agreed
		Case by case specification for path surfaces to be agreed with SCC and expectation that some non-sealed paths will be built with compacted stone + MOT specification. This applies during the	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided at detailed design stage.	Agreed	Agreed

		construction phase and on completion of the scheme.			
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	Schedule for path signage to be agreed with SCC with requirement for location, design and destination signage where appropriate.	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided at detailed design stage.	Agreed	Agreed
		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 landowners should note that SCC is not responsible for maintaining fencing either during or post-construction.	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways will be designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Further details will be provided at detailed design stage.	Agreed	Agreed
		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.	All footways/ footpaths and Bridleways are designed to the current Standards and in consultation with SCC. Where required, ramps have been included in the design including; Sharesill 1, Saredon 8 and Saredon 13.	Agreed	Agreed
		HE need to show paths very clearly in large scale on the correct alignments to ensure no ambiguity with landowners	The location and alignments of all footpaths and bridleways are shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b> . These will be agreed with the	Agreed	Agreed

		regarding the alignment of a right of way or its status.	landowners and included within the definitive land plans associated with the scheme .		
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	SCC Public Right of Way Requirements	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 legal right of access over construction traffic.	Noted, any temporary signage required on the PRow network during construction will be agreed between the Contractor and SCC.	Agreed	Agreed
		In places where construction traffic has used the PRow network SCC expect HE 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.	Pre-construction condition surveys will be undertaken ahead of the commencement of works. All PRow are to be reinstated to a suitable standard upon completion of the scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
		HE 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.	The landscape design is outlined on Figures 2.1 to 2.7 of the ES <b>[TR010054/APP/6.2]</b> . The landscaping design will be further developed at the detailed design phase. Natural screening for PRow has been included where appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Modifications to NMU facilities, at M54 J1, that provide an off-carriageway route are supported along with any necessary crossing	On carriageway facilities have been explored however, due to the cross-section restriction through the structure, separate facilities have been discounted. Further details are	Agreed	Agreed



		improvements and requirements to ensure and improve safety and connectivity. On-carriageway options should also be explored. Shared use routes are considered suitable.	provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b> .		
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	Shared-use facilities at M6 J11 are also supported to enable NMU access across the junction. Improvements to on carriageway facilities are also welcomed.	On carriageway facilities have been explored however, due to the cross-section restriction through the structure, separate facilities have been discounted. Further details are provided on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b> . NMUs will be encouraged to use the existing A460 and will be directed to the off carriageway facilities through M6 J11 for safety reasons to access the A460 North.	Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	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.	The current proposals include a new bridleway from Hilton lane to Dark lane to provide the required access.	Agreed	Agreed
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	SCC supports consideration of improved NMU facilities along the existing A460 corridor. Links to the National Cycle Network are supported and off-carriageway facilities should be considered where possible.		Agreed	Agreed

		<p>The Scheme does not include proposals to improve NMU facilities along the existing A460 corridor. However, Highways England has accepted a designated fund application for an initial feasibility study to identify opportunities to provide improved NMU routes along the existing A460. This will be developed in partnership with key stakeholders including SCC.</p> <p>This matter was discussed at a meeting between SCC and HE on 13 January 2021. SCC and HE agree that the cycleway is being dealt with through designated funds and is not to be included in the Scheme being progressed through the DCO process.</p> <p>SCC is of the view that the weight restriction proposed by SCC would facilitate future cycleway enhancements. HE acknowledge this point, although disagree that the weight restriction is required. Both parties agree that this point is agreed with the exception of the need for the weight restriction.</p>		
Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[TR010054/APP/2.7]</b>	Proposed Public Right of Way Diversions	<p>New facilities providing sustainable access to Cheslyn Hay along Saredon Road are also supported improving connectivity to Cheslyn Hay Primary school in particular.</p> <p>HE and SCC agree that there is potential for such improvements to be provided as part of Highways England's designated funds package. However, such improvements fall outside of the Scheme Order limits and are agreed not to be material to the DCO application. No commitment can be made at this stage, however the details will be developed in partnership with key stakeholders including SCC. This matter was discussed at the meeting on 13 January 2021.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment Report (WCHAR)	WCHAR Assessment – Bus Routes	<p>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 HE contact our passenger transport team to discuss.</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		Comment addressed in latest revision of WCHAR Report <b>[APP-199/6.3]</b> . The parties agree that this point will be addressed during detailed design.			
Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment Report	WCHAR Assessment – Bus 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.	Comment addressed in latest revision of WCHAR Report <b>[APP-199/6.3]</b> . Routes now added to Figure in report.	Agreed	Agreed
Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment Report	WCHAR Assessment – Bus Routes	The text in Section 2.3.1 for services 67 and 71 should refer to them being operated by 'Select Bus Company'.	Comment addressed in latest revision of WCHAR Report <b>[APP-199/6.3]</b> .	Agreed	Agreed
		The route of service 67 shown on Figure 2.2 is slightly different around Featherstone than shown on Figure 2.2.	Comment addressed in latest revision of WCHAR Report <b>[APP-199/6.3]</b> .	Agreed	Agreed
		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.	These routes are noted in the Transport Assessment Report <b>[TR010054/APP/7.4]</b> as not being impacted by the Scheme and therefore have not been assessed.	Agreed	Agreed
		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.	Comment addressed in latest revision of WCHAR Report <b>[APP-199/6.3]</b> .	Agreed	Agreed

Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Review Report		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.	The impact on affected public transport routes is assessed in the Transport Assessment Report [TR010054/APP/7.4].	Agreed	Agreed
<b>4/ Water environment effects, including any permits required from SCC as LLFA</b>					
Chapter 13. Road Drainage and Water Environment [TR010054/APP/6.1]	Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The LLFA is content that the ES appropriately assesses the effect of the Scheme on road drainage and the water environment and that impacts would be managed through adherence to mitigation measures detailed in the OEMP.</p> <p>The submitted Drainage Strategy outlines the key parameters and standards to be followed in the detailed drainage design to achieve these requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attenuation within SuDS features to be provided to ensure no flooding in a 1 in 100 year + 40% return period event, with a 300mm freeboard included in the proposed design.</li> <li>• Discharge of surface water runoff to be restricted to a greenfield rate of 5l/s/ha for all events up to the 1 in 100 year + 40% return period event.</li> <li>• Drainage design to be in accordance with the SuDS Manual 2015, CIRIA C753, with water quality treatment in accordance with DMRB LA113, to be assessed using the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT).</li> </ul> <p>Delivery of the OEMP [TR010054/APP/6.11] is a Requirement in the draft DCO.</p>		Agreed	Agreed

		The OEMP commitment D-WAT1, secures drainage treatment in accordance with Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-201/6.3].			
	Ordinary Watercourses	The LLFA has previously been consulted on the form, size and design of proposed ordinary watercourse crossings. This has included a review of the FRA. In principle the LLFA is content with the design proposals. Future maintenance responsibility of these structures will need to be clearly described in the application.	Noted and agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Consents and Agreements Position Statement [TR010054/APP/3.3]	Land drainage consent	When determining applications for land drainage consent the key topic of concern is flood risk. However, the LLFA is required to also consider compliance with the Water Framework Directive and for this will liaise closely with the Environment Agency.	Noted and agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 13.1 of the ES [TR010054/APP/6.3])	Flood Risk	The LLFA is content that the Flood Risk Assessment appropriately assesses the flood risk associated with the Scheme with the exception of the below points on fluvial flood risk.	Noted	Agreed	Agreed

	Impact on fluvial flood risk	<p>(Watercourse 2) – Confirms flood depths at the A460 during the 1% AEP plus 50% climate change storm are the same as the baseline scenario. SCC asked HE to confirm that the frequency of flooding will not be increased here by the Scheme? i.e. What is the lowest return period that flooding is seen at the A460 in the baseline and scheme scenarios?</p> <p>This is reported in the hydraulic model report (Annex B of the FRA) but not explicitly stated. The following text has been added to the FRA Report to clarify:</p> <p>“The baseline model predicts that the first instance of flood risk to the A460 is as a result of a 1% AEP plus 50% climate change storm. The application of the Scheme design to the baseline model shows that there is no change in the return period of the first instance of flood risk, as flood risk in the vicinity of the scheme first occurs during the 1% AEP plus 50% climate change storm event. “</p> <p>The parties agree that this resolves SCC’s query.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
		<p>Is there any potential to reduce the flood risk at the A460 by providing additional floodplain storage upstream / downstream of the new culverts?</p>	<p>This was considered as part of the option design development; however, it was not explicitly stated in the FRA as it was discounted from the Scheme early on. The following text has been added to FRA and Hydraulic model report to clarify:</p> <p>“Different Scheme 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</p>	Under discussion	High



			design given the increase in Scheme costs."		
		<p>(Watercourse 3) – confirms that the Scheme does not impact the fluvial flood risk for this watercourse IF the Lower Pool is retained as an online pond.</p> <p>As the model sensitivity testing demonstrated the importance of Lower Pool, and a section of Lower Pool will be lost as a result of the Scheme, can you specify the necessary storage capacity to be retained, or will the detailed design need further modelling to confirm no increase in flood risk?</p>	<p>The following text was added to the FRA:</p> <p><i>"4.1.8 The Scheme reshapes the outline of Lower Pool and includes a culvert underneath the new carriageway. The dissection of Lower Pool will reduce its area from 13200m<sup>2</sup> to 8723m<sup>2</sup>."</i></p> <p><i>"4.1.9 Despite the reduction in size of the Lower Pool, the Scheme does not impact the fluvial flood risk for this watercourse if the Lower Pool is retained as an online pond. Water levels within the channel are increased in the section of watercourse between the culvert crossing and the Dark Lane culvert, as a result of reprofiling the upstream river reach. However, retaining part of the Lower Pool protects properties at Dark Lane, as well as the existing A460 from potential flood risk."</i></p> <p>The following text was added to the Hydraulic model report (Annex B of the FRA):</p> <p><i>"The dissection of Lower Pool will reduce its area from 13200m<sup>2</sup> to 8723m<sup>2</sup> (approximate values) [...]"</i></p>	Agreed	Agreed

			<p>Therefore, it is important that the Lower Pool is retained as an online feature, as it provides flood protection downstream. The current scheme design showing Lower Pool with an area of 8723m<sup>2</sup> does not increase flood risk downstream.”</p> <p>The parties agree this response resolves the query raised.</p>		
	Pond/ weir design	<p>SCC asked whether there potential to optimise the pond / weir design to reduce flood risk downstream?</p> <p>This was partially discussed in the Hydraulic model report (Annex B of the FRA), around sensitivity testing. Further text was added by HE to the Hydraulic model report to clarify:</p> <p>“5.3.9 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.”</p> <p>SCC requested that a firmer commitment be reached than described above. In light of SCC’s request, HE agree that further sensitivity testing concerning the pond size and weir design <u>will</u> be undertaken at the detailed design stage to minimise flood risk downstream. In light of this commitment, the point is now agreed.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	
Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy [TR010054/APP/6.3]	Preliminary drainage design	<p>The LLFA is content that the Drainage Strategy as outlined in Appendix 13.2 of the ES is appropriate and that the requirement to implement this design is captured through adherence to the OEMP. Delivery of the OEMP [TR010054/APP/6.11] is a Requirement in the draft DCO.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	

		The LLFA is content that the submitted Drainage Strategy outlines the key parameters and standards to be followed in the detailed drainage design to achieve these requirements.			
Appendix 13.3 Water Framework Directive Assessment of the ES [TR010054/APP/6.3]	Water Framework Directive	<p>The LLFA is content that the WFD Assessment as reported in Appendix 13.3 of the ES appropriately assesses the impact of the Scheme in line with the Water Framework Directive and that impacts would be managed through adherence to mitigation measures detailed in the OEMP.</p> <p>Delivery of the OEMP [TR010054/APP/6.11] is a Requirement in the draft DCO.</p> <p>LLFA: As noted above, the LLFA's remit in relation to the WFD assessment is limited to the consideration of land drainage consent applications under S23 of the Land Drainage Act, for which we will liaise with the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency raised some concerns about the preliminary WFD assessment.</p> <p>Consultation with the EA with regard to WFD compliance is reported within the EA SoCG [TR010054/APP/8.8P(A)]. This point is now agreed between the parties.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
OEMP [TR010054/APP/6.11] and Consents and Agreements Position Statement [TR010054/APP/3.3]	Consents and permissions	<p>The LLFA has amended the Water Permits and Consents Register to ensure that this refers more clearly to the diversions/ realignment of Watercourses 2 and 3. However, this remains a live document and will need to be kept under review as the project develops.</p>	Noted and agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
		<p>It will be important that any land drainage consent application for Watercourse 3 also considers changes to Lower Pool to ensure that</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>The OEMP issued with draft DCO includes commitment D-WAT3 'detailed design of the realignment and diversion of Watercourses 3 and</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		there is no worsening of flood risk. It may be possible for the Scheme during detailed design to potentially support alleviating flood risk downstream along Watercourse 3 and a commitment to investigating this should be included in the OEMP.	Lower Pool would be undertaken within the detailed design stage. The design will follow best practice to maintain flow, stream processes and ensuring flood risk is not worsened downstream, whilst seeking to provide morphological and ecological enhancement on current channel form.'		
		The LLFA and HE agreed that where new ditches are proposed from the highway drainage system to ordinary watercourses, only the temporary works will require land drainage consent (given the attenuation of discharges to the ditches to greenfield runoff rates). It is agreed that wherever possible ditches will be used to discharge treated highway runoff to local watercourses. This avoids the need for engineered outfalls, creates better links to existing green corridors, and improves connectivity with new treatment/attenuation ponds. Drainage ditches and realigned/diverted watercourses will be designed to best practice to maximise biodiversity opportunities.		Agreed	Agreed
		The LLFA is content that consents and permissions as outlined in the OEMP and Consents and Agreements Position Statement (CAPS) capture the appropriate consents and permissions relevant to the Scheme as required under Land Drainage Act Section 23. A more detailed consents register will be progressed in consultation with SCC as the detailed design of the Scheme progresses.		Agreed	Agreed
5/ Socio-economic effects					
N/A	Socio-economic effects	SCC supports the need for better connectivity to promote economic growth and prosperity; supports the reduction of traffic along the A460; and is supportive of the general principle for the need for a link road between the M54 and M6.		Agreed	Agreed

6/The draft DCO provisions and requirements including future procedures for approval of details					
Draft DCO [TR010054/APP/3.1]	Protective Provisions and approval of design	<p>SCC queried whether protective provisions for the benefit of SCC as highway authority would be included in the draft DCO.</p> <p>SCC sent HE a copy of preferred draft protective provisions and indicated that they could operate like a 'section 4 agreement' (i.e. where one highway authority works on another highway authority's road).</p>	<p>HE confirmed in meetings and by email (23/08/20) that HE does not propose to include such protective provisions in the draft DCO. The works to SCC's highway will be managed and delivered by HE, as an experienced highway authority, in accordance with the terms of the draft DCO and to the reasonable satisfaction of SCC. As such, there is no need for further protections to be built into the draft DCO. The principle of this has been accepted by other local highway authorities on other DCO schemes promoted by HE.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, HE did review the draft protective provisions provided by SCC and can confirm that it remains HE's view that protective provisions for SCC are not necessary.</p> <p>HE is aware that, where SCC has been involved in other DCO schemes, SCC has agreed protective provisions with the applicant. However, we understand that private companies rather than another statutory body were promoting those schemes. That would involve additional risk, which warrant additional protections built into the DCO. The same does not</p>	Under discussion	Medium

			<p>apply in this case. As another highway authority, HE, will carry out the works to SCC highway to the same standard to which it would undertake works on its own highway. In this respect, HE can confirm that any works will be developed and designed having regard to the DMRB.</p> <p>Article 10 of the draft DCO further imposes a requirement on HE to carry out any street works to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority.</p> <p>Save for one exception, other local highway authorities on other HE DCOs (made or applied for) have accepted the above approach as sufficient protection without the need for additional protective provisions. The one exception is A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling DCO and the reason for protective provisions in that case was due to the complex nature of the works and the proposed adoption of new structures by the local highway authority. The same issues do not apply here, so there is no need for an exception in this case.</p> <p>This matter was raised at the draft DCO hearing on 9 December 2020 (Issue Specific Hearing 3). HE agreed to consider whether a requirement should be placed on the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--



			<p>consent to provide SCC with more input to the design of assets that they will maintain. SCC confirmed at the hearing that if it had appropriate input into the design then it would not require any protective provisions. SCC and HE discussed at the meeting on 13 January 2021.</p> <p>Highways England maintains that there is no need for protective provisions and the current draft DCO provides sufficient involvement for SCC given the relationship between the two parties and that Highways England is a highway authority accustomed to delivering highways to standard.</p>		
Other considerations related to the ES					
Chapter 6: Cultural heritage [TR010054/APP/6.1]	Methodology and assumptions	<p>SCC is content that the assessment methodologies applied to undertake the environmental impact assessment as reported within the ES are appropriate. The assumptions and limitations reported in the ES are reasonable and do not impact upon the validity of the assessment findings.</p> <p>Details of methodologies and assumptions and limitations used to undertake the environmental impact assessment are provided in Section 6.3 and 6.4 of the ES.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	
	Baseline Conditions	<p>SCC is content that the study area and baseline conditions reported in the ES is appropriate.</p> <p>Details of study areas and baseline conditions are reported in Section 6.5 and 6.6 of the ES.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	

	Mitigation measures	<p>The parties agree that the ES has identified appropriate mitigation measures for archaeological assets.</p> <p>SCC is content that mitigation measures are appropriate to mitigate impacts on unknown known and unknown archaeological assets identified in Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage of the ES <b>[APP-045/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The parties agree that the archaeological trial trenching is not required to inform the ES, due to the low potential for archaeological remains on the site. Therefore, the trial trenching does not need to be completed prior to decision making on the DCO Application so can be carried out in parallel with the Application or after the DCO is made.</p> <p>The parties agree that it is highly unlikely that any remains would be found that would require any design changes to the Scheme as remains need to be of national value to warrant retention <i>in situ</i>. Even then, mitigation measures can be applied to excavate if preservation is not possible.</p> <p>The OEMP and Archaeological Mitigation Strategy which form part of the OEMP include the requirement to consider preservation in situ. PW-CH1 of the OEMP details the timing of evaluation trenching. This position is agreed with SCC.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
	Impacts and Effects	<p>The parties agree that the assessment of impacts in the ES presents a worst-case scenario and it is highly unlikely/ unlikely that anything found in the trial trenching would lead to 'new' or 'different' environmental effects. SCC is content the impact and effect of the Scheme on archaeological assets has been assessed appropriately and sufficiently for a decision to be made on the DCO.</p> <p>Impacts and effects on cultural heritage assets are reported in Section 6.7 and 6.9 of the ES.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
		<p>SCC is content the impact on the built environment and landscape has been assessed appropriately, however will defer to Historic England on this matter as they have had more engagement on this matter, particularly with regards to the impact on Hilton Hall and Hilton Park. It is noted much of the additional information that Historic</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		<p>England requested in our meeting in August has been provided although the noise modelling appears to be outstanding.</p> <p>Additional text was included in the Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage prior to submission of the draft DCO, including the results of noise modelling in relation to the built environment and landscape.</p>			
ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [TR010054/APP/6.1]	Hilton Park	<p>SCC note that the significance of Hilton Park as an 18<sup>th</sup> century historic parkland is acknowledged in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report.</p> <p>SCC state, although the parkland has already been compromised by the M6 and M54, the 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 ES in order to assess the impact on the Hilton Park historic landscape.</p>	<p>It is noted that the parkland has already been compromised to a degree by the M6 and M54. The impact on Hilton Park has been considered in detail with further research on the park presented in Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage rather than Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual in the ES</p>	Agreed	Agreed
	Viewpoint Locations	<p>Following the addition of an additional viewpoint from Featherstone Farm/Whitehouse Farm outlying the North side of Featherstone (VP18), the viewpoints are agreed between the parties.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
	Lighting and night-time views	<p>The impact of junction lighting and views of signage gantries should be considered in more detail and incorporated into</p>	<p>Night-time viewpoints were agreed at a meeting 02/08/2019. The survey team visited much of the study area at night to understand the baseline</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		the visual appraisal. Night-time views and impact on tranquillity and dark skies should also be considered.	lighting levels. Where lighting and signage associated with the Scheme would potentially be visible, this is discussed within the chapter. Tranquillity is also discussed within the ES (7.6.20) and illustrated on Figure 7.27 [TR010054/APP/6.2].		
	Mitigation Measures	SCC comments at the consultation stage suggested the creation of heathland vegetation around M6 Junction 11, however the ES has dismissed this as not feasible due to unsuitable soil conditions. SCC accept this point.	Agreed. An explanation as to why heathland creation in this location is not appropriate is provided in paragraph 7.3.28 of the ES.	Agreed	Agreed
	Views from Hilton Hall	SCC state that 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 development. SCC approve of the views from Hilton Hall being assessed in the heritage chapter providing the landscape team stay involved with the historic assessment and assist in providing appropriate mitigation measures.	Viewpoints from Hilton Hall and Portobello Tower have been considered within the ES. Due to the heritage nature of these views, they have been considered as part of the cultural heritage assessment in Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage rather than Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual.	Agreed	Agreed

	Landscape and Visual Assessment	SCC is content the methodology and content of Chapter 7 conform with the DMRB LA 107 (2019) requirements and they provide an accurate assessment of landscape and visual impacts of the proposed Highway works.	Noted	Agreed	Agreed
Chapter 8: Biodiversity [TR010054/APP/6.1]	Scope of ecological surveys	SCC has confirmed that the survey coverage and methodologies used are appropriate for the ecological impact assessment including that hazel dormice can be categorically scoped out from further survey.		Agreed	Agreed
		SCC are content the survey coverage and methodologies	Noted.	Agreed	Agreed
	Habitats	Hedgerow assessment should use the HEGS methodology in addition to the 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.	Hedgerows to be directly affected have been assessed and evaluated in line with the HEGS methodology (refer to Appendix 8.4: Designated Sites and Habitats [TR010054/APP/6.3]) and assessed within the ES Ecology chapter (refer to Section 8.9), and appropriate mitigation/replacement recommended for any being lost.	Agreed	Agreed
		SCC could not find a reference to assessment of veteran trees in their own right, rather than as bat roost potential (which is covered.) SCC noted that veteran 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		Agreed	Agreed

		<p>intermediate veterans should also be assessed and considered because these are the veterans of the future.</p> <p>HE confirmed that a full tree survey has been undertaken and details of veteran trees are provided in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report, Appendix 7.1 <b>[TR010054/AP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Seven veteran trees have been identified within the biodiversity study area, five of which are within the Scheme boundary (T137, T227, T221, T214 and 211). T226 is shown on the Environmental Masterplan [AS-086 to 092/6.2] as a veteran tree however as set out in Appendix 7.1: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [AS-101/6.1] this tree is a prominent tree, a particularly large over-mature ash but it is not considered to be a veteran tree.</p> <p>A further 12 veteran trees were identified as part of the assessment of impacts from nitrogen deposition. These trees are located within 200 m of the affected road network but are outside the Scheme boundary. Further details of these veteran trees can be found in application document, 'DMRB Updates and the Impact on the DCO Application' [AS-059/8.2].</p> <p>An assessment of potential impacts has been undertaken in Section 8.9 of the ES chapter.</p> <p>SCC confirmed on 13 January 2020 that they are content all veteran trees with the potential to be impacted by the Scheme have been identified by Highways England.</p>		
Bats	<p>Lesser horseshoe bat is now found further north in the county than 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.</p>	<p>HE is aware of the lesser horseshoe records and all of the survey recordings have been analysed for all bat species, including lesser horseshoe. Full results are provided in Appendix 8.7: Bats <b>[TR010054/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>	Agreed	Agreed



Discussions between parties	Biodiversity net gain (metric used)	<p>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.</p> <p>Biodiversity metrics have been used to assess the Scheme and demonstrate that it achieves no net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>The biodiversity metric calculation undertaken for the application submitted in January 2020 was 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. Details on and the outcome of the metric are provided in Appendix 8.2: Net Gain Calculations [APP-176/6.3].</p> <p>A re-calculation using Defra Metric 2.0 has been undertaken by the applicant and submitted to the inspectorate as a revision of Appendix 8.2: Biodiversity Metric Calculations, submitted to the Inspectorate on 9 October 2020.</p> <p>SCC and HE agree that the metric used is correct.</p>		Agreed	Agreed
	<p>Biodiversity net gain (what the Scheme should achieve)</p> <p>National Policy Requirements</p>	<p>The parties agree the National Policy does not mandate for a 10% net gain on NSIPs (as per the emerging Environment Act) and consequently CPO powers could not be used to acquire land for such a purpose.</p>		Under discussion	High
	Biodiversity net gain (voluntary additional commitments).	<p>SCC asked what the relationship is between the project and the project to deliver net gain being investigated using HE's designated funds package and whether off site measures</p>	<p>The designated funds applications cannot be considered part of the DCO application and are not material to decision making on this application. It is only possible to apply for and receive designated funds funding where the work is</p>	Under discussion	Medium

		<p>to deliver net gain can be secured through a S106 agreement.</p> <p>SCC requested that HE consider a voluntary agreement to secure a net gain in biodiversity and provide a clearer commitment than provided through the designated funds scheme.</p>	<p>achieving environmental benefits over and above the essential mitigation for the Scheme. By definition, if something is necessary for the Scheme, it cannot be funded using designated funds.</p> <p>Highways England cannot guarantee the outputs of the EDF study nor availability of further EDF funding as EDF has to meet strict appraisal requirements in order to be eligible for the funding. Until we have outputs from the feasibility study (expected spring 2021) we will be unable to know if 10% net gain or the HE target of 24% net gain is achievable. Notwithstanding this, a designated funds application for the next stage of the study involving detailed design of enhancements would be submitted in 2021, funding for delivery of enhancements would be sought following this most likely late 2021 with works expected to be undertaken in 2022, subject to approvals and programming.</p> <p>Regarding the potential for a S106 agreement to deliver net gain, Highways England do not consider that this agreement would be an appropriate mechanism. For items to be included in a S106 agreement and to form the basis on which consent for the scheme is granted,</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>they should meet three tests, which are that requirements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</li> <li>o directly related to the development; and.</li> <li>o fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</li> </ul> <p>Due to the lack of a policy imperative to net gain, delivering a net gain is not necessary in planning terms. A requirement to deliver net gain would therefore not meet the three tests and should not be included in a S106.</p> <p>For all the reasons above, Highways England does not think it is appropriate to link the designated funds project with the DCO application through a S106 or another mechanism but will continue to pursue the two projects in parallel.</p> <p>This matter was discussed that the meeting on 13 January 2021, given that the designated funds application is separate to the DCO application, updates will be provided separately. On 13 January 2020 SCC asked whether there was any other mechanism for a voluntary contribution to be provided. HE did look into this, but the mechanism for providing funds for these activities is</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>designated funds. This programme ensures activities are evaluated and there is a selection process. There is not an alternative method to provide funding for these purposes and HE remains of the view that designated funds are the most appropriate and best way to take forward these activities.</p> <p>HE will continue to work with SCC to identify opportunities that can be progressed through the Designated Funds process.</p>		
	Non-Statutory Designated Sites and Ancient Woodland	<p>SCC 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.</p> <p>SCC is of the view that if the Inspector rules in favour of Allow Ltd the Scheme will not</p>	<p>A full account of the effects on Lower Pool and Brookfield Farm Local Wildlife Sites and Oxden Leasow Wood is included within the ES (refer to Section 8.9 of the ES Ecology chapter). The woodlands within Lower Pool and Brookfield Farm have been assessed as to whether they are ancient, the outcomes of which have been agreed with Natural England as set out in the SoCG agreed with Natural England. Mitigation is shown in the Environmental Masterplan and described in Section 8.9 of the ES Ecology Chapter.</p>	Agreed	Agreed

		provide sufficient habitat creation.			
	Woodland Mitigation	SCC and HE consider provision of woodland mitigation as shown in the Environmental Masterplan [AS-086 to AS-092/6.2] to be the minimum required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Further reduction would not sufficiently mitigate the impacts of the scheme on woodland habitats and SCC would object to the removal of further areas of mitigation planting from the Scheme.	Agreed	Agreed	
		Provision currently sits at less than 1 to 1 for woodland not associated with Ancient Woodland or SBIs, with losses and gains as reported in 8.11 Environmental Mitigation Approach [REP-057/8.11] at 15.3 ha planted for 16.67 ha (19.49 ha woodland minus 0.71 ha loss at Brookfield Farm SBI and 2.11 ha loss at Lower Pool SBI), a ratio of 0.92 to 1. The majority of woodland to be lost outside of the AW and SBIs is made up of small fragments of roadside planting alongside the existing M54, M6 and A460 and is less than 30 years old. This woodland has therefore been compensated for at a ratio less than 1:1.  Further reduction would not sufficiently mitigate the impacts of the scheme on woodland habitats. See also SCC's comments on net gain above.	Agreed	Agreed	

## Appendix A – Personnel and organisations referenced in this SoCG

Initials	Name	Role or Discipline	Organisation
AG	Anna Gee	Hydromorphology	AECOM
AK	Andrew Kelly	Project Manager	Highways England
AL	Alison Leeder	DCO Lead	AECOM
AMa	Alex Maddox	Environmental Consultant	AECOM
AMc	Alistair McNeil	Highways Design Lead	AECOM
AS	Amy Spencer	Environmental	AECOM
AW	Adam Wilson	Environmental Consultant	AECOM
BB	Bryan Bradley	Assistant Project Manager	Highways England
BK	Bill Klemperer	Principal Inspector	Historic England
CA	Chris Archer	Flood Team	SCC
DC	Dean Cordelle	Ecologist	SCC
DL	Dave Last	Project Manager	AECOM
DT	Dyfan Thomas	Highways	Amey
FL	Fiona Lee	Archaeology	AECOM
GK	Gerard Kelly	Senior Project Manager	Highways England
GL	Graham Littlechild	Project Manager	Highways England
HH	Hannah Howe	Flooding/Water	AECOM
HM	Hazel Murrells	Ecology	Tyler Grange
HMac	Helen MacLean	Heritage	AECOM
HP	Howard Price	Landscape Consultant	SCC
JB	Julia Banbury	Landscape	SCC
JC	James Chadwick	SCC Case Manager (planning)	SCC
JCa	Jacqui Casey	Interim Partnership Manager	Stoke & Staffordshire LEP
JCo	Jamie Cooper	Flood Risk	Environment Agency
JF	Jane Field	Planning Specialist	Environment Agency
JFr	Julie Frost	Office Manager	Stoke & Staffordshire LEP
JH	Jim Hunter	Heritage	Highways England
JK	Joanne Keay	Strategy Officer	SCC
JT	Julie Taylor	Inspector of Historic Buildings	Historic England

KH	Kelly Harris	Strategic Planning Team Manager	SSC
KK	Katerina Koukouthaki	Built Heritage	AECOM
KV	Kanishka Varoon	Former Assistant Project Manager	Highways England
LB	Lizzie Bushby	Landscape	AECOM
LH	Lucy Hill	Resources and Waste Management Specialist	AECOM
MG	Matthew Griffin	Team Leader	SCC
MW	Mark Winnington	Cabinet Member for Economic Growth	SCC
ND	Nick Dawson	Connectivity Strategy Manager	SCC
NP	Nick Phillips	Traffic Modelling	AECOM
OT	Owen Tucker	Environmental Scientist	AECOM
PA	Peter Adams		Highways England
RR	Rob Ramshaw	Project Manager	AECOM
RW	Rose Walker	Landscape Architect	AECOM
SBa	Sally Barnett	Highways/Drainage Design	AECOM
SBe	Steve Beech	Project Director	LinkConnex/ BAM
SBI	Suzy Blake	Historic Environment Record Officer	SCC
SC	Stephen Callister	Operations Directorate	HE
SG	Stuart Graham	Ecology	Amey
SH	Simon Hawe	Highways Development	SCC
SK	Shane Kelleher	Archaeology	SCC
SL	Sue Lawley	Ecology	SCC
TB	Tom Bennett	Former Stakeholder Lead	Amey
TE	Trish Evans	Legal	SCC
TP	Tamara Percy	Environmental Lead	AECOM
WS	Will Spencer	Traffic	SCC