

**From:** [Neville Ball](#)  
**To:** [WMIinterchange@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:WMIinterchange@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Application by Four Ashes Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the West Midlands Interchange - Reference TR050005  
**Date:** 05 April 2019 17:03:58  
**Attachments:** [WMI - Response by Wolverhampton and Walsall Councils to EA Questions.docx](#)

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached a response to the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council (CWC) and Walsall Council (WC) following the preliminary meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> February.

Unfortunately, owing to an unexpected long term staff absence it has not been possible for the response to the questions in section 1.8 about air quality to be as comprehensive as we would like. We hope that the Staffordshire authorities will be able to provide an adequate response to these points. We note however that the timetable includes the possibility of an issue specific hearing about air quality in the week commencing 3<sup>rd</sup> June should the EA require further information.

Neville Ball  
Planning Policy Team  
Economy & Environment  
Walsall Council  
Civic Centre  
Darwall Street  
Walsall  
WS1 1DG  
Telephone (01922) 658025  
e-mail: [Neville.Ball@walsall.gov.uk](mailto:Neville.Ball@walsall.gov.uk)

"The information in this message should be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless explicitly stated. If you have received this message in error it must be deleted and the sender notified. The views expressed in this message are personal and not necessarily those of Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council unless explicitly stated. Please be aware that e-mails sent to or received from Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council may be intercepted and read by the Council, and may be provided to third parties under the Freedom of Information Act. Interception will only occur to ensure compliance with Council policies or procedures or regulatory obligations, to prevent or deter crime, or for the purposes of essential maintenance or support of the e-mail system".

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

**Application by Four Ashes Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the West Midlands Interchange**

Your Ref: TR050005

Response to The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council (CWC) and Walsall Council (WC) (respondent reference 20015794)

Submitted : 5 April 2019

The responses below are based on the table produced by the EA. Only questions that seek a response from the local authorities have been listed. "No response" means that CWC and WC have no comments to make about the question.

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
<b>1.0</b>	<b>General and Cross-topic Questions</b>	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No questions in this section require a response from CWC or WC.	
<b>1.1.</b>	<b>Policy Context</b>	
1.1.1	The Applicant, Local Authorities and other IPs who have commented on policy matters.	<p>The National Networks National Policy Statement (NPS) provides the primary policy basis for decision making on applications for development consent for national network NSIPs and paragraph 5 of the NPPF states that it does not contain specific policies for NSIPs. The references to the NPPF in Planning Statement are to the revised (July 2018) version of that document but those in the ES and many of its appendices are to the 2012 version. Both have now been superseded and replaced by the NPPF issued in February 2019.</p> <p>In relation to matters covered in the ES are there any specific new or significantly amended policies in the 2019 NPPF which are of particular importance to the examination of the application and the decision by the SoS as to whether development consent should be granted?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.1.4	The Applicant and local authorities	The Planning Statement asserts that the need for a SRFI in South Staffordshire has been established in public policy for many years and refers

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>to the Site having been promoted in the West Midlands (WM) Regional Spatial Strategy process up until the time that such strategies were revoked in 2013.</p> <p>(i) Where in any currently adopted regional and sub-regional policy document is the need identified for a SRFI in what the Applicant refers to as the North West Quadrant of the WM Region?</p> <p>(ii) What policy support is there for the location of a facility of the type and scale proposed in this part of South Staffordshire?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>With the abolition of the RSS there is no longer an adopted regional policy document expressing a need for a SFRI (SFRI and RLS synonymous).</p> <p>Support is retained sub-regionally in the adopted Black Country Core Strategy and locally in the South Staffordshire Core Strategy. Both documents, however, were prepared to be in general conformity with the RSS. Whilst the strategic policy framework has been removed, it is relevant to give weight to the evidence which underpinned it unless more up to date material is available.</p> <p>The adopted Black Country Core Strategy (2011) (para 2.18), recognises the need for a RLS in southern Staffordshire and that this requirement is difficult to accommodate within the Black Country due to its tightly knit urban form and lack of suitably large sites. The lack of sites within the Black Country remains.</p> <p>The Black Country Core Strategy Issues and Options Report (2017) is the first formal stage in the preparation of the review of the existing Core Strategy. An Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) has been prepared to support the review. This considers a range of growth scenarios with the preferred scenario requiring a need for up to 800ha of additional employment land for the period to 2036. Para 8.6 of the EDNA explains that occupier enquiries are dominated by logistics and manufacturing, with B8 requirements forecast to make up around 70% of the overall land requirement. Existing Black Country</p>	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	land supply is some 263ha resulting in a 'gap' of 537ha. Para 8.5 of the EDNA identifies WMI as having the potential to contribute to meeting the needs / jobs for the Black Country.	We note that the South Staffordshire Site Allocations Document (SAD) states at para 9.33 'It is recognised that the issue of an RLS/SRFI remains outstanding. However, it is also recognised that an RLS would require a scale of development beyond a 'modest extension' and therefore seeking to resolve this issue in the SAD would be contrary to the adopted Core Strategy, and therefore will be considered in the Local Plan Review'.
<b>1.2.</b>	<b>Need for the Proposed Development and Alternative Options</b> <i>Paragraph references are to the Planning Statement [APP-252] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.2.1.	The Applicant, NR and local authorities	<p><b>Need in the North West Quadrant of the WM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.18 states that the Proposed Development is included in the list of sites on which the forecasts in the Long-Term Planning: Freight Market Study (October 2013) (as summarised in NPS Table 3) are based.</p> <p>Is this correct and, if so, what if any bearing does its inclusion in that list have regarding the demonstration of a clear need for: (i) a SRFI in the North West Quadrant of the WM Region, and (ii) the suitability of the Four Ashes Location to meet any identified need?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.2.2.	The Applicant, NR and local authorities	<p>Paragraph 5.1.11 refers to the Strategic Rail Authority's Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy (March 2004).</p> <p>(i) Given the subsequent designation of the NPS what is the current status of that policy?</p> <p>(ii) Given the date of the document, what if any weight can now be put on its findings as to the need for SRFI capacity in the West Midlands (WM)?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		(iii) Have any significant SRFI facilities been opened or approved since the publication of that report that would help to meet the need identified in the Policy?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.2.3.	The Applicant and local authorities	Reference is made to the Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).  Is the need for a SRFI in South Staffordshire and for a warehousing/logistics development of the type and scale proposed identified in any strategy or programme approved and adopted by the LEP?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.2.4	The Applicant and local authorities	An assertion is made in the RRs that the Black Country and Southern Staffordshire Regional Logistics Study (which the ExA understands to be the URS Study (2013) referred to in the Planning Statement) found that there was no need for a SRFI in South Staffordshire and recommended that possible locations over a wider area should be considered.  The parties are requested to comment and respond to this assertion.
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	The URS study said that:  'A key finding of the study is therefore that RLS development does not need to be located in southern Staffordshire because it is a regional facility serving a regional catchment.'  It elaborates on this by stating that 'considering southern Staffordshire in isolation fails to appreciate what part other areas in the West Midlands including north Staffordshire could play in meeting need'.	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>It goes on to suggest that assessment of need and supply should be on a West Midlands Regional basis and probably cross Midlands incorporating the East Midlands too.</p> <p>It is incorrect to interpret the study as concluding that there is no need in southern Staffordshire when what it is actually saying is that there may be alternative ways of meeting this need. It does not preclude the need being met in southern Staffordshire. Indeed, elsewhere the study cites myriad benefits that such a proposal would offer.</p> <p>Attention is also drawn to the fact that this study has not been tested under examination conditions. Whilst the RSS Phase 2 Revision was never adopted, the policy and accompanying evidence were independently examined and the Panel Report (para 5.29) concluded that:</p> <p>“Priority attention must therefore be directed to securing provision to the north of the conurbation to serve the Black Country and southern Staffordshire as it is that area that is identified in the Preferred Option as in most urgent need.”</p> <p>Given the scale and nature of RLS facilities, the RSS evidence base sought to delve deeper and be more location specific. In doing so it identified the four best RLS Sub-regions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Burton, Lichfield and Sutton Coldfield</li><li>• North Black Country / South Staffordshire (subsequently amended to southern Staffordshire)</li><li>• Tamworth and Atherstone</li><li>• Nuneaton Rugby and Coventry</li></ul> <p>The study drilled down further and identified potential areas within the sub-regions. In relation to the Black Country and south (ern) Staffordshire it recommended:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Wolverhampton to Penkrige corridor – The area to the north of Wolverhampton covering the Wolverhampton to Stafford railway line corridor between Wolverhampton and Penkrige (W10 loading gauge) an are served by the M6, M54 and M6 Toll.</p> <p>Para 13.3.11 confirms the need for a RLS facility that can serve the Black Country and southern Staffordshire, and para 13.3.13 states that southern Staffordshire is an attractive proposition to RLS developers and occupiers, assuming that a viable site could not be found in the Black Country. We confirm that at the time of the preparation of the URS Report, and in the period since then, no alternative sites have become available within the administrative area of the Black Country that could meet this need.</p> <p>Therefore, the URS Report did not discount the need for a RLS to be located in South Staffordshire, and advised that it is a location considered to be attractive to the market. We do accept that the Report advised that the area of search be broadened for the purposes of the Stage 2 Study on the grounds that the need at the time was not necessarily restricted to south Staffordshire.</p> <p>With the abolition of the RSS, it is clear that there is a policy vacuum at regional level as such recourse needs to be made to the National Networks Policy Statement. Paragraph 2.45 states that:</p> <p>This requires the logistics industry to develop new facilities that need to be located alongside the major rail routes, close to major trunk roads as well as near to the conurbations that consume the goods. In addition, the nature of that commercial development is such that some degree of flexibility is needed when schemes are being developed, in order to allow the development to respond to market requirements as they arise.</p> <p>The NPS was published in December 2014 and is therefore more up to date than the 2012 URS study. The guidance also requires facilities to be close to the strategic road and rail network and crucially to be near to the conurbations that consume the goods. This is inconsistent with the URS study conclusions, which suggests more remote facilities may be suitable.</p>
1.2.5	The Applicant and local authorities	Paragraph 5.2.27 indicates that the URS Study concluded that the requirement for " <i>at least 200-250ha</i> " of land to be used for Regional Logistics Sites (RLS) in the sub-region still held good (at 2013).



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Is this a realistic assessment of the <u>current</u> scale of the unmet need for RLS in the sub-region as a whole?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>There is no additional evidence to dispute this. A lower figure of 150 hectares was tested through the RSS2 examination and the Panel Report recommended it be increased to 200 -250 ha. The West Midlands Interchange proposal is 297ha so meets these criteria.</p> <p>The 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Sites Study is the only region-wide assessment of overall employment land need and supply (but not specifically RLS/SRFI requirements) completed since 2013. This Report identifies southern Staffordshire and the Black Country as one of three areas of highest market demand across the West Midlands, and finds that longer term supply is 'both small and risky' (para 6.6). The Report recommends the preparation of a Stage 2 Study to identify potential opportunities to accommodate future needs. This work has now commenced in the form of the 2019 West Midlands Strategic Employment Sites Study – commissioned by the Black Country LEP, Birmingham-Solihull LEP, Coventry-Warwickshire LEP and Staffordshire County Council. The Study is being prepared by Avison Young / Arcadis and is programmed to report in the Summer of 2019.</p>	
1.2.6	The Applicant and local authorities	(i) If the unmet need for RLS in the sub-region as a whole is for some 200-250ha of land what evidence is there as to what proportion of this need should be met in South Staffordshire district?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>No work has been done to apportion the requirement between Black Country and southern Staffordshire Local Authorities. If the requirement were to be apportioned then it would no longer meet the National Networks criteria / RLS minimum size requirements and agglomeration benefits would be lost. Furthermore, it is established that need cannot be met where it arises. The Black Country does not have sites capable of meeting the required specification.</p> <p>The work on the Black Country Core Strategy review as outlined in question 1.1.4 identifies a need for some 560ha of land for all B8 uses for the period to 2026. While this need is not specific to a RLS 'format' the Black Country EDNA identifies WMI as having the potential to make a significant contribution towards meeting this need.</p>	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.2.6	The Applicant and local authorities	(ii) What contribution, if any, would the proposed strategic employment site being promoted by Nurton Developments (Hilton Park) Limited on land near to Junction 11 of the M6 (see RR-0991) to meeting South Staffordshire's appropriate share of any identified need?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	The Hilton Park site could play a role in meeting the Black Country employment land needs as set out above. However, we note that this site is not rail served and so would not have the characteristics of SRFI / RLS.	
1.2.6	The Applicant and local authorities	(iii) Have any other strategic site/RLS opportunities been identified that might contribute to meeting that need?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>The most recent study commissioned by local authorities was the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Sites Study. This examined the demand for and supply of strategic sites as designated in the RSS. It did not distinguish between B2 and B8 end users but focussed on the size, quality, location and availability of land. With regard to the Black Country and South Staffordshire, it concluded that:</p> <p>'The Black Country and South Staffordshire has the smallest total years supply, at 9.1 years. Not only is potential supply very small at just 1.6 years, but all of that potential supply is at one site, Phoenix 10 (IMI) [in Walsall], which has serious issues with infrastructure and access.'</p>	
1.2.8	The Applicant, NR and local authorities	<p><b>Alternative Sites Assessment [APP-255]</b></p> <p>(i) Although there appears to have been some engagement at consultation stage, what consultation or engagement was carried out with relevant bodies and authorities when setting out the methodology and area of search adopted in the Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA)?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We confirm the contents of the Planning Statement para 5.5.36 in terms of engagement with local authorities. While our response to the Stage 2 consultation did not specifically refer to the availability of alternative sites, we did engage in discussions with the applicant to inform the Alternative Sites Assessment.	
1.2.8	The Applicant, NR and local authorities	(ii) Was consultation carried out in respect of sites included in the long list of potential sites and the subsequent filtering of this list to produce the short list of sites at paragraph 8.4.1 of the ASA?

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We confirm the findings of the ASA in terms of there being no suitable alternative sites within the administrative area of the Black Country.	
1.2.8		(iii) To what extent are the findings of the ASA agreed by the local authorities within the sub-region, particularly in relation to those included in the short list of sites considered?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	See above	
1.2.9	Local authorities and NR	Are there any potential sites which might meet the need for a SRFI in the North West Quadrant of the WM Region which have not been considered in the ASA?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	See above	
1.2.11	The Applicant, NR and Local Authorities	Paragraph 5.5.31 states that, to achieve a suitably sized site at Dunston through CA, would require it to be demonstrated that there are no alternative sites available but, unlike the Four Ashes Site, the potential site at Dunston does not include Green Belt land.  Has sufficient work been undertaken in the ASA to rule out the potential Dunston site as a suitable alternative for a SRFI development?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.2.27	The Applicant and local authorities	Could and should the commitment to the building and making available for use of the Rail Terminal be dealt with as a Requirement within Schedule 2 of the DCO rather than by means of the DCOB?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
<b>1.3.</b>	<b>Green Belt</b>	
1.3.3	SSDC and other local authorities	Can the Councils please set out their views as to what specific role(s) they consider that the Green Belt in the vicinity of the application site performs having regard to the guidance at paragraph 134 of the NPPF?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No response.	
1.3.4	The Applicant, SSDC and other local authorities	The parties are invited to comment on statements made in some of the RRs that the Green Belt in the vicinity of the site: (i) forms an important buffer between the historic settlements of Penkridge and Cannock; (ii) forms an important buffer between Wolverhampton and the nearby villages and between the villages themselves; and (iii) forms a 'lung' for the urban area of Wolverhampton and is important to the health and wellbeing of Wolverhampton's communities and other local communities.
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	The site is located some 6km to the north of Wolverhampton and there are extensive tracts of open countryside surrounding the site and between it and the northern boundary of the City. The site does not provide a formal recreational role available to residents of the City and so its importance to the health and well-being of residents must be limited.	
<b>1.4.</b>	<b>Employment and Socio-Economic and Human Health</b> <i>All paragraph, figure and table references are to ES Chapter 14 [APP-052] unless specified</i>	
1.4.6	The Applicant and local authorities	Paragraph 14.53 states that the Travel To Work Area (TTWA) was defined by use of a Gravity Model and has been agreed with HE.  Was the extent of the TTWA also discussed with the local authorities and/ or LEPs and to what extent is this agreed to represent a realistic assessment of where employees are likely to travel from in order to access the job opportunities that would be generated by the proposed WMI?

<b>ExQ1</b>		<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We confirm that we engaged with FAL on the travel to work plan, highlighting and discussing a realistic geography where potential employees could travel from. It is our intention that a high proportion of employment from the site can be secured from within the Black Country. To maximise this opportunity means that our residents need to have the skills and training to access the job, hence the ask for funds to ensure there is a mechanism in place to enable this to happen.		
1.4.17	The Applicant, local authorities and other IPs	Chapter 14 appears not to consider the possibility of any adverse effect on the revenue generated by existing businesses (including, for example, tourist and leisure-based businesses) as a result of the Proposed Development although such concerns are raised in many of the RRs.  Can the Applicant set out its views as to: (i) whether or not such adverse effects are likely in either the construction or operational phases of development and, if so, what the scale and significance of such effects might be? (ii) whether such effects might potentially result in the displacement of any local businesses or loss of employment in such businesses?	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	The potential impact on existing businesses on or adjacent to the site is not a matter that it would be appropriate for CWC or WC wish to comment on.		
1.4.18	The Applicant and local authorities	Figure 14.5 indicates that less than 500 of the direct jobs expected to be created by the Proposed Development would be in the sales and customer services category and that the large majority of direct jobs would be in operations. This would suggest that most jobs created would not be in the sales and service category in which most of those currently seeking work in the Study Area are looking for employment (paragraph 14.278).  (i) How does this data relate to the assertion in paragraph 14.268 that half of the jobs created would be in sales and customer services?	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) What, if any, strategies and mechanisms does the Applicant propose to adopt to target unemployed people with background and experience in the main sectors that match the majority of the newly created positions?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	The Employment and Skills (E&S) Plan for FAL is based on the City of Wolverhampton Council Wolves@work model. It is a highly regarded, innovative demand led model that partners with DWP and their clients. The resources to extend this model will be secured through the E&S. This will bring mean there is capacity to connect opportunities with a number of priority groups including the unemployed.	
1.4.19	The Applicant and local authorities	<p>Chapter 14 paragraphs 14.43 and 14.44 state that "<i>The ability of the proposals to support national and local economic growth regeneration, particularly in the most disadvantaged areas</i>" is scoped out of Chapter 14 and included within [APP-245] Statement 7.1B: Statement of Economic Benefits.</p> <p>Considering that ES Chapter 14 does not appear to identify any significant effects in areas of economic disadvantage and Document 7.1B makes no reference to such areas, how would the Proposed Development provide meaningful support to economic growth and regeneration in the most disadvantaged areas within the sub-region?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We are aware that the Black Country has a number of significantly deprived areas, some falling within the UKs 10% most deprived. For the proposal to be of benefit to the communities of the Black Country, it is critical that jobs opportunities are linked to the needs of our residents. The Wolves@work model ensures that both geographical areas of deprivation and target groups can be prioritised.	
1.4.21	The Applicant and local authorities	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Paragraph 14.281 states that Applicant will submit an Employment Skills and Training Plan. For this to be effective in respect of construction employment and training it would need to be submitted and approved some time in advance of the commencement of development.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>(i) When is the proposed Employment, Skills and Training Plan Framework to be submitted and who will be responsible for approving the document?</p> <p>(ii) How is this to be secured in the dDCO or DCOB?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>CWC is already working with the applicant, South Staffordshire District Council, Staffordshire County Council to develop an Employment, Skills and Training Plan Framework, the latest draft is well advanced.</p> <p>CWC look forward to seeing a finalised Draft Development Consent Obligation which includes an Employment, Skills and Training Plan Framework (at Schedule 11), It is our understanding that this would be secured under the DCOB, which would be an appropriate legal mechanism to secure this Framework.</p>	
1.4.22	The Applicant and local authorities	<p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p>(i) What measures, if any, are proposed for monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the Employment, Skills and Training Plans in securing employment and training opportunities for unemployed people, school leavers and people in other target groups?</p> <p>(ii) How would the output of any monitoring undertaken be used to influence future recruitment and training initiatives?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>The benefit and value of the Wolves@work model is that it is a partnership with DWP that comes with a clear monitoring framework that means we can track outputs and outcomes both for people and businesses. The model also gathers intelligence about workforce skills and has been successfully engaging with training providers to influence the provision, so that it meets the future needs of the employer.</p>	
1.5.	<p><b>Agriculture and Soils</b>  <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 6 (APP-026) unless otherwise specified</i></p>	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	<p>No questions in this section require a response from CWC or WC</p>	

<b>ExQ1</b>		<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>1.6.</b>	<b>Ground Conditions</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 11 (APP-031) unless otherwise specified</i>		
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No questions in this section require a response from CWC or WC		
<b>1.7.</b>	<b>Transport and Traffic</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to the Transport Assessment (ES Technical Appendix 15.1) (APP-114) unless otherwise specified</i>		
1.7.8	The Applicant, HE and local authorities	(i) Are the M54/ M6/M6 Toll Link Saturn and South Staffordshire VISSIM models subject to any limitations or notes of caution that may materially affect the outcome of the TA?	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	Not for CWC / WC		
1.7.8	The Applicant, HE and local authorities	(ii) As these models are used to inform both the TA and the AQ assessment, please clarify what committed development schemes been taken into account in the TA either in the base Models or in subsequent adjustments made as part of the assessment?	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	Not for CWC / WC		
1.7.8	The Applicant, HE and local authorities	(iii) Are the key relevant consultees satisfied that all significant development commitments have been taken into account?	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	Yes. The planned development will impact directly on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) (motorways and trunk roads, in this case primarily the M6 and A5), which are managed by Highways England. That organisation will of course be making its own representations.  M6 Junction 10 will be improved by WC and Highways England (starting on-site in 2020) and the traffic modelling that supports that scheme has taken account of committed and planned development in the future (as coded into the West Midlands strategic		



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>traffic model). The improvement scheme can cope with all traffic (current; background growth; and development-generated) up to 15 years after the scheme opening date of 2022.</p> <p>CWC do not have specific highway capacity issues as the majority of freight movements are either via Highways England roads (M6 and A5), or is local freight distribution traffic that would be coming from/going to the Black Country via other means (local authority roads) anyway.</p> <p>A key transport concern is about ensuring good public transport access from key Black Country local and strategic centres to the site for workers/potential workers. Securing a S106 contribution for Wolverhampton and Staffs CC to support good bus connectivity on the WMI – i54 – Wolverhampton city centre corridor is essential. Other demand-responsive transport services should also be considered, including to communities in the north of Walsall e.g. Brownhills and Bloxwich.</p> <p>As the development is in South Staffordshire, both the local planning authority (South Staffordshire Council) and transport authority (Staffordshire County Council) will obviously be making their own representations too.</p>
1.7.13	The Applicant, Local Authorities, Parish Councils and other IPs	<p><b>Assessment of Effects and Mitigation</b></p> <p>The Applicant's findings and conclusions about the likelihood of development generated traffic using minor roads (including routes through nearby local villages and communities) as an alternative to the signed routes are set out in Section 9.11.</p> <p>(i) Are these accepted by the local authorities, Parish Councils and other IPs?</p> <p>(ii) If they are not accepted, what specific aspects are disputed and what are the reasons for taking a different view on these potential effects?</p>
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	Assumed routeing relevant to CWC and WC is accepted	
1.8.	<p><b>Air Quality and AQMA</b></p> <p><i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 7 [APP-027] unless otherwise specified</i></p>	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.8.1	The Applicant, EA and local authorities	The parties will be aware that the UK government has been the subject of a significant level of judicial scrutiny over its implementation and compliance with the Air Quality Directive. Can the parties please: (i) set out their understanding of the current legal position on this question, having regard to the Client Earth litigation; (ii) explain how this might affect the assessment of the potential AQ impacts of the Proposed Development; (iii) state their opinion as to whether or not a DCO for the Proposed Development can be granted without leading to any infringement of EU or UK law; and (iv) clearly identify what they understand to be the current UK guidance and policy documents in relation to these potential impacts?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We assume the Staffordshire authorities will be able to provide a response to this question	
1.8.7	Local authorities	Table 7.15-7.18 and Figures 7.3a-7.5d, dealing with AQ effects of road traffic generated by the Proposed Development, shows only negligible to slight adverse impact in terms of NO <sub>2</sub> concentrations at the identified roadside receptors in all the assessment years.  (i) Are these findings accepted by the local authorities? (ii) As two of the receptor locations where a slight adverse impact is predicted are within a designated AQMA do the relevant local authorities accept the conclusion set out in paragraph 7.220 that a slight adverse impact in these locations is not considered to be significant?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We understand that the Staffordshire authorities have some concerns about the air quality modelling carried out by the applicants. However, we are not currently in a position to provide technical comments about this. It	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>will be for the relevant authorities, which may include Highways England in respect of the motorway and trunk road network, and DeFRA, to comment about this issue.</p> <p>It should be noted that the reconstruction of M6 junction 10 will have an effect on the accuracy of the model over the next few years.</p>
1.8.9	The Applicant and local authorities	In terms of its potential effect on the designated AQOMAs identified in paragraphs 7.34-7.40 does the Proposed Development satisfy the guidance and requirements set out in NPS paragraphs 5.11-5.13?
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	We are not currently in a position to provide further technical comments about this	
1.9.	<b>Noise, Vibration and Lighting</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 13 [APP-046] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.10.	<b>Ecology and Nature Conservation</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 10 [APP-030] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.11.	<b>Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 9 [APP-029] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.12.	<b>Landscape and Visual Effects</b> <i>All paragraph and table references are to ES Chapter 12 [APP-032] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.13.	<b>Drainage and Flood Risk</b> <i>All paragraph and figure references are to ES Chapter 16 [APP-055] unless otherwise specified.</i>	
1.14.	<b>Recreational and Leisure Activity</b> <i>All References are to ES Chapter 14 [APP-052] unless otherwise specified</i>	
1.15.	<b>Compulsory Acquisition</b> <i>References to Land Parcels are abbreviated to LP</i>	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>1.16.</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order</b>	
<b>CWC/WC Response</b>	No questions in these sections require a response from CWC or WC.	