

# Addendum to the Statement of Common Ground

The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

FAL and Staffordshire County Council: 05 July 2019

Four Ashes Limited

**ADDENDUM TO THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

**for**

**WEST MIDLANDS INTERCHANGE**

**between**

**STAFFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**and**

**FOUR ASHES LIMITED**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. This Addendum has been prepared to set out further areas where common ground has been reached since the original Statement of Common Ground ('the original SoCG') between Four Ashes Limited's ('the Applicant') and Staffordshire County Council ('SCC') (signed 28 March 2019 and submitted at Deadline 2)[Document 8.4/RP2-007].
- 1.2. Any matters which were not yet agreed at Deadline 2 were set out at the end of each relevant section of the original SoCG and, as explained in the Introduction of the original SoCG, SCC and the Applicant continued to work together with the intention of updating the position in future iterations of the SoCG.
- 1.3. This Addendum covers the following topics:
  1. Transport
  2. Ecology
  3. Landscape
  4. Minerals and Waste
  5. Flood Risk and Drainage
  6. Archaeology
- 1.4. All matters were informed by the submission of SCC's Written Representations at Deadline 2; further discussions between the Applicant and SCC; and subsequent amendments to the dDCO and relevant control documents and drawings.

## **2. TRANSPORT**

- 2.1. The method of approving and controlling the form of the bridge structure that spans the West Coast Mainline and the Canal and mechanism for agreeing and securing future maintenance are agreed.
- 2.2. There is common ground on the phasing of the highways infrastructure (as controlled by draft Requirement 24).

## **3. ECOLOGY**

- 3.1. Following amendments to the draft Requirements and the Framework Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan ('FEMMP') (both submitted along with this Statement at Deadline 5) the following matters are now agreed.
- 3.2. The updated FEMMP is acceptable and the proposed Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMPs) for each phase of development comprises an appropriate mechanism for securing ecological enhancement and mitigation.
- 3.3. The method of approving and controlling the provision and location of vehicle access points across conserved hedgerows in Development Zones A7 is acceptable (paragraph 3.3.4 of the updated FEMMP).
- 3.4. The phasing and timing of the proposed ecological mitigation (as controlled by draft Requirements 11 and 17) is acceptable.

- 3.5. There have been further discussions on the matter of 'net gain' the outcome of which is the Applicant has agreed to make a financial contribution towards works to improve off-site local wildlife sites. The details of this contribution are included in the latest version of the s.106 Agreement and are agreed in principle. Based on this contribution, and taking account of the ecological mitigation measures proposed in the FEMMP (which comprise proposed on-site ecological enhancement and off-site farmland bird mitigation), the package of ecological mitigation measures are acceptable.

#### **4. LANDSCAPE**

- 4.1. Following amendments to the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan [Document 2.7], the relationship of finished floor levels, existing ground level and bund heights relative to surrounding receptors is clear and acceptable.
- 4.2. Following amendments to the draft Requirements, it is agreed that the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [Document 7.5/APP-259] provides adequate coverage for decision making post consent.
- 4.3. The phasing and timing of the proposed landscape mitigation (as controlled by draft Requirement 17) is acceptable.
- 4.4. The Lighting Assessment's approach to addressing the impact on landscape is acceptable and, following the amendments to draft Requirement 19, the mechanism of controlling future lighting design is agreed.

#### **5. MINERALS AND WASTE**

- 5.1. It is common ground that the submitted Mineral Resource Statement [Document 14.2; REP4-011] provides an accurate and fair assessment of the existence, quantity, quality and value of the underlying mineral resource at the WMI Site.

#### **6. FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE**

- 6.1. Following amendments to draft Requirement 15 (h), the process for maintaining the SUDS is secured and agreed.

#### **7. ARCHAEOLOGY**

- 7.1. Based on the archaeological evaluation undertaken (ES Chapter 8 and ES Technical Appendices 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4) SCC and FAL agree that the presence of an archaeological asset of major significance is a low possibility. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (ES Technical Appendix 8.5), which has been agreed with SCC, describes mitigation measures which include preservation by record. This approach is consistent with primary planning policy for the site, including paragraph 5.142 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks. However, in the unlikely event that an archaeological asset of major significance is identified, and if possible within the development proposals, an option to mitigate by preservation in-situ will be considered (for example within areas of green infrastructure).