

M42 Junction 6 Improvement TR010027

5.2 Annex P: Responses to Consultation and Demonstration of Regard Had to Responses

Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

M42 Junction 6 Improvement

Development Consent Order 202 []

5.2 Annex P: Responses to Consultation and Demonstration of Regard Had to Responses

| | |
|---|---|
| Regulation Number | Regulation 5(2)(q) |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010027 |
| Application Document Reference | 5.2 Consultation Report Annex P |
| Author | M42 Junction 6 Improvement, Project Team, Highways England |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Rev 1 | January 2019 | DCO Application |

Annex P (Part 1): Tables evidencing regard had to consultation responses (in accordance with s49 of the Planning Act 2008)

The tables below provide evidence of Highways England's regard to responses to the statutory consultation in accordance with s49 of the PA 2008. Each table summarises responses received, sets out whether a change has been made in response to it, and details Highways England's response and regard had to the consultation response. It should be noted that where multiple responses containing the same comment have been received, these are addressed at the same time in tables below. A separate table is included for each individual strand of statutory consultation (s42(a)*, s42(b), s42(d) and s47 and s48) as presented below).

*Note that all local authority s42(a) Schedule 1 Prescribed Consultees are contained in the s42(b) consultee table.

| Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees Consultation - 9 January 2018 to 9 March 2018 | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses: | | Prescribed Consultee(s): | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response): |
| General issues | | | | |
| General | <i>The proposed development site is located outside the defined coalfield.</i> | <i>The Coal Authority</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| General | <i>The Crown Estate is not affected by the proposed works.</i> | <i>The Crown Estate</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| General | <i>The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) has no comment on the proposals.</i> | <i>The Office of Rail and Road</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| General | <i>Pleased to see that the consultation material refers to motorists, residents and local businesses rather than them being wrapped up together.</i> | Transport Focus | N | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| General | <i>We have no issues with the scheme and we express our support for the scheme.</i> | Transport for West Midlands | N | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| General | <i>Updated correspondence email. With regard to the proposals in question it is noted that the application to upgrade the junction is "preparing capacity for the new HS2 station." Accordingly internal liaison with colleagues in the relevant sector construction, traffic and engineering teams has taken place and following that process I can confirm that HS2 Ltd has no specific comments or concerns to make at this time. In light of the interface between the respective projects it would also clearly be advisable to follow ongoing progress of the HS2 programme as it moves towards the construction phase at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/high-speed-two-limited</i> | HS2 | N | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to closely liaise with HS2 through ongoing regular coordination meetings. This engagement is supported by Highways England's HS2 Liaison Group which works closely with HS2 to ensure the region's programme of works are coordinated.</i> |
| General | <i>While there is nothing in the preferred option being proposed that would be subject to any formal comment at this stage I would remind you that a scheme of this nature is likely to cause considerable disruption to the local area and so liaison with Warwickshire County Council in their capacity as highway authority and the Police are vital to ensure that this disruption is kept to an acceptable level.</i> | Warwickshire & West Mercia Police | N | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to work with SMBC, Warwickshire County Council and the emergency services.</i> |

| Assets and Wayleaves | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|----------|---|
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>High or Intermediate pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment and Low or Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment have been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works (Issued by Fisher German LLP on behalf of Cadent). Cadent will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus.</i> | <i>National Grid (Cadent Gas Limited)</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Meetings were held with Cadent diversion team to discuss scheme details, asset diversions and programme. C3 information has been provided. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing. Draft text has been provided for comment. Work plans have indicated proposed diversion and protection works -however these are subject to detailed design studies. Limits of deviation have been provided to allow flexibility for Cadent to optimise diversion routes.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Some assets are expected to be affected. Our assets are leased off Zayo – it will be Zayo's responsibility to move these (if required) and manage this work.</i> | <i>Interoute Vitesse</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Interoute Vitesse lease their assets from Zayo and all communication for diversions and protected provisions are being negotiated with Zayo. The impact on the assets will be determined via ongoing dialogue with Zayo.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Zayo have a primary duct route between Copt Heath and Bickenhill which will need to be re-routed as a result of your proposed works. A significant amount of duct laying (approx. 1800m) will be required, followed by full span cable renewals & recoveries for two fibre cables. In accordance with NRSWA, we have enclosed one copy of our records showing the approximate locations of Zayo apparatus, together with details of our proposed necessary alterations and budget estimate. Please be aware if these works are to proceed they will involve installation of new fibre cable which in turn will require network outages. The Zayo outage date is approximately</i> | <i>Zayo</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The impact on the assets will be determined via ongoing dialogue. Zayo have agreed that the proposed draft protected provisions are adequate.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|----------|---|
| | <i>6 months from the date of completion of the civils and fibre installation and therefore we advise you to start Zayo work ASAP (preferably before other utility companies).</i> | | | |
| <i>Assets and Wayleaves</i> | <i>Confirm that Vodafone Limited does own underground apparatus within the area of your proposed works, but due to the nature and location of your works this apparatus should not be affected. However, should the need arise to alter the design of your proposed works; it is imperative that you make contact to discuss the implications and any increased risk to the integrity of the Vodafone duct(s) and fibre-optic cable(s).</i> | <i>Vodafone Ltd</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Following review of the information provided it was established that the Vodafone assets are all within Network Rail's corridor and are therefore not impacted by the Scheme.</i> |
| <i>Assets and Wayleaves</i> | <i>Virgin Media and Viatel plant should not be affected by your proposed work and no strategic additions to our existing network are envisaged in the immediate future.</i> | <i>Virgin Media</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>Safety advice relating to statutory undertaker assets</i> | <i>The extent of the scheme will pass over and in part run parallel with Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s) – 3 are listed. There are currently no Major Hazard Installations in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.</i> | <i>Health and Safety Executive</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England continues to liaise with Cadent Gas who is the owners/operators of these gas mains.</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--------------|---|---|
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Severn Trent acknowledged receipt of the C3 service diversion estimate request and enclosed a copy of their records showing existing mains and the area affected by the proposed works plus a preliminary outline specification and cost estimate. Note the estimate and programme have been produced without the benefit of detailed site information such as, detailed design, site investigation works, service information or topographical surveys. These will be carried out as part of the technical feasibility and detailed design and, therefore, the estimated cost and programme detailed in the C3 may change and possibly increase. Happy to enter into discussions for the purpose of considering the scheme and any modifications which might assist in facilitating the programme of the works and/or reducing the cost of the diversionary works. These discussions should also help to determine if a C4 estimate is required.</i> | Severn Trent | N | <i>No response received during the statutory consultation but Highways England had previously engaged with Severn Trent prior to this and a number of meetings have been held to discuss impacts to their assets and required diversion and/or protection works. Highways England are awaiting the results of the C4 detailed design estimate. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing. Draft text has been provided for comment. Due to the level of uncertainty the limits of deviation have been increased to provide Severn Trent the flexibility to optimise the diversions.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>We can confirm that all of the Level 3 apparatus within your works area is along the rail network and as such should not be affected by your works.</i> | Instalcom | N | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation).</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Need to understand scheme requirements and what technology will be altered on the strategic road network.</i> | Genesys | N | <i>Meeting held in January 2018 to explain the Scheme and help Highways England understand Genesys' requirements. Highways England will continue to engage with Genesys.</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>It would appear from your proposals that alterations to our existing Openreach apparatus may be necessary. Details of assets and preliminary assessment of diversionary works necessary provided.</i> | BT (Openreach) | N | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation). Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing - draft text has been provided for comment.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>LV asset team requested meeting to discuss diversion and protection works.</i> | Western Power Distribution (LV) | N | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation). A meeting was held January 2018 to discuss the proposals and a C3 budget estimate was received during the consultation period. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing. Draft text has been provided for comment.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Confirmed receipt of C3 budget estimate request. Western Power requested details of their assets likely to be affected and confirmation of whether diversions are to remain overhead or be buried.</i> | Western Power Distribution (HV) | Y Table 15 Ref. 21 | <i>Dialogue commenced prior to statutory consultation. The C3 budget estimate was received April 2018. Highways England have met with Western Power Distribution (WPD) in conjunction with HS2 (also impacting WPD assets in the vicinity) to ensure that the works are coordinated. Due to the level of uncertainty the red line boundary was extended and limits of deviation have been increased to provide WPD the flexibility to optimise the diversions. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing - draft text has been provided for comment.</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------|--|
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>National Grid assets – electricity and gas - are within or in close proximity to the order limits however it would appear that none of National Grid's towers are directly affected. There are no high pressure gas transmission pipelines within or close proximity to the proposed order limits.</i> | <i>National Grid (Cadent-Electricity)</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Following meetings with National Grid (represented by Cadent Electricity) it was confirmed that none of their assets would be directly impacted by the Scheme. HV cables currently over-sail the scheme and the project team have had meetings with their overhead line engineers to agree a method of construction that does not impact their assets. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing. Draft text has been provided for comment.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>GTC no longer provide written responses – and instead ask applicants to refer to their online portal.</i> | <i>GTC Utility Construction Ltd.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation).</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Our gas infrastructure is unaffected by the proposed works.</i> | <i>Fulcrum Pipelines</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation).</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Our network does not extend into that land subject to the scheme.</i> | <i>Southern Gas Plc</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>Esso have apparatus near the proposed works. No objections to the proposals so long as the 'Special Requirements for Safe Working' booklet and the covenants contained in the Deed of Grant are adhered to.</i> | <i>Esso Petroleum Company Ltd</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Meetings have been held with Fisher German (Esso's agents) to discuss scheme details, potential asset diversions and Scheme programme. These meetings confirmed that no diversions are required, only protection works in discrete locations. Dialogue regarding wayleaves and proposed protected provisions is ongoing. Draft text has been provided for comment.</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------|--|
| <i>Assets and Wayleaves</i> | <i>Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the location on the plan provided. Search is based on Overseeing Organisation Agent data supplied.</i> | <i>Colt Technology Services</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. (Further consultation response now identifies Colt assets are impacted).</i> |
| <i>Assets and Wayleaves</i> | <i>Confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.</i> | <i>ESP Gas Group</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted (response received before start of statutory consultation response).</i> |

| Environment | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------|---|
| <i>Water environment</i> | <i>Following consideration of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) we have the following comments to make: The Grand Union Canal runs to the west of the site and as land owner/ operator of the canal the Trust would therefore wish to see any potential impacts on the canal and its users fully identified and addressed within the final Environmental Statement (ES). As you are aware the Trust have previously commented on the Scoping Opinion for the ES and are pleased to note that the PEIR includes additional references to the canal. The documents clarify that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will include user views from the Grand Union Canal. The canal will also be identified and considered as a sensitive receptor to noise / air quality with the assessments addressing potential impacts to the users of the canal both during construction and operation of the development. The applicant is advised that the trust is not a land drainage authority and any surface water discharge to the waterway will require prior consent from the trust.</i> | <i>Canal and River Trust</i> | <i>N</i> | <p><i>This is noted. The Canal and River Trust (CRT) were an early consultee during the scoping of the EIA and the scope was amended to reflect their comments.</i></p> <p><i>The Scheme's impacts are reported in the ES - Chapter 8 - Landscape; Chapter 6 – Air Quality; and Chapter 12 – Noise. A draft drainage strategy for the scheme has been developed and this does not require any surface water run-off to be fed into the canal.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------|----------|--|
| <i>Environment</i> | <i>No formal response received during the consultation period.</i> | <i>Environment Agency</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Although Environment Agency did not respond directly to the formal Statutory Consultation they have been involved in in ongoing dialogue with Highways England, starting with their response forming part of the EIA Scoping Opinion. Additional comments have been provided in response to the further consultation.</i> |
| <i>Environment</i> | <i>No formal response received during the consultation period.</i> | <i>Natural England</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Although Natural England did not respond directly to the formal Statutory Consultation they have been involved in in an ongoing dialogue starting with the scoping of the EIA pre-consultation. A meeting was held April 2018 to discuss EIA scoping and mitigation measures. Since then there have been a number of meetings around issues such as ancient woodland, drainage, hydrology and impact on the SSSI.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| Public health | <p>Public Health England (PHE) provided a response at the scoping stage to the Planning Inspectorate in October 2017 and recommend that this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence.</p> <p>PHE recommended that the developer consider including a chapter in the environmental statement (ES) on the impacts of the scheme to public health and also to include PM2.5 in the assessment of air quality impacts. PHE are reassured to see these have been acknowledged in the Section 42 Consultation and will be included as an integral part of the ES in the submission for the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>Note that EMF impacts have not been mentioned. It is possible that the scheme does not result in the movement or construction of any significant sources of EMF but would ask that this be confirmed or that the necessary assessments be included with the next submissions.</p> | Public Health England | N | <p>This is noted. Air quality assessment will be included in the EIA and reported in the ES, Chapter 6.</p> <p>Highways England model and assess PM10 levels, which is used instead of a PM2.5 assessment.</p> <p>EMF is not a relevant matter for a scheme of this nature.</p> |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|

Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees
Consultation - 9 January 2018 to 9 March 2018

| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | | Prescribed Consultee(s) | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| General issues | | | | |
| Construction programme length | Consider reducing the construction programme to less than three years. | SMBC | N | This is noted. The proposed construction phasing will allow Highways England to stagger construction and optimise the programme to minimise disruption. As Highways England develops the design, it will apply industry best practice and develop specific actions to mitigate the disruption that construction may cause. Highways England will carefully consider the needs of road users, residents during construction to ensure that access is maintained and disruption minimised. |
| Construction congestion | Concern over construction congestion, especially at Clock due to the scheme which interfaces at the same time at Birmingham International Station. Options to combine works should be explored. | SMBC | N | This is noted. Highways England and our construction partner will work collaboratively with stakeholders to understand their issues and coordinate construction activities to minimise impact. Construction impacts will be mitigated with a variety of measures including construction phasing. For example, initial plans are to build the mainline link road offline prior to impacting the A45 and M42. The Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [TR010027/APP/6.11] will identify practical measures to minimise impact on the local community. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|---|
| <i>Future responsibility for infrastructure</i> | <i>Discussion to determine the future responsibility of the strategic routes in this area would be welcomed as this scheme adds new bridges, signals, carriageway etc.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The new mainline link road will be a Trunk Road. The A45 and Clock Interchange and other local roads will remain part of SMBC's network. Revised trunking arrangements may be considered by Highways England in future RIS periods. Agreement of the responsibility and classification of the local road network will be concluded through discussions with SMBC.</i> |
| <i>M42 mainline</i> | <i>Welcome further discussion on improving the capacity of the M42 mainline from Junction 3a to Junction 7.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>M42 mainline improvements are outside the scope of the Scheme – this is noted as a potential future scheme in the Midlands Motorway Hub Study. Future RIS programmes may include studies to explore corridor improvements.</i> |
| Modelling | | | | |
| <i>Modelling</i> | <i>Modelling to-date does not seem to replicate current conditions, particularly at peak periods and does not seem to have been validated.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Models and associated modelling runs are compliant with DMRB/ WebTAG and have been signed off by Highways England's specialists. The traffic forecasts have been prepared using traffic models representing all significant roads and junctions in the area. The models have been calibrated and validated against DMRB/ WebTAG criteria to represent existing traffic count and journey time data in the morning, interpeak and evening peak hours. Future year forecasts were developed from the base model using standard forecasting methods and assumptions. However, recognising that SMBC were concerned that the junction will not cope with exceptional peaks due to events at NEC and Birmingham Airport, Highways England undertook further sensitivity tests and presented the findings in various</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>meetings – this facilitated agreement with SMBC of a scheme base case that realistically reflected the current conditions. This formed the basis for revised traffic forecasts into the future design year which confirmed the Scheme's compliance with DMRB capacity requirements.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with key stakeholders to further develop their traffic management plans to accommodate exceptional events with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>Further network resilience has been provided through retention of the M42 to A45 west bound slip road for emergency use – subject to safe operating protocols being developed during detailed design.</p> |
| Design | | | | |
| Exclusion of north-facing slips | The exclusion of north-facing slips at the new Junction 5A does not seem to cater for future growth. | SMBC | N | <p>This is noted. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north-facing slips at Junction 5A.</p> <p>Highways England continues to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. The possibility of north-facing slips has not been precluded by the design of the Scheme subject to wider improvements of the SRN in the area – such as widening of the M42 or use of All Lane Running.</p> |
| Gas governor | Consider moving gas governor on the A45 E during the preliminary design phase as this is a pinch point location. | SMBC | N | <p>This is noted. Moving or de-commissioning of the gas governor is included in the design and the relevant powers to implement this are being sought in the DCO. Discussions with Cadent Gas are ongoing.</p> |
| North-facing slips | Whilst we have received some reassurance that there will be further | Coventry and Warwickshire | N | <p>North-facing slips at Junction 5A are not included in the Scheme. During design development Highways England's</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|
| | <i>opportunities to improve this part of the SRN following the proposed improvements detailed in the consultation, it is not clear what this could specifically involve. North-facing slips at the new Junction 5A are not currently proposed. It has been confirmed by the Project Team that it would be difficult to do so to meet motorway design standards, presumably due to the proximity of Junction 6 and associated difficulties with traffic wishing to exit conflicting with traffic joining from Junction 5A.</i> | <i>Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP), Coventry City Council and Warwickshire County Council.</i> | | <i>traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north-facing slips at Junction 5A. In addition, the close proximity to Junction 6 precludes the inclusion of north-facing slips on safety grounds based on the required design standards. Highways England continues to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. The possibility of north-facing slips has not been precluded by the design of the Scheme subject to wider improvements of the SRN in the area – such as widening of the M42 or use of All Lane Running.</i> |
| <i>Free running lane to Clock</i> | <i>A free running lane should be considered onto the A45W at the Clock Interchange</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 12</i> | <i>As a consequence of consultation with SMBC a free flow link has been added to Clock Interchange from the mainline link road to the A45 westbound.</i> |
| <i>Signage</i> | <i>Would be useful to see signage and carriageway marking details of the approach to the proposed A45 Eastbound free running link on to the M42 North and traffic modelling. SMBC support variable signing to allow traffic to be switched to alternative routes for network resilience, details, discussion and responsibility for management need to be discussed with SMBC and the Combined Authority.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>At the time of the consultation the new signage strategy had not been developed fully. Highways England has had a number of meetings with SMBC to develop the draft signing strategy which has informed the DCO requirements. This will include static and variable components which will be subject to further discussion and agreement during detailed design.</i> |
| <i>Alternative NMM access</i> | <i>An alternative access from the National Motorcycle Museum (NMM)</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England carried out surveys and investigated this issue. The study identified that there was</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| | <i>would be beneficial as it would provide an alternative to the current exit on M42 Junction 6 where traffic can block the roundabout when traffic from major events leaves the NMM at the uncontrolled exit.</i> | | | no significant safety or capacity problems associated with the current access/egress arrangements for the NMM. The traffic modelling indicates that there are no capacity issues in the design year, supporting the conclusion that the existing arrangements will continue to be satisfactory. Following discussions with the NMM it was agreed not to include a new rear egress. |
| <i>Extra lanes on M42 J6 north slip road</i> | <i>Should you look at increasing the number of lanes available on the M42 J6 north slip road for Coventry bound traffic?</i> | SMBC | Y Table 15, Ref. 17 | <i>This is noted. The segregated lane from M42 northbound slip onto the A45W has been removed and the geometric design now been modified (i.e. increased) to four lanes at the stop line, this will help Coventry-bound traffic as two lanes will be signed to Coventry.</i> |
| Non-motorised Users (NMUs) | | | | |
| <i>NMU facilities</i> | <i>Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are currently constrained within this area by the presence of major road and rail infrastructure, which leads to community severance and encouraging car-based trips. We welcome therefore any proposals as part of the overall scheme which aims to improve this situation particularly through improved connectivity across the A45. The potential pedestrian/cycle bridge to the west of the Clock Interchange is therefore supported.</i> | <i>Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP), Coventry City Council and Warwickshire County Council.</i> | Y Table 15, Ref. 13 | <i>This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. This includes a range of measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45. The new NMU A45 over-bridge is now located to the east of Clock Interchange following consultation with SMBC and the residents of Bickenhill. This will provide connectivity between the north and south side of the A45 corridor and provide a safer pedestrian and cyclist crossing of the A45.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Lengthy local diversion</i> | <i>Concern about the lengthy local diversions. Would like a jointly agreed plan for the routes and then arrange a site review and visit with any interested groups and SMBC Officers.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 6</i> | <i>Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Highways England and SMBC worked closely together during preliminary design to optimise the layout and minimise excessive local diversions. Following statutory consultation Highways England have met with NMU user groups on site to identify issues on the ground and as a consequence an accommodation works bridge over the mainline link road has been provided to maintain connectivity to the public footpath network.</i> |
| Environment | | | | |
| <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>SMBC seeks assurance that the mitigation hierarchy approach will be followed (avoid / mitigate / compensate), that there will be no net loss in biodiversity value.</i> | <i>SMBC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Detailed assessments were carried out as part of the EIA process in order to establish the likely effects during the construction, operation and long term maintenance of the Scheme. Through the processes of option identification and selection, iterative design-development and detailed assessment, the approach has been to apply a hierarchy of avoiding/mitigating/ compensating effects wherever possible. Where effects are unavoidable, the approach to mitigation has focused on integrating measures into the design to reduce effects, with compensatory measures proposed only where other solutions would not be effective. The resulting landscape and environmental design has ensured no net loss to biodiversity. See the ES [TR010027/APP/6.1].</i> |

| Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees Consultation - 9 January 2018 to 9 March 2018 | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | | Prescribed Consultee(s) | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
| General issues | | | | |
| Construction impact | We support being able to construct the new southern junction and link road "off line" and with minimal impact. By being able to complete this early and reducing traffic at the existing junction. Careful planning and management of construction will be essential. | NEC | N | This is noted. Highways England has held regular meetings with the NEC to discuss how we can construct the scheme with minimal disruption. These meetings will continue. The construction period has been extended to enable the contractor to re-phase the works and minimise the impact on NEC's access to Junction 6. |
| Design | | | | |
| Southern Junction (Junction 5A) | The southern junction should be designed to meet future growth as any upgrades at a future date are likely to be disruptive. | Birmingham Airport | N | This is noted. The design of the new junction and mainline link road provides for forecast traffic growth and does not preclude future development. Highways England will continue to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. |
| Eastern Link | No eastern link is now proposed as was considered in the earlier proposals. This is unfortunate as an eastern link would add further resilience. | Birmingham Airport | N | This is noted. The original eastern link option was removed at a very early stage prior to option consultation. The design of the new Junction 5A with two roundabouts, one on each side of the M42, does not preclude an eastern link in the future. |
| North-facing slips | We are disappointed at the lack of north facing slip roads at the new junction. | NEC | N | This is noted. North facing slips at Junction 5A are not included in the Scheme. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north facing slips at Junction 5A. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <i>In addition, the close proximity to Junction 6 precludes the inclusion of north facing slips on safety grounds based on the required design standards.</i> |
| <i>Aerodrome safeguarding</i> | <i>It will be necessary to work closely with Birmingham Airport in terms of detailed design to ensure that safeguarding issues such as light distraction, radio altimeter issues from aircraft flying over the road in cutting and bird strike issues are addressed. Consideration should be given to the DfT's Public Safety Zone Policy.</i> | <i>Birmingham Airport</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 4, 5, 10</i> | <i>This is noted. The mainline link road is not fully lit – only the approaches to, and including the junctions, will be lit. Birmingham Airport has been involved in the preliminary design of the works particularly in relation to: 1) safeguarding – location, form and buildability of structures; 2) drainage design - redesign of the highway drainage in airport critical areas to incorporate the use of storage tank solutions rather than detention basins; 3) landscaping - creation of a landscaping strategy that minimises planting that will attract nesting birds. A draft Bird Management Plan has been produced following engagement with the relevant stakeholders. Highways England will continue to work closely with the airport as the design is developed.</i> |
| <i>Land take</i> | <i>Significant loss of land on either a temporary or permanent basis will have a significant business impact.</i> | <i>NEC</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.21</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has held regular meetings with the NEC to discuss how we can construct the scheme with minimal disruption and impact on their car parks. These meetings will continue with a view to minimizing impact where possible. We will be working closely with HS2 to ensure a coordinated approach is achieved.</i> |
| <i>Variable signage</i> | <i>The scope for switching traffic between different entry points to the campus, by the use of motorway variable message signs, is critical and must be maintained. This will require a dynamic and flexible variable messaging system. We would welcome the opportunity of</i> | <i>NEC</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. At the time of the consultation the new signage strategy had not been developed fully. This has now been developed with SMBC and includes static and variable components which will be subject to further discussion and agreement during detailed design. Highways England will continue to engage with key stakeholders to further develop their traffic management plans to accommodate exceptional events with the Scheme in place.</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | <i>being included in the discussions and design of the signage strategy.</i> | | | |
| <i>Road signage</i> | <i>Signage into the village is very important (during and after construction).</i> | <i>PIL 77</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. A draft signage strategy has been developed with SMBC. New signage and road markings will be provided within the scheme extents, in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, to better inform the road users of the key improvements to the local and strategic road networks. It will be necessary to amend existing signage, outside the extents of new works, to provide road users with advance notification of network alterations.</i> |
| <i>Journey time to Bickenhill</i> | <i>As a Bickenhill resident, I am not happy with village access. We will have to drive 1 mile in the opposite direction to get onto the new road. This will increase journey time.</i> | <i>PIL 77</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England understands that there is a desire in the area to keep this as a local road to avoid 'rat running' through the local villages. The Scheme has therefore been designed to prevent direct access between the local road network and Junction 5A to prevent rat running. Unfortunately this has impacted residents in Bickenhill who will have a longer journey to access the new mainline link road.</i> |
| Non-motorised Users (NMUs) | | | | |
| <i>Footbridge location</i> | <i>Improvements to footpaths and cycle paths to the Airport/Train Station/ NEC complex. A footpath across the A45 from the bottom of Church Lane would improve access for residents.</i> | <i>PIL 77</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.13</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has developed an NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. This includes a range of measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45.</i> |
| <i>Footbridge location</i> | <i>Church Lane is 150m from the A45. Using the bus to Coventry, we need a footbridge across the A45 not at Clock, but north of the village.</i> | <i>DCO 071</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.13</i> | <i>See above – a footbridge is being provided across the A45. Bus stop locations are being discussed and agreed with SMBC.</i> |
| <i>Footbridge</i> | <i>Like the idea of a footbridge over</i> | <i>DCO 074</i> | <i>Y</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <i>location</i> | <i>A45 I am happy to have visited and had questions answered positively.</i> | | <i>Table 15, Ref. 13</i> | |
| WGAA Sports club | | | | |
| <i>Loss of County standard pitch</i> | <i>The loss of the County standard pitch would exclude the County Team from participating in National Competition.</i> | <i>WGAA PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Highways England note the concerns with regard to the temporary loss of the County Standard pitch. Highways England has engaged with the club since early 2017 and is committed to continue to work with the club to find an appropriate solution that can be included within the DCO submission. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i> |
| <i>Club house extension</i> | <i>Planning permission was granted approximately 4 years ago to extend and enhance the existing clubhouse facility. Everything is now in place for the extension of the clubhouse to be constructed, but the HE proposals have caused us to defer construction until we are clear about how and when our existing site will be affected.</i> | <i>WGAA PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i> |
| <i>Memorial location</i> | <i>There is a significant memorial, which has a strong emotional and spiritual attachment for the families and colleagues of our deceased members.</i> | <i>WGAA PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i> |
| <i>Floodlighting</i> | <i>To assist HE we have already secured agreement from Birmingham Airport for floodlighting to be</i> | <i>WGAA PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The club does not currently have floodlighting for its pitches. Due to the location of the club within the Green Belt and its close</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|----------|--|
| | <i>incorporated and we have had detailed architectural plans prepared.</i> | | | <i>proximity to Birmingham Airport's flightpath, floodlighting will not be incorporated. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i> |
| <i>Relocation site</i> | <i>We understand that HE accept that if compulsory purchase powers are used to acquire the existing facility, as proposed under the preferred option, it will be necessary for HE to deliver a replacement facility under the principle of equivalent reinstatement (in accordance with Rule 5 of Section 5 of the Land Compensation Act 1961). A site has been identified for the replacement facility and prompt acquisition of that site is required.</i> | <i>WGAA PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. If required, a decision on the Rule 5 Party status of the Club will be made in due course. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i> |
| <i>Impact of sports club relocation not fully considered</i> | <i>Highways England made no contact with PIL45 before agreeing site location with the WGAA and no alternative site is currently proposed. Impact of proposed sports club relocation site not fully considered. Increased noise, disturbance, pollution & traffic. Loss of privacy and security. 7m+ fall across proposed site but no indication on how level site will be provided. Brick building with tiled roof not appropriate on a greenfield site.</i> | <i>PIL 45</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England included an area for a potential relocation site for the WGAA to seek peoples' views. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1]. Highways England is committed to continue to work with consultees to understand their concerns and seek appropriate resolution. A meeting to discuss these issues with PIL45 arranged.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|----------|--|
| | <i>Previous proposals for similar on same site was refused by SMBC.</i> | | | |
| <i>Sports Club relocation and impact on Green Belt</i> | <i>Site is elevated and construction of new building and associated car park in a greenfield, in the middle of the Green Belt would cause loss of open aspect of Green Belt. Installation of floodlights has been mooted and requested by WGAA it would cause inappropriate, and unwelcome light pollution.</i> | <i>PIL 45</i> | <i>N</i> | <p><i>This is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England included an area for a potential relocation site for the WGAA to seek peoples' views.</i></p> <p><i>The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1].</i></p> |

| Traffic data | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------|----------|--|
| <i>Traffic data</i> | <i>Numbers on traffic flows don't add up and don't show direction of travel for increase or decrease. What data was used? Numbers shown for Catherine-de-Barnes Lane are not accurate reflection. Scheme does nothing to reduce congestion on Hampton Lane or Catherine-de-Barnes Lane.</i> | <i>PIL 45</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>The traffic forecasts have been prepared using traffic models representing all significant roads and junctions in the area. The models have been calibrated and validated against DMRB/WebTAG criteria to represent existing traffic count and journey time data in the morning, interpeak and evening peak hours. Future year forecasts were developed from the base model using standard forecasting methods and assumptions. The traffic flows shown in the consultation document have been prepared in summary form for key road links only, for presentation purposes. They show daily two-way traffic for the selected key links and do not necessarily add up.</i> |

| Environment | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---------------|----------|---|
| <i>Landscaping</i> | <i>We would like to see more landscaping between the pond and the new slip road from the new dual carriageway up to the Clock island to give us more screening from the light pollution and traffic noise from the new road.</i> | <i>PIL 45</i> | <i>N</i> | <p><i>This is noted. Opportunities to introduce landscaping on the new and improved sections of carriageway between Clock Interchange and Bickenhill / Church Lane have been taken where feasible; however as this area coincides with Birmingham Airport's safeguarding zone, restrictions exist on the form, extent and location of planting that can be introduced. The majority of the new mainline link road in this area would be positioned within an earthwork cutting. This will limit the views of the road and traffic from Bickenhill. This arrangement will also reduce road traffic noise.</i></p> <p><i>The design of the Scheme includes new lighting only in locations where there is a requirement to meet safety standards. The design and specification of which has been developed to minimise potential light spill beyond the highway. The mainline link road is not fully lit – only the approaches to, and including the junctions, will be lit. Clock Interchange is currently lit and shall remain so under this Scheme.</i></p> |
| <i>Ancient woodland</i> | <i>The southern junction could be relocated 150 metres north towards J6 to reduce impact on Aspbury's Coppice. Negative impact upon local rare wildlife.</i> | <i>PIL 70</i> | <i>N</i> | <p><i>This is noted. Considerable effort has been made to lessen the impact of the Scheme on Aspbury's Copse. The proposed location of Junction 5A within the Scheme would represent the least worst option in terms of impact on the Ancient Woodland. This includes an approved departure from Highways England's standard length and approach angle for slip roads, which greatly reduces land take requirements in the woodland area. Highways England will also seek to compensate for the loss of Ancient Woodland through translocation of soils and woodland replanting.</i></p> |

| Statutory Consultation under s47 & s48 of the Planning Act 2008 with the local community & statutory publicity Consultation - 9 January 2018 to 9 March 2018 | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
| General | | | |
| Construction Period | <i>Villagers wish construction to occur in a short period of time and carefully ordered, so that their journeys and everyday activities are disrupted as little as possible.</i> | N | <i>This is noted. It is proposed to phase construction to minimise disruption. As Highways England develops the design, we will apply industry best practice and develop specific actions to mitigate the disruption that construction may cause. Highways England will carefully consider the needs of road users, residents during construction to ensure that access is maintained and disruption minimised.</i> |
| Construction disruption | <i>This area will have construction disruption from multiple schemes, staged construction and an awareness of other schemes coming forward is key to the successful delivery of this scheme.</i> | N | <i>This is noted. As Highways England develops the design, it will work with HS2 and other key stakeholders and apply industry best practice and develop specific actions to mitigate the disruption that construction may cause. Highways England will carefully consider the needs of road users, residents during construction to ensure that access is maintained and disruption minimised.</i> |

| Design | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| <i>Free-flow link</i> | <i>The biggest concern raised about the Southern Junction is why it is not being designed as a free-flow link, when most of the traffic will be making the movement between the M42 in the south and the new link road. The new link road uses roundabouts with at-grade traffic conflicts seems misconceived, and may result in a decrease in safety.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The proposed layout has a relatively small footprint. Design development has included realigning the new roundabouts to minimise impact. The dumbbell arrangement also facilitates non-motorway traffic the opportunity to turn around if required. A compact free flow junction design would require greater land take and increased impact on the Scheduled Ancient Woodland.</i> |
| <i>North-facing slips</i> | <i>Adding a new junction without north-slips seems short-sighted. North-facing slips would be well below DMRB requirements. The issue of weaving could potentially cause more accidents after completion.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. North facing slips at Junction 5A are not included in the Scheme. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north facing slips at Junction 5A.</i> |
| <i>Clock Interchange capacity</i> | <i>There is a concern that Clock Interchange will not cope with the proposed increase in traffic as a signalised gyratory with the link road in place.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Traffic modelling undertaken shows that a fully signalised Clock Interchange, widened to a three lane carriageway, will accommodate the forecast traffic flows. In addition, less traffic will use Clock Interchange due to the introduction of the new free flow links from the new mainline link road to the A45 westbound and to the Airport Way Connector Road.</i> |
| <i>Clock Interchange lane width</i> | <i>There are concerns that making three lanes from two will make for narrow lanes and HGVs will struggle to make movements within the narrow lanes.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The roundabout at Clock Interchange will be widened to three lanes using space currently occupied by a footway. The lane widths are proposed to be 3.65m and considered to be sufficient for HGV traffic. Traffic lights on the junction will control vehicle speed and ensure safe and efficient operation of the roundabout.</i> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <i>Local roundabouts</i> | <i>There are two roundabouts on the local road, which seem unnecessary for the scheme. The roundabout at Birmingham Dogs Home seems unnecessary, over-designed.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.7</i> | <i>This is noted. Roundabouts have been included in the scheme design to allow access on/off the mainline link road, to Catherine-de-Barnes Lane and local connections to Bickenhill and Catherine-de-Barnes. As a consequence of consultation responses the Barber's Coppice roundabout has been reduced in diameter and its position has been moved closer to the existing Catherine-de-Barnes Lane to improve safety and operational arrangements. These changes are in response to a request by SMBC.</i> |
| <i>Isolation of Bickenhill</i> | <i>The scheme further isolates Bickenhill residents from other nearby communities. They want to ensure that there is no more severance in terms of footpaths and local roads.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.11, 13 & 25</i> | <i>This is noted. NMU connectivity for the Bickenhill community is improved with a new pedestrian overbridge across the A45 from Church Lane. East-west connectivity for pedestrians is maintained by a new pedestrian underpass and realigned ramps accessing the Airport Way connector road footpath. A new footpath is provided to the west of the new mainline link road to enable east-west movement via Catherine-de-Barnes bridges, north and south. Vehicular links to Catherine-de-Barnes, Hampton in Arden and areas to the west of the mainline Link Road are maintained. There will be a longer route between Bickenhill and the A45.</i> |
| <i>Local road re-route</i> | <i>There is a strong feeling that the local road diversion is convoluted and is a real dis-benefit of the scheme.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England understands that there is a desire in the area to keep the realigned Catherine-de-Barnes Lane as a local road. The Scheme has therefore been designed, in consultation with SMBC, to prevent direct access between the local road network and Junction 5A to prevent 'rat running' through the local villages. Unfortunately this has impacted residents in Bickenhill who will have a longer journey to access the new mainline link road and the A45.</i> |
| <i>Local road safety</i> | <i>There is a safety concern with children trying to cross the local road network to get to bus stops to get to/from school.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The Scheme has developed an NMU strategy that considers the safety of pedestrians who live in Bickenhill. Highways England is also discussing the location of bus stops affected by the Scheme with SMBC and TfWM.</i> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Mainline link road traffic safety</i> | <i>Due to the short length of the link road there are concerns about traffic safety as vehicles reach Clock Interchange</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The speed limit for this stretch of road will be 70mph. The mainline link road accords with current standards, including forward visibility for this speed. Warning signage will be included as appropriate.</i> |
| <i>M42 J6 Interchange</i> | <i>Would Junction 6 be better as an Interchange or at least all free-flow links should be included in the current design to improve traffic flow as suggested in Highways England's own Strategic Road Network Initial Report?</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. These options were considered as part of the options selection process and rejected due to a number of significant issues.</i> |
| <i>M42 J6 improvements</i> | <i>There is nothing to improve the traffic flow from M42 northbound to A45 eastbound.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref.17</i> | <i>This is noted. The scheme would remove 4 out of 8 traffic movements out of the junction providing additional capacity. The segregated lane from M42 northbound slip onto the A45W has been removed and the geometric design now been modified (i.e. increased) to four lanes at the stop line, this will help Coventry-bound traffic as two lanes will be signed to Coventry.</i> |
| <i>M42 J6 traffic management</i> | <i>There are a number of solutions provided for M42 J6 including – improve lane designations, traffic management and destination signage. These would be easy wins to integrate into the scheme design.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>M42 mainline capacity</i> | <i>There is a capacity issue on M42 mainline, assume there will be widening of any structures built to future-proof.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. M42 mainline improvements are outside the scope of the Scheme – it is noted as a potential future scheme in the Midlands Motorway Hub Study. Future RIS programmes may include studies to explore corridor improvements. Solihull Road overbridge is designed with a span wide enough to futureproof the structure.</i> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>M42 traffic weaving</i> | <i>Weaving as a result of this scheme is perceived to be an issue, particularly with north-facing slips associated with the MSA.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. North facing slips at Junction 5A are not proposed as part of this Scheme.</i> |
| <i>Middle Bickenhill Lane closure</i> | <i>There are concerns raised about why Middle Bickenhill Lane needs to be closed, as this will cause local access issues.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 19</i> | <i>This is noted. The slip road off the A45 eastbound to Middle Bickenhill is to be closed. The scheme includes alterations to enable two-way movement between Middle Bickenhill and East Way to mitigate this.</i> |
| <i>Settlement ponds</i> | <i>The design of the settlement ponds is an enormous waste of land. The ponds are poorly designed in terms of safeguarding the airport, excessive areas required, and there are severed areas which would be a better location.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 4 & 5</i> | <i>This is noted – Highways England will continue to work with Birmingham Airport and other landowners to reduce impact on farmland and reflect airport safeguarding requirements.</i> |
| <i>Shadowbrook Lane</i> | <i>As Shadowbrook Lane is going to get busier as a direct result of this scheme, there is an assumption that HE will improve the drainage, surface quality, lighting and ultimately NMU safety as part of the scheme.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Shadowbrook Lane is the responsibility of SMBC to improve and maintain appropriately. Highways England will continue to liaise with SMBC regarding the Schemes' impact on the local road network.</i> |
| <i>Rat-running</i> | <i>Locals want access to the new link road for their access, but they do not wish to see an increase in 'rat-running' on the local roads by other vehicles wanting to access the link road.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The Scheme has been designed in collaboration with SMBC so that it discourages 'rat running' on local roads. Access will be provided to the new mainline link road via new roundabouts at Barber's Coppice and Bickenhill.</i> |
| <i>Lower speed on mainline link road</i> | <i>Will you consider the introduction of a 50mph speed limit with a lower design speed for the new link road?</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>The speed limit for this stretch of road will align with national designations for this type of road (70mph).</i> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---|
| Free-flow junctions | Highways England recently published Strategic Road Network Initial Report includes a proposal for a study on free-flow junctions, why is this scheme not implementing any free-flow connections for right-turn movements? | N | These options were considered as part of the options selection process and rejected due to a number of significant issues. |
| Non-motorised User (NMU) provision | | | |
| NMU severance | Severance has been raised as an issue by a number of respondents including the Ramblers, both north-south and east-west across the scheme. | Y Table 15, Ref.6,11,13 & 25 | This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45 and east-west links have been considered in light of consultation responses. |
| NMU connectivity | NMU connectivity across M42 J6 as a necessary improvement of the scheme between Hampton-in-Arden and the NEC/Resort World/Birmingham International. | Y Table 15, Ref.6 | This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45 have been considered in light of consultation responses. |
| NMU desire lines | Any new NMU paths need to route directly; any which are circuitous will show a lack of the needs of users. | Y Table 15, Ref.13 | This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45 have been considered in light of consultation responses. |
| Active Transport | Improved signage/ wayfinding for active travel in the vicinity of the Scheme would be required. | N | This is noted. The NMU routes will be signed in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions and in collaboration with SMBC. |
| Design for horses | There are many liverys in the area. Respondents would like paths designed for horses to be separated or fenced, so that horses are kept away from speeding traffic. | N | This is noted. Provision for equestrians as part of this Scheme will be discussed with SMBC. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Clock Interchange NMU route</i> | <i>Clock is a currently a well-used NMU route to the Birmingham International Railway Station, the alternative footbridge will make people have to travel further by foot/cycle.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 11&13</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45 have been considered in light of consultation responses.</i> |
| <i>NMU access across M42 J6</i> | <i>There is a demand for NMM access across M42 J6 as Old Station Road is an ideal NMU route, but currently there is no NMU route across the junction.</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 13</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Measures to reduce community severance and improve connectivity across the A45 have been considered in light of consultation responses.</i> |
| WGAA Sports club | | | |
| <i>Sports club relocation site</i> | <i>Comments by a local resident raise a number of concerns about the proposed sports club relocation site. The site is in Green Belt, it is not flat, will overlook a neighbouring property and also the surrounding area. The floodlights would be intrusive and the clubhouse design would need to be in keeping with the area (a previous planning application design was refused by SMBC). An alternative site is requested.</i> | <i>N</i> | <p><i>This is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England included an area for a potential relocation site for the WGAA to seek peoples' views.</i></p> <p><i>The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1]</i></p> |
| <i>Minimise impact on sports facility</i> | <i>Members of the sports club would like the scheme to cause as little impact as possible to the club and to fixtures played at this important site.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| Environment | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|--|
| <i>Landscaping</i> | <i>Ensuring landscaping/tree planting is used between the link road and Bickenhill village to reduce visual impact.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Opportunities to introduce landscaping on the new and improved sections of carriageway between Clock Interchange and Bickenhill / Church Lane have been taken where feasible; however as this area coincides with Birmingham Airport's safeguarding zone, restrictions exist on the form, extent and location of planting that can be introduced. The majority of the new mainline link road in this area will be positioned within an earthwork cutting. This will limit the views of the road and traffic from Bickenhill village.</i> |
| <i>Noise and disruption</i> | <i>While construction takes place, locals are concerned that there will be additional noise and disruption.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. As Highways England develops the design, we will apply industry best practice and develop specific actions to mitigate the disruption that construction may cause. Highways England will carefully consider the needs of road users, residents during construction to ensure that access is maintained and disruption minimised as described in OEMP [TR010027/APP/6.11]</i> |
| <i>Ancient Woodland</i> | <i>Aspbury's Copse is an area of Ancient Woodland and should be protected from any development, so the southern junction should be moved further north.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. This is noted. Considerable effort has been made to lessen the impact of the Scheme on Aspbury's Copse. The proposed location of Junction 5A within the Scheme would represent the least worst option in terms of impact on the Ancient Woodland. This includes an approved departure from Highways England's standard length and approach angle for slip roads, which greatly reduces land take requirements in the woodland area. Highways England will also seek to compensate for the loss of Ancient Woodland through translocation of soils and woodland replanting.</i> |
| <i>Green Belt development</i> | <i>There is concern about the impact of the scheme on the Meriden Gap Green Belt. This relates to the amount of development coming forward in the area and the consequent impact on wildlife.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------|--|
| <i>Green Belt mitigation</i> | <i>If there is development in the Meriden Gap, then this should be designed to be in-keeping with the area, in other words with minimal lighting, bunding, screening and tree planting in sensitive areas to minimise the impact of the scheme on the local area.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>Air quality</i> | <i>If the scheme brings more traffic through the area, then there is a concern that it will cause a decline in air quality.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Detailed assessments are being carried out as part of the EIA process in order to establish any short term and long term changes in air quality and noise, the findings of which will be reported in the ES. Highways England will apply industry best practice and develop specific actions to mitigate the air quality impacts that construction may cause as described in OEMP [TR010027/APP/6.11]</i> |
| <i>Flood risk</i> | <i>There is a concern that this scheme is being built in a high-water table area, where surface flooding occurs. The scheme will have an impact on flooding, drainage, safety on the link road.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Detailed assessments are being carried out as part of the EIA process to understand the impact on water and groundwater flows in the area. The design of the Scheme will include mitigation measures to ensure that surface flooding does not occur. The findings of these assessments will be reported in the ES.</i> |
| <i>Road Noise</i> | <i>As the link road is going through a rural area, the use of quiet surfacing is suggested for new road surfaces.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England will apply industry best practice in determining the surfacing requirements. We will liaise with SMBC with regard to surfacing of local roads.</i> |
| <i>Lighting</i> | <i>Lighting needs to be screened from the local housing, particularly around local villages and the Southern Junction.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The design of the Scheme includes new lighting only in locations where there is a requirement to meet safety standards. The design and specification of which has been developed to minimise potential light spill beyond the highway. The mainline link road is not fully lit – only the approaches to, and including the junctions, will be lit. Clock Interchange, the A45 and the M42 are currently lit and shall remain so under this Scheme.</i> |
| <i>Local views</i> | <i>As long as it doesn't affect our views rear and front and makes our road quieter in the long run, we are in support of the proposal.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

Annex P (Part 2) Tables evidencing regard had to consultation responses (in accordance with s49 of the Planning Act 2008) – Further Consultation

The tables below provide evidence of Highways England's regard to responses to the statutory consultation in accordance with s49 of the PA 2008. Each table summarises responses received, sets out whether a change has been made in response to it, and details Highways England's response and regard had to the consultation response. It should be noted that where multiple responses containing the same comment have been received, these are addressed at the same time in tables below. A separate table is included for each individual strand of statutory consultation (s42(a)*, s42(b) and s42(d)). We have also taken on board the responses of other non-statutory consultees as presented below.

*Note that all local authority s42(a) Schedule 1 Prescribed Consultees are contained in the s42(b) consultee table.

| Statutory Consultation under s42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees Further consultation (statutory consultation) - 4 September to 2 October 2018 | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses: | | Prescribed Consultee(s): | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response): |
| General issues | | | | |
| <i>Not affected by the works</i> | <i>The Crown Estate does not believe they are affected by the works.</i> | <i>The Crown Estate</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>No change to advice</i> | <i>We have reviewed the information provided and confirm that our advice stays the same as when consulted in February 2018.</i> | <i>Health and Safety Executive</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>No comments</i> | <i>Response provides updated contact details.</i> | <i>Esso Petroleum Company Ltd</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>No comments</i> | <i>Response provides updated contact details.</i> | <i>Canal and Rivers Trust</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>No safeguarding</i> | <i>No safeguarding objection to the proposal.</i> | <i>NATS (En Route) Public Limited</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| <i>objection to the proposal</i> | | <i>Company</i> | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <i>No safeguarding objection to the proposal</i> | <i>No safeguarding objection to the proposal.</i> | <i>Ministry of Defence</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| <i>No additional comments since the statutory consultation in early 2018</i> | <i>No additional comments.</i> | <i>Public Health England</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| Design | | | | |
| <i>People Mover</i> | <i>It is apparent that areas of the updated extent of the proposed DCO scheme within the red line boundary are located within formal safeguarding/HS2 Act limits for the HS2 Birmingham Interchange Station Automated People Mover (APM). Arup have carried out an assessment based on the CAD data available and identified that there is sufficient space for a D4m carriageway + hard shoulder + 2m verge between the edge of the proposed M42 lane 1 and the proposed APM column. There is also sufficient space for a 2m verge between the proposed slip road and the APM column. This leaves a 2m zone for the column which is sufficient for APM needs.</i> | <i>HS2</i> | <i>Y Table 22, Ref.4</i> | <i>This is noted. Following consultation with HS2, the local limits of deviation have been altered in the DCO submission. This will ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in this location for effective coordination with HS2 during detailed design. Highways England will continue to work closely with HS2's design team to facilitate a satisfactory coordinated design.</i> |
| <i>NMM rear egress</i> | <i>Following engagement between HS2 Phase One Directorate and the AECOM designers for</i> | <i>HS2</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England understand that HS2 will seek independent assurance from</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | <i>the HE scheme it has also been confirmed that the National Motorcycle Museum (NMM) rear egress included in the HS2 Assurance is not included in the M42 Junction 6 scheme design and red line boundary plan. It is understood that a meeting held between HE and NMM on 20 September discussed this issue and the NMM confirmed at that meeting that they were content with this approach. However, in order to ensure the terms of the aforementioned assurance offered during the Parliamentary process are complied with HS2 Ltd will need to confirm that NMM are satisfied with this arrangement.</i> | | | <i>NMM that they are satisfied that HS2 are no longer required to provide a rear egress.</i> |
| | <i>Finally, it has also been noted that the scheme does include improvement to the existing footway cycleway provision on the south side of the A45 westbound diverge slip road to Junction 6 as shown on the further consultation scheme plan drawing which may require a strip of land from the NMM.</i> | <i>HS2</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>As part of Highways England's NMU strategy to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities impacted by the Scheme, the intention is to widen the existing footway along the A45 westbound diverge/Coventry Road. This will create a combined off carriageway footway/cycle way which may require a strip of land from the NMM.</i> |
| <i>Construction compound</i> | <i>The proposed layout includes wide areas of the NEC car parks, presumably for construction uses. The APM alignment passes through these areas and two construction compounds are proposed. As APM and M42 J6 works will be concurrent this arrangement is not feasible and an alternative compound location will therefore be required for the proposed M42 works.</i> | <i>HS2</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref.6</i> | <i>This is noted. The area of land taken for the permanent works is some distance from the HS2 works compounds. The remaining land is for temporary construction and access purposes. Highways England will continue to work with HS2 to minimise disruption to HS2 and the NEC.</i> |

| Environment | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|--|
| Various environmental issues – need for continued dialogue | <p>Natural England provided a very detailed additional consultation response and this is summarised below.</p> <p>They list a number of technical notes shared by Highways England during pre-application dialogue and suggest early engagement via their Discretionary Advice Service for advice and continued dialogue about Bickenhill Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Aspbury's Copse Ancient Woodland. Natural England agrees that no main badger setts will be impacted, that the impacts on bats are very low and no ponds/habitats for great crested newts will be lost. Natural England repeated comments made by Warwickshire Wildlife Trust in relation to the type of mitigation required at Shadowbrook Meadows Local Nature Reserve – particularly highlighting potential impacts on groundwater flows and SSSI grassland communities. They also stressed the importance of investigating a more natural mitigation for these impacts.</p> <p>They also noted that a highly disturbed area of Aspbury's Copse close to the M42 Motorway is being removed from their Inventory of Ancient Woodland.</p> | Natural England | Y Table 22, Ref.5 | <p>These issues are noted. Highways England has maintained an ongoing dialogue with Natural England and had a number of meetings to identify issues and agree appropriate strategies for further assessment and mitigation.</p> <p>Agreements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tree re-planting rates. 2. Landscaping valuation and replacement strategy. 3. A hierarchical approach to dealing with SSSI monitoring of baseline conditions and potential impacts and mitigation. <p>Highways England will continue to work closely with Natural England to ensure that environmental impacts are understood, minimised and mitigated appropriately. In addition, licenses will be obtained before any site works are undertaken as required.</p> |
| Environment | No additional comments since the consultation on the EIA scope in 16 November 2017. | Environment Agency | N | This is noted. |
| Historic environment | On behalf of Historic England we have no detailed comments to offer at this stage. We | Historic England | N | This is noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|----------|--|
| | <i>note the attention being paid to the historic environment issues and subject to appropriate mitigation, particularly with respect to the Bickenhill Conservation Area. We are content with the proposals as they currently stand.</i> | | | |
| Woodland | <i>Confirmed presence of ancient woodland and provided advice on the application of Government policy on the protection of such designated sites. Offered to provide additional information that might be helpful when developing the application.</i> | <i>Forestry Commission – North West and West Midlands</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted (the response was received after the close of the consultation period).</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | | | | |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>WPD own many assets in the areas you have highlighted which may require permanent diversion to enable these works these are chargeable works for which you would need to engage WPD. At this early stage it is not possible to provide an estimate for these works based on the information provided.</i> | <i>Western Power Distribution</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. A number of meetings have been held with WPD (LV and HV divisions) and options for diversions explored. Liaison is ongoing to establish detailed design and confirm diversion routes. C4 detailed estimates have been requested. In advance of receiving this detail the limits of deviation have been expanded to provide flexibility for diversion routes when considering the constraints in this region.</i> |
| Assets and Wayleaves | <i>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do have apparatus near the above location within the scheme reference and enclose the relevant drawings showing the approximate location of Colt apparatus for purpose of initial plant enquiry. Detailed network location will be presented via Scheme Identification Study Process. All reasonable effort has been made</i> | <i>COLT Utility Services</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Following consultation and design development East Way roundabout is to be relocated to accommodate the new M42 southbound diverge. As a consequence Colt assets are now impacted by the Scheme. Details and supporting documents, including outline programme, were provided and C3 estimates requested.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|----------|---|
| | <i>to capture network however image may not reflect unprocessed new build track. If your proposed works are likely to affect or expose the Colt Technology Services apparatus in anyway please contact Colt Civils Team Members.</i> | | | <i>Highways England will continue to liaise with Colt to ensure appropriate diversion routes are defined.</i> |
| <i>Assets and wayleaves</i> | <i>Appropriate protection will be required for the retained NGET infrastructure apparatus. It would appear that none of the National Grid's towers are directly affected. National Grid Gas has no high pressure gas transmission pipelines located within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits.</i> | <i>National Grid (Cadent Gas and Electricity)</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. No change to previous consultation.</i> |
| <i>Assets and Land Interest</i> | <i>Land Interest Questionnaire duly completed and the scheme potentially crosses a large and important trunk water main in multiple places. This may potentially have a material impact Severn Trent's statutory undertaking and Severn Trent may well need to seek appropriate protection through the drafting of the DCO.</i> | <i>Severn Trent Water Limited</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. No change to previous consultation.</i> |

| Statutory Consultation under s42(b) of the Planning Act 2008 with Local Authorities Further Consultation (statutory consultation) - 4 September to 2 October 2018 | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | | Prescribed Consultee(s) | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
| General | | | | |
| Collaboration | <i>Supportive of the Scheme and keen to see quick delivery. They recommend that Highways England work closely with SMBC during scheme development and consider the broader implications of this work on future improvements to M42 Junction 6.</i> | Transport for West Midlands | N | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to work closely with SMBC as the Scheme development progresses.</i> |
| Design | | | | |
| Location of bus stop on A45 | <i>SMBC prefers the location of the bus stop shown on consultation plan to the proposal to move it nearer to Church Lane.</i> | SMBC | Y Table 20, Ref. 1 | <i>This is noted. The precise location of the bus stops will be subject to discussion with SMBC and Transport for West Midlands.</i> |
| NMM | <i>HS2 advise that they are expecting Highways England to deliver the exit from the NMM which HS2 are to fund.</i> | SMBC | N | <i>This is noted. Highways England has met with HS2 and confirmed that the NMM rear egress is not included within the scope of the Scheme.</i> |
| WGAA | <i>Is there an alternative access to the WGAA, off Catherine de Barnes Lane, that would avoid a link past Four Winds?</i> | SMBC | N | <i>This is noted. Highways England is discussing separate accesses with landowners in the area; these will be confirmed during detailed design.</i> |
| Environment | | | | |
| Green belt impact | <i>Joint discussions over mitigation along Catherine de Barnes Lane as SMBC have a 'Greening the Grey' scheme.</i> | SMBC | Y Table 20, Ref. 5 | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to work closely with SMBC as the Scheme development progresses.</i> |

| Statutory Consultation under s42(d) of the Planning Act 2008 with persons with an interest in the land (PILs) Further consultation (statutory consultation for newly-identified PILs and previously-identified PILs with a greater impact) - 4 September to 2 October 2018 | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------|---|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | | Prescribed Consultee(s) | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
| General | | | | |
| Logistics site | After receiving the consultation letter, the local business requested further information about how the Scheme would impact their site located close to M42 Junction 6 which is used for logistics. Their site is currently within the redline boundary. | JLR - PIL 36 | Y | This is noted. Following the meeting on 31 August 2018 the redline boundary (Order Limits) was slightly moved to reduce the impact on the company. |
| Review of Works close to the operational rail boundary | Network Rail provided four locations requiring review, as the Applicant proceeds further with the Scheme design. The bulk of the Scheme works are to occur at least 50 metres from the operational rail boundary, therefore they would only need to review any proposed Works over the operational railway. | Network Rail - PIL 80 | N | This is noted. Highways England will continue to liaise with Network Rail. |
| Construction timeframe | The construction timeframe has doubled to 24 months, from 12 months. | NEC - PIL 30 | N | This is noted. The construction programme around the junction has increased to enable construction to proceed with less impact on the NEC. Highways England will continue to liaise with the NEC. |
| Scheme co-ordination | There is a need to co-ordinate with High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd. For example to undertake utility | NEC - PIL 30 | Y Table 20, | This is noted. Highways England will continue to work closely with HS2, NEC and its tenants to |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | <i>diversion Works across East 5 car park and the need to maintain traffic flow and mitigation of the impact to local businesses during the construction period.</i> | | <i>Ref. 6</i> | <i>minimise the impacts on their facilities. Following consultation with HS2, the limits of deviation as part of the DCO submission have been altered to ensure that the M42 Junction 6 Improvement and HS2 scheme are coordinated in this region.</i> |
| <i>Continued dialogue on safeguarding</i> | <i>Ongoing dialogue to continue with regard to Scheme design (taking into consideration the Obstacle Limitation Surface) and construction impacts.</i> | <i>Birmingham Airport - PIL 31</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to liaise with Birmingham Airport.</i> |
| <i>Construction disruption</i> | <i>Construction disruption will impact on land owner's businesses.</i> | <i>PIL 77</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Construction impacts will be minimised in accordance with best practice, as captured in the OEMP TR010027/APP/6.11. Highways England will continue to liaise with local businesses.</i> |
| Land Interests | | | | |
| <i>Land take impact</i> | <i>The revised redline boundary which has been increased to include a greater area of car park and construction timeframe will have a significant business impact. Resorts World lease NEC East 5 car park and are concerned about construction impact on their business.</i> | <i>NEC - PIL 30</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref. 6</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has held regular meetings with the NEC to discuss how we can construct the scheme with minimal disruption. The construction programme around the junction has increased to enable construction to proceed with minimal impact on the NEC. Highways England will continue to liaise with the NEC.</i> |
| <i>Minimise land take</i> | <i>Some land owners would like to minimise the land take required by the scheme for Environmental Mitigation and/ or Enhancement areas.</i> | <i>PIL 39</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref. 5</i> | <i>This is noted. Following consultation with various landowners across the scheme, the environmental mitigation and enhancement strategy has been adjusted to reduce the Scheme's footprint.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|----------|---|
| <i>Willing to sell land</i> | <i>Several PILs are amenable to providing their land for temporary works or selling their land, by agreement for an agreeable sum.</i> | <i>PIL 41, 42 & 47</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to meet with these PILs to progress agreements in principle.</i> |
| <i>Relocation of WGAA sports facilities</i> | <i>A reconfiguration of the current site will not leave the club in an equivalent position to that which it currently enjoys. The club is unable to comprehend why Highways England now considers that the relocation may not be possible to justify using compulsory purchase powers to acquire the site that had previously been identified for the relocation. The club would support a like-for-like replacement and confirm that if that solution is taken forward they would lend their full support to the Scheme. If this is not possible, a search for an alternative site will commence and Highways England would be required to compensate the club</i> | <i>WGAA - PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The Scheme will have a direct impact on parts of the WGAA site. Highways England has therefore included land within the DCO to mitigate the impact on the club. The land identified is considered sufficient in size to facilitate the reconfiguration and re-provision of pitches, car parking and access road affected by the Scheme. This land will therefore allow the club to maintain the same facilities that it currently benefits from during both construction and operation of the Scheme. Highways England continues to engage with the WGAA to identify the optimal, proportionate reconfiguration option for the Club within the boundary of the land identified. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement.</i> |
| <i>Reconfiguration of the sports facility</i> | <i>A reconfiguration of the current site will bring the site closer to a local residential property and cause increased traffic, noise and disturbance, floodlighting would be an issue, restrict access, result in loss of privacy, the PMA will not be well-maintained, will be subject to anti-social behavior, fly-tipping lorry drivers parking and a private raceway.</i> | <i>WGAA - PIL 38</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. A number of these issues are linked to the WGAA item described above. Highways England will continue to work with this property owner to address the listed issues, including the PMA, where possible.</i> |

| Design | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------|--|
| <i>East Way Roundabout</i> | <i>The proposed changes to the East Way roundabout such that traffic could potentially back up on the slip road onto the M42, as traffic leaving the NEC Estate has priority and this will need careful management.</i> | <i>NEC - PIL 30</i> | | <i>This is noted. Highways England will continue to engage with key stakeholders to further develop their traffic management plans to accommodate exceptional events with the Scheme in place.</i> |
| <i>North-facing slips on M42 J5A</i> | <i>Disappointed about the lack of north-facing slip roads at the new Junction 5A</i> | <i>NEC - PIL 30</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. North facing slips at Junction 5A are not included in the Scheme. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north facing slips at Junction 5A. Highways England continues to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. The possibility of north-facing slips has not been precluded by the design of the Scheme subject to wider improvements of the SRN in the area – such as widening of the M42 or use of All Lane Running.</i> |
| <i>North-facing slips on M42 J5A</i> | <i>Disappointed about the lack of north-facing slip roads at the new Junction 5A</i> | <i>Birmingham Airport - PIL 31</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. North facing slips at Junction 5A are not included in the Scheme. During design development Highways England's traffic modelling demonstrated, based on the agreed growth scenario, that there was minimal traffic demand for north facing slips at Junction 5A. Highways England continues to work with its regional partners to support their firm growth aspirations. The possibility of north-facing slips has not been precluded by the design of the Scheme subject to wider improvements of the SRN in the area – such as widening of the M42</i> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | or use of All Lane Running. |
| M42 J5A | Seeking reassurance that the modifications to Solihull Road will not prejudice or preclude delivery of the MSA and would wish the MSA site to be clearly labelled on maps with the application number. | Extra - PIL 33 | N | This is noted. The Scheme is totally independent of the proposed Motorway Service Area. Highways England is not promoting or supporting this development but has undertaken to not preclude its construction should it receive planning permission. A number of meetings have been held with the developer to ensure a coordinated approach. Future development in the vicinity of the Scheme is outside Highways England's remit and will be subject to planning controls exercised by SMBC. |
| Clock Interchange merge | The location of the proposed segregated left turn lane will cause difficulties in providing two merging lanes onto the A45 westbound from Clock Interchange | Birmingham Airport - PIL 31 | N | This is noted. The proposed free flow link at Clock Interchange has been provided in response to a request by SMBC. Highways England will continue to work closely with SMBC and other stakeholders as the Scheme development progresses. |
| Runway End Safety Area | The proposed new motorway junction and link road should not prejudice the construction of the Runway End Safety Area should this be built in the future. | Birmingham Airport - PIL 31 | N | This is noted. |
| Pedestrian overbridge | The airport would like cyclists who use the pedestrian footbridge adjacent to the West Coast Mainline to be able to travel without dismounting. | Birmingham Airport - PIL 31 | N | This is noted. The preliminary design assumes that the proposed footbridge will accommodate cyclists without the need for dismounting. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <i>Pedestrian overbridge</i> | <i>The Scheme is likely to affect their 'perfect location' and would oppose anything which detracts from this. However, if there is a mutually beneficial agreement associated with the provision of the footbridge over the A45, then this may change their position. Issues for discussion include the duration of the project, compensation, condition of the site and design of the bridge.</i> | <i>Arden Hotel - PIL 75</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Following consultation with SMBC and the Arden Hotel it has been identified that the alignment of the northern ramp of the A45 pedestrian overbridge may require realignment works. Multiple options are in preparation and additional consultation meetings will be held to determine the appropriate configuration that is agreeable to all parties. Subsequently the limits of deviation in this DCO have been modified to provide sufficient flexibility to build the agreed configuration. Highways England will continue to liaise with the Arden Hotel and SMBC.</i> |
| <i>Access arrangements</i> | <i>Concern about the access arrangements for the Private Means of Access for local resident and the WGAA.</i> | <i>PIL 45</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref. 2&3</i> | <i>This is noted. This issue is linked to the WGAA item described above. Highways England will continue to work with the parties to address the issue where possible.</i> |
| <i>Access proposals</i> | <i>Existing and future farming activities will not be satisfactorily accommodated with the current access arrangements (relating to severance of some fields).</i> | <i>PIL 39</i> | <i>Y</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has met the majority of the PILs and has sought to minimise the impact on farming activities. Highways England will continue to liaise with the impacted land owners and tenant farmers.</i> |
| <i>Private means of access (PMA)</i> | <i>What is the nature of the private means of access along the west of the link road? Can it be used as a through route?</i> | <i>PIL 77</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref. 2 & 3</i> | <i>The private means of access is not intended to be used as a through route for vehicular traffic. Meetings have been held with SMBC and adjacent landowners to agree an appropriate solution to prevent it being a through route.</i> |
| <i>Alignment of attenuation ponds</i> | <i>Wish to align attenuation ponds to minimise land take.</i> | <i>PIL 39</i> | <i>Y Table 20, Ref. 5</i> | <i>This is noted. Highways England has worked with local landowners and Birmingham Airport to ensure that the attenuation features are located appropriately. Highways England will continue to</i> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|----------|--|
| | | | | <i>work with land owners to further minimise land take where possible.</i> |
| Environment | | | | |
| <i>SSSI</i> | <i>Strong concerns regarding the impacts of the Scheme on Bickenhill Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Trust questioned whether the new road may impact the flow of ground water to the SSSI which if not mitigated would destroy the grassland for which the site is designated and they questioned whether the mitigation plan is suitable for the site.</i> | <i>PIL 19 – Warwickshire Wildlife Trust</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>These issues are noted. Highways England will continue to work closely with Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England to ensure that environmental impacts are understood, minimised and mitigated appropriately. Highways England has identified a hierarchical approach to dealing with SSSI monitoring of baseline conditions and potential impacts and mitigation. This approach is described in the ES [TR010027/APP/6.1].</i> |
| <i>Ancient Woodland</i> | <i>Natural England is currently removing an area of Aspbury's Copse close to the M42 Motorway from their Inventory of Ancient Woodland and further suggests that, as there is strong evidence that Aspbury's Copse has not been continuously wooded, it should not be designated as Ancient Woodland.</i> | <i>PIL 33 - Extra</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |

| Consultation Responses Further consultation (non-statutory consultation) 4 September to 2 October 2018 | | |
|--|--|--|
| Topic Area and Consultation Responses | Change (Y/N): | Highways England's Response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response) |
| <i>The Warwickshire Gaelic Athletic Association</i> | | |
| <i>These responses are taken from the 214 written responses from members of the WGAA which followed a generic template. Instead of dealing with these separately they have been consolidated into the various themes raised.</i> | | |
| <i>Importance of WGAA sports facility</i> | <i>The WGAA is an important community sports facility, as it serves a large Irish diaspora.</i> | <i>N</i> |
| <i>Proximity to new link road</i> | <i>The new link road will be close to Páirc na hÉireann.</i> | |
| <i>Noise and air pollution</i> | <i>There would be an increase in noise and air pollution as a result of the new link road and this could have a potential impact on the health of players at Páirc na hÉireann.</i> | |
| <i>Safety of road users</i> | <i>The safety of road users could be affected as sliothars (hurling balls) can travel quickly and over long distances.</i> | |
| <i>Monument</i> | <i>The monument on the current site is very important to the members and they would like thought put into where it will be relocated.</i> | |
| <i>Rejection of the reconfiguration</i> | <i>Consultees reject Highways England's decision to opt for a reconfiguration of the current site rather than a relocation of the WGAA site as the site is not suitable. The revised proposals are to the detriment of the</i> | |
| | | <i>These concerns are noted. The Scheme will have a direct impact on parts of the WGAA site. Highways England has therefore included land within the DCO to mitigate the impact on the club. The land identified is considered sufficient in size to facilitate the reconfiguration and re-provision of pitches, car parking and access road affected by the Scheme. This land will therefore allow the club to maintain the same facilities that it currently benefits from during both construction and operation of the Scheme. Highways England continues to engage with the WGAA to identify the optimal, proportionate reconfiguration option for the Club within the boundary of the land identified. The WGAA issue is complex and has evolved through the DCO preparation process. Highways England's position is set out in the Planning Statement. [TR010027/APP/7.1]</i> |

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|---|
| | <i>WGAA. Adequate compensation should be provided.</i> | | |
| <i>Preference for a relocation site</i> | <i>A relocation site is the preferred option.</i> | | |
| <i>Timing of consultation</i> | <i>This consultation is premature, and should only take place as and when the full scheme, which incorporates a relocated WGAA etc., is available for scrutiny and the impacts assessed, along with a concern at the lack of public road shows for the further consultation.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. The further consultation was targeted at those statutory stakeholders who would be impacted by changes to the Scheme since the statutory consultation in early 2018. Highways England took this opportunity to extend the consultation to include the general public with an update on scheme progress and seek their views.</i> |
| Environment | | | |
| <i>Green Belt</i> | <i>A road scheme should not be located in the Green Belt</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted. Given the national need for the Scheme there are considered to be very special circumstances which outweigh any harm to the Green Belt.</i> |
| <i>Noise and pollution</i> | <i>Will a new link road increase the amount of noise and pollution in the local area?</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Detailed assessments were carried out as part of the EIA process in order to establish the existing noise and visual conditions associated with the strategic and local road networks, and the potential changes that construction and operation of the Scheme will have on these conditions. The findings of these assessments are reported in the ES forming part of the DCO application [TR010027/APP/6.1].</i> |
| <i>Ancient Woodland</i> | <i>Warwickshire Wildlife Trust objects to the destruction of ancient woodland at Asbury's Copse and designated Local Wildlife Site at Castle Hill Farm and would like information about how connectivity for wildlife will be retained across the new road.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>These issues are noted. The Scheme will impact on Asbury Copse and on the local wildlife site at Castle Hill Farm. The ES describes the Scheme's environmental impacts on these areas and associated mitigation. [TR010027/APP/6.1]. Highways England will continue to work closely with the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England to ensure that environmental impacts are understood, minimised and mitigated appropriately.</i> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| <i>Ancient woodland</i> | <i>Warwickshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the reduction in land take within the ancient woodland; the embankments which will support the slip roads will still be located inside the ancient woodland resulting in direct loss on both sides of the existing road. The Trust requests that the scheme is re-configured further to ensure that no land take occurs within Aspbury's Copse.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This noted. The design of the southern junction has been developed following a detailed option development and refinement process. It is in the optimum location to minimise the amount of land taken from Aspbury's Copse that would be required to construct and operate the scheme, balanced against the noise and air quality impacts moving it north would have on Shadowbrook Lane. The location also seeks to minimise impacts on the landscape characteristics of the area and addresses design and safety standards.</i> |
| <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>The whole scheme should be reviewed from a 'green infrastructure' perspective.</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>This is noted.</i> |
| Non-motorised Users (NMUs) | | | |
| <i>NMU provision</i> | <i>How will the Scheme impact on NMU provision in the area?</i> | <i>Y Table 15, Ref. 6</i> | <i>Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Highways England and SMBC worked closely together during preliminary design to optimise the layout and minimise excessive local diversions. Following statutory consultation Highways England have met with NMU user groups on site to identify issues on the ground and as a consequence an accommodation works bridge over the mainline link road has been provided to maintain connectivity to the public footpath network.</i> |
| <i>Bus stop</i> | <i>Relocation of the bus stop on the A45.</i> | <i>Y</i> | <i>This is noted. The precise location of the bus stops will be subject to discussion with SMBC and Transport for West Midlands.</i> |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | <i>There are still a number of public footpaths severed by the Scheme. There has been no resolution of the loss of M106 Green Man Trail between Birmingham International Station and the footpath network to the south of the A45. The detour of footpath M109 is long. The closure of the 110m segment between St Peters Lane and Catherine de Barnes Lane lacks justification. Severance of M112 would have a serious impact on both local and longer distance pedestrian traffic.</i> | Y | <p><i>These concerns are noted. Highways England has developed a NMU strategy for the area impacted by the Scheme. Highways England and SMBC worked closely together during preliminary design to optimise the layout and minimise excessive local diversions. Following statutory consultation Highways England have met with NMU user groups on site to identify issues on the ground</i></p> <p><i>NMU connectivity for the Bickenhill community is improved with a new pedestrian overbridge across the A45 from Church Lane. East-west connectivity for pedestrians is maintained by a new pedestrian underpass and realigned ramps accessing the Airport Way connector road footpath. A new footpath is provided to the west of the new mainline link road to enable east-west movement via Catherine-de-Barnes bridges, north and south.</i></p> |
| <i>Public footpaths</i> | <i>Despite earlier representations, there are errors in the depicted alignments of several Public Footpaths.</i> | Y | <i>This is noted. The public footpaths alignments have been reviewed and corrected as necessary.</i> |