

# **M54 to M6 Link Road**

## **TR010054**

### **8.8 LIU(C) Draft Statement of Common Ground with Robert Edward Rowe**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 8

November 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

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

---

**8.8 LIU(C) Draft Statement of Common Ground with  
Robert Edward Rowe**

---

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

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
1 (P01)	July 2020	First draft for landowner review
2 (P03)	November 2020	Issue to ExA for Deadline 1

## STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Robert Edward Rowe.**

Signed.....  
Andrew Kelly  
Project Manager  
on behalf of Highways England  
Date: [DATE]

Signed.....  
[NAME]  
[POSITION]  
on behalf of Robert Edward Rowe  
Date: [DATE]

## Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of this document.....	1
1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground .....	1
1.3 Terminology .....	2
<b>2 Record of Engagement .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Issues .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Introduction and General Matters .....	10
3.2 Issues.....	10

### List of Tables

Table 2-1: Record of Engagement.....	3
Table 3-1: Issues .....	10

### List of Appendices

Appendix A: Initials and details of individuals involved

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of an application for a Development Consent Order ('the Application') under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ('PA 2008') for the proposed M54 to M6 Link Road ('the Scheme') made by Highways England Company Limited ('Highways England' or 'HE') to the Secretary of State for Transport ('Secretary of State').
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.
- 1.1.4 **This version of the SoCG has been drafted by Highways England based on correspondence with Mr Rowe during the development of the Scheme and records Highways England's current understanding of the matters agreed and not agreed.**
- 1.1.5 **The first draft was provided to Mr Rowe on 27 July 2020, with a second draft provided on 3 November 2020. The contents of the first draft were discussed but no formal comments were received. Highways England will continue to work to finalise the contents of this SoCG at the earliest opportunity as the Application proceeds through the Examination process.**

## 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the applicant and (2) Robert Edward Rowe ('RRO' or 'Landowner').
- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 The Landowner is the freehold owner of plots 4/14a, 4/14b, 4/14c, 4/14d, 4/14e, 4/14f, 4/14h, 4/14i, 4/15, 6/1b, 6/1c, 6/1d, 6/1e and 6/8 as identified on the Land Plans [AS-007/2.2]. The Scheme changes as accepted by the Examining Authority merge plots 4/14a and 4/14b (with both plots then part of 4/14a). There is therefore no plot 4/14b on the Scheme changes version of the plans [AS-65/2.2].

## 1.3 Terminology

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

DRAFT

## 2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and the Landowner in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1: Record of Engagement**

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
30/11/2017	Meeting with RRo, Amey (TB), District Valuer (SD) and HE (AK)	<p>Discussion on route options.</p> <p>Noted that RRo did not respond to non-statutory consultation held in 2017.</p> <p>RRo was interested in the Scheme options and their impact on current access arrangements.</p> <p>Tower House Farm has multiple businesses/interests on site.</p> <p>Car boot site is located off Mill Lane, operates 52 weeks a year.</p> <p>RRo requested to be consulted with future options regarding junction improvements/access provisions.</p>
08/10/2018	Meeting with RRo, Amey (TB), District Valuer (SD) and HE (AK)	<p>Potential site compound discussed with RRo.</p> <p>TB discussed geotechnical surveys in principle with RRo.</p> <p>RRo outlined potential development of M54 J1 and the impacts it may have to Tower House Farm re visibility / screening / noise.</p> <p>RRo confirmed there are plans for 3 barn conversions to residential at Tower House Farm.</p>
13/02/2019	Meeting with RRo, Amey (TB), District Valuer (SD) and Gateley Hamer (SB)	<p>RRo concerned over proximity of the dumbbell roundabouts by Tower House Farm. RRo concerned it has moved closer to Tower House since last meeting.</p> <p>RRo stated that the access track needs to be extended / re-connected to A460 to ensure</p>

		<p>access is not lost when severing existing access track.</p> <p>Discussion around mineral extraction and whether Hansons have planning permission or not.</p>
23/05/2019	Letter from Gateley Hamer to RRo	S42 consultation pack. Included Land Interest Plans showing areas of land ownership, areas of land that may be required for the Scheme and the Order limits. The draft Environmental Masterplan was also made available online, indicating initial thoughts on areas required for environmental mitigation.
11/09/2019	Meeting with RRo, Amey (TB), District Valuer (SD) and Gateley Hamer (SB)	<p>RRo confirmed that they did not attend the consultation or respond to the S42 Consultation or Land Information Questionnaire due to it being difficult to understand.</p> <p>RRo confirmed he is keeping a diary of time spent on the Scheme for potential compensation claim.</p> <p>RRo concerned about potential access issues south of M54 J1 at Mill Ride Farm due to traffic management on M54 J1.</p> <p>RRo requested gates on the access track and access to Tower House Farm to restrict public / unwanted access.</p> <p>RRo confirmed that until a land agent was appointed, he was the main contact. RRo also confirmed that when (expected) a land agent is appointed he still wants to be told of discussions/involved in all meetings.</p> <p>SD commented if a land agent was appointed, that reasonable fees would be paid by Highways England subject to an agreed scope of instruction.</p>
03/10/2019	Letter from Gateley Hamer to RRo	Land acquisition discussion letter.
04/11/2019	Landowner meeting with project team	<p>RRo raised concerns over the quality of the surface of the yard access track during the construction phase of works. Needs to be HGV appropriate.</p> <p>RRo wishes to remind design team of the size of the vehicles using the access route and yard – HGV sized and articulated.</p>



		<p>RRo requires 24 hours access to yard at all times.</p> <p>RRo requires early visibility and consultation on the Traffic Management Plan to ensure access requirements.</p> <p>RRo reminded Highways England that the access and yard also serves three residential properties with planning for a further three.</p> <p>RRo stated that it is essential that Highways England provide a northern internal agricultural access track which will need to be gated.</p> <p>RRo requires access gates off both roundabouts.</p> <p>RRo stated no land agent instructed or expected to be at this point.</p> <p>RRo stated that there is a large land take (80 acres) of agricultural land taken leaving a small amount of grazing land plus impact upon yard space.</p> <p>RRo stated the proposed Scheme will pose significant operational issues in the yard area due to reducing the turning head of the hard standing.</p> <p>RRo stated that the land benefits from natural spring water and would like assurances that the spring water will not be affected as a result of the Scheme.</p>
11/11/2019	Letter sent from GH to RRo	<p>Supplementary consultation documents arrived with Landowners including revised plans showing areas proposed for permanent and temporary land acquisition. Also included links to revised Environmental Masterplan and General Arrangement Plan to help explain the reasons for land acquisition.</p>

09/12/2019	Supplementary consultation response letter from RRo to project team	<p>RRo concerned regarding the area of land taken from agricultural to environmental mitigation.</p> <p>RRo raised concern with temporary land now being permanently required for the Scheme.</p> <p>RRo raised why other landowners are not as affected in respect to land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>RRo's perception that increased areas of environmental mitigation will attract anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>RRo requests the outcome of the proposals and notes that they want to retain as much land as possible.</p>
24/01/2020	SoCG introductory Letter sent	Introductory SoCG letter addressing concerns raised within latest supplementary consultation response.
09/03/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	S56 – Notifying persons of accepted application.
10/03/2020	Meeting with RRo & JR and Project team: TF & TP	<p>Team provided an update on the Scheme, what has happened since the last meeting and programme going forward - Application submitted, accepted for examination and relevant representations period open.</p> <p>Introduction to a number of changes to RRo's yard on General Arrangement drawings.</p> <p>TF explained that a new forked access had been incorporated into the design to assist with vehicles turning in yard and removing the need for additional turning head in retained land.</p> <p>Project team advised of the inclusion of an internal farm access track to replace the existing and remove the need for farm vehicles to use public highway.</p> <p>RRo highlighted that the access to the yard has to be high quality and fit for fragile motor homes. Unsuitable roads can cause windscreen issues and can damage the vehicles, high degrees of flex.</p>

		<p>RRo has an issue with the project taking productive agricultural land for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>RRo concerned who will manage the land once the land required for the southern site compound (plot 4/14e, 4/14f) has been taken and planted for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>TP explained the land needs to be managed for biodiversity benefit to mitigate the impacts of the construction and operation of the new road.</p> <p>In response to TP's explanation, RRo was concerned that the land will be subject to unsociable and destructive behaviour from motorbikes and quad bike trespassers.</p> <p>RRo feels aggrieved that Hilton Park is dictating the impacts on his land. The project team explained that Hilton Park is a locally designated Historic Landscape area which has to be considered in the assessment and mitigation design.</p> <p>RRo explained there is limited replacement agricultural land in the area.</p> <p>RRo asked why can the land above yard (plot 4/14i) not be used for permanent environmental mitigation? RR would be open to providing thick wooded borders for environmental mitigation and attenuation pond around plot 4/14e and 4/14f and possibly retain a squared off field in the centre.</p> <p>RRo requested that the attenuation pond in plot 4/14f be moved to a more southerly point in the field.</p> <p>RRo wishes to retain as much land as possible. Project team suggests there is potential for land to be returned back to RRo subject to restrictive covenants. TP to review maintenance requirements of mitigation areas.</p> <p>RRo concerned that the Scheme is still taking 50% of the yard space limiting operations in the future.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>RRo concerned that the future maintenance of access road 4/14h will be a liability considering that Hanson Quarries has a right of access.</p> <p>RRo suggested an access route through the woodland at Lower Pool. The project team noted that alternative routes through Hilton Park have been reviewed but would have impacts on the Hilton Park land and Allow Ltd land, affecting woodland, private gardens and historic landscape.</p>
17/04/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	Updated S56 letter and Notice notifying landowners of accepted application and extension of relevant representations period due to Covid19.
19/05/2020	Email from RRo to HE	Summary of previous issues raised at meeting dated 10/03/2020.
27/07/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	SoCG, provisional maintenance schedule & environmental mitigation approach issued.
28/07/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	Notification of change request sent.
21/08/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	Supplementary consultation consultee letter sent.
02/09/2020	Email from SB to JR	<p>Discussion and proposal to relocate environmental mitigation from land on the western side of the new link road, to the eastern side.</p> <p>Proposition for landowner to enter into a legal agreement with Highways England to either sell land by agreement or grant Highways England all necessary rights to deliver the environmental mitigation.</p>
07/09/2020	Email from JR to SB	<p>Confirmation that landowners wish to enter into agreements regarding the eastern land.</p> <p>Landowner puts forward alternative land for environmental mitigation off Mill Lane and offers further details upon request.</p>
07/09/2020	Email from SB to JR	Request for further information and plan for alternative land put forward for environmental mitigation.
08/09/2020	Email from JR to SB	Plan attached and clarification of alternative land offered for environmental mitigation.

09/09/2020	Email from SB to JR	Acknowledgement of plan, question raised of alternative land ownership and location of proposed site compound.
09/09/2020	Email from JR to SB	Confirmation of land ownership for alternative land proposals and confirmation landowner agrees the location of the site compound.
14/09/2020	Email from TF to JR	Email containing proposed draft land plans ahead of landowner meeting.
15/09/2020	Letter from HE to RRo	Follow up letter sent to Landowner concerning land by agreement.
17/09/2020	Meeting at Tower House Farm with landowners: JR & RRo Project team: RRa & TF in person. Conference call attendees: TP, TW, AK & SD	<p>Review of water spring and pump house.</p> <p>Review of revised land plans and identified proposed changes made to reduced land take.</p> <p>RRa highlighted that as a result of design change 6, there is a reduction of land take requirements around the yard area of the land holding.</p> <p>Review of proposed southern compound.</p> <p>Discussion on land access and project commencement on site – Spring 2022.</p> <p>Review of consultation documentation for design change 1 &amp; 6. RRo and JR agreed in principal that the changes are a positive on their holding and are supportive of the proposals.</p> <p>Discussion regarding proposed alternative land put forward for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>Discussion and action for project team to issue draft HoTs.</p> <p>Review of SoCG issued on 27/07/2020.</p>
21/09/2020	Email from RRo to HE	DCO changes consultation response received.

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

### 3 Issues

#### 3.1 Introduction and General Matters

3.1.1 This chapter sets out the 'issues' which are agreed, not agreed, or are under discussion between the Landowner and Highways England.

#### 3.2 Issues

3.2.1 The table below shows those matters which have been agreed or yet to be agreed by the parties, including a reference number for each matter, and the date and method by which it was agreed (if relevant).

**Table 3-1: Issues**

Document/Meeting	Landowner Comment	Highways England Response	Status	Agreement likely (app) <sup>1</sup>	Agreement likely (IP)
Landowner meeting 4th November 2019	Internal northern access track required to remove need for farm vehicles to use public highway.	An internal access track has been added to the design.	Agreed	High	
	Private accesses from roundabout requested to be gated.	Highways England will continue to discuss this with the Landowner during detailed design of the Scheme in late 2020.	Under discussion	High	
	Landowner is concerned the new proposed layout of the yard will create	Highways England has noted the Landowner's concerns and in response has proposed a change to the alignment of the slip road leading on to the M54 eastbound	Under discussion	High	

<sup>1</sup> Indication on likelihood that the matter will be agreed by the close of the Examination period as rate by the applicant (app) and the Interested Party (IP). Dark green = agreed, light green = high likelihood of agreement, orange = medium likelihood of agreement, red = low likelihood of agreement.

	restricted access and operational issues.	<p>to reduce the impact on the yard at Tower House Farm (change 6 in the documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 9 October 2020). The proposed alignment would minimise the amount of required land take in the yard to just the very south-western corner and will retain more of the existing access track along the southern boundary of the yard.</p> <p>Furthermore, Highways England has incorporated a forked access to the Tower House Farm yard to assist with vehicles turning in the yard and removing the need for an additional turning head, this was discussed at a meeting with the landowner on 10/03/2020. This change was incorporated into the design prior to submission of the DCO application in January 2020.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that the impact on the yard has been minimised and HGVs and motorhomes will be able to continue to access the yard with little impact on operations.</p>			
--	---	---	--	--	--



<p>Supplementary Consultation response</p> <p>9th December 2019</p>	<p>Concern regarding the amount of land take required for environmental mitigation at Tower House Farm and land owned at Mill Lane.</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge the Landowner's concern regarding the use of land at Tower House Farm and Mill Lane and that the Scheme design has developed in these areas since initial conversations with the Landowner. During construction of the link road, this area of land will contain a construction compound and will therefore be cleared of vegetation. The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the Scheme in this and other locations along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types. The proposed area in question is adjacent to the habitat loss and therefore well located for ecological mitigation.</p> <p>An environmental technical note was issued to RRo 27/07/2020 detailing the need and rationale for the area, location and type of environmental mitigation to be provided on the Landowner's land.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>Medium</p>	
---	---	---	-------------------------	---------------	--



	<p>Concern if land is taken out of private ownership and is planted with trees, that these areas of land will become a potential nuisance area attracting scrambling and quad biking and this will cause great disturbance for the local residents of Featherstone, Hilton, Shareshill and Saredon.</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the changes in land ownership as a result of the Scheme. It is anticipated that all mitigation areas, created as a result of the construction of the link road, will be fenced off to prevent unauthorised access and minimise the potential for unsociable behaviour.</p>	Under discussion	Medium	
	<p>The environmental mitigation plan dated 8th November 2019 now shows our land you wish to acquire with some trees but majority being grassland.</p> <p>Further concern regarding the increase in permanent land take since the statutory consultation and request for retaining some of the permanent land take areas.</p>	<p>The landscape design must account for habitats lost to the Scheme along with the existing landscape character of the area and so must include a matrix of habitat types, including for the loss of grassland areas. The proposed areas of species rich grassland would be managed to replicate the benefits of hay meadow management. An environmental technical note and draft maintenance schedule was issued to RRo on 27/07/2020 detailing the need for and rationale of the proposed environmental mitigation to be provided.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Landowner and it may be possible to return the land to the Landowner's</p>	Under discussion	Medium	

		ownership, subject to conclusion of an appropriate legal agreement.			
Landowner meeting 10/03/2020 and email received from landowner to Highways England on 19/05/2020	Landowner seeks assurances that the access to Tower House Farm will be high quality and sufficient for large HGV's such as motorhomes	<p>Access and proposed road surfaces will be sufficient for the existing business uses.</p> <p>The Landowner has raised concerns about the fragility of the motorhomes on unsuitable road surfacing. It is therefore proposed that the access is constructed to a suitable standard with surfacing bound material to accommodate the motorhomes.</p> <p>Large articulated vehicles will still be able to access Tower House Farm therefore operations will still be able to continue at the yard.</p> <p>Discussions regarding temporary access during construction are ongoing with the Landowner.</p>	Under discussion	Medium	

<p>Landowner offered alternative land for environmental mitigation (land above yard, plot 4/14i).</p> <p>Landowner would be amenable to providing thick wooded borders for Environmental Mitigation and attenuation pond around plot 4/14e and 4/14f as to retain a squared off field in the centre.</p>	<p>Highways England is considering the possibility of using alternative land and wooded borders in plot 4/14f for environmental mitigation following discussions with the Landowner who wishes to retain as much of the freehold interest of plot 4/14f as possible. The change was not submitted as part of the Scheme changes submitted in October 2020 and is not currently part of the Scheme before the Examining Authority. Notwithstanding this, Highways England is drafting Heads of Terms for a legal agreement which might facilitate this request.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>Medium</p>	
<p>Landowner has requested to retain as much land as possible. If land is required and potentially returned subject to a legal agreement; the landowner would like to know what the maintenance requirements are for land subject to environmental mitigation</p>	<p>HE agrees in principle that the Landowner could retain ownership of land required for environmental mitigation subject to legal agreement requiring retention, management and maintenance in line with the requirements on the DCO if/when made. This is, in principle, acceptable for the mitigation as currently proposed or the alternative location, if taken forward. Maintenance schedules were issued in 27/07/20 as part of an earlier version of the SoCG to provide an indication of potential requirements, but there is the potential for this to change as the Application moves through the DCO process.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>Medium</p>	

	Concern regarding future maintenance of access road (Hanson Quarries also have a right of access)	Highways England is reviewing the land rights and responsibilities.	Under discussion	Medium	
	Landowner advised that Tower House Farm benefits from a natural spring water supply and wants assurances that the supply or quality will not be affected as a result of the proposed scheme	Highways England will endeavour not to affect the existing natural spring water supply and will be consulting with its in-house water specialist team.  Highways England have obtained further information from the Landowner with regard to the location and use of the spring during the meeting on 17/09/2020.	Under discussion	Medium	
	Landowner advises that the proposed attenuation pond is in the wrong location and suggests the pond should be located further south of the current proposed location.	The location of the attenuation pond has been reviewed and Highways England has discussed the conclusions with the landowner.  The current location of the attenuation pond is considered to be the optimal location at the low point in the topography near the outfall, with an existing access that can be utilised from the A460. Highways England has discussed the conclusions with the landowner.	Under discussion	Medium	
	Landowner requires early sight of traffic management plan	An Outline Traffic Management Plan was submitted with the Application [APP-223/7.5] and is available on the Planning	Under discussion	Medium	

		<p>Inspectorate website. A revised version has also been submitted with the Scheme changes on 9 October 2020 [AS-116/7.5] to account for proposed changes to the Scheme design.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan would be produced to discharge Requirement 10 on the draft Order so is unlikely to be finalised until late 2021. Highways England will share its contents with the Landowner prior to submitting to the Secretary of State.</p>			
Response to consultation on proposed DCO changes.	Land take extent and maintenance requirements for existing track alignment shown in change no 2.	Highways England notes the landowners concerns and will continue discussions with the landowner to address these concerns whilst ensuring the access track is available for intended use.	Under discussion	Medium	
	Tower House Farm access requirements during construction	<p>Access to Tower House Farm will be maintained at all times and proposed new road surfaces will be sufficient for the existing business uses.</p> <p>Highways England met with the Landowner on site on 17/09/2020 and agreed that a meeting with the works contractor would be arranged to provide further detail and assurances.</p>	Under discussion	Medium	

	<p>–Evidence required to show change to alignment to reduce the impact on Tower House Farm reflected in change No 6</p> <p>We are very much in agreement to have as little impact on Tower House Farm as possible. We can see from the proposed scheme that the changes to the alignment of the slip road reduce the impact on Tower House Farm on the map. The main concerns to us are that we still could be very badly affected as the red line is still close around the main yard area. We are not fully convinced that we will get as much land back as expected.</p> <p>We feel more evidence is needed to show that we will not be adversely</p>	<p>Following concerns raised by the Landowner in regard to the impact on the yard at Tower House Farm, Highways England have reviewed the design and proposed a change in slip road alignment to minimise the impact in this area. Change 6 has been accepted by the Examining Authority.</p> <p>Revised Land Plans showing the changes to land take requirements have been provided via email and discussed during a meeting on site between Highways England and the Landowner on 17/09/2020. The change will reduce the area to be permanently acquired and reduce the impact on the Landowner as far as possible.</p> <p>Highways England will not have the powers pursuant to the Order to compulsorily acquire land beyond that shown in the Land Plans, even if the area remains within the Order limits (the red line). Therefore, for acquisition it is the land parcels on the Land Plans that are important rather than the Order limits.</p>	Under discussion	High	
--	--	--	------------------	------	--

	affected as we know the red line is the worst-case scenario. We do not want to be in a situation where this will be the case. This concerns us about the amount of yard we will have back after the motorway is completed.				
Landowner meeting 10/03/2020	Land retention and alternative land offered for environmental mitigation – Southern Compound	<p>Highways England welcomes the support from the Landowner for use of its land during construction.</p> <p>RRo suggested during site meeting on 10/03/2020 relocating the environmental mitigation for plots 4/14f to plots 4/14i (i.e. southern alternative mitigation land).</p> <p>Highways England is preparing to issue draft Heads of Terms to explore the potential for the southern alternative mitigation land i.e. to move the southern compound location and environmental mitigation from plot 4/14f to 4/14i. As indicated above, this change was not submitted as part of the Scheme changes submitted in October 2020 and is not currently part of the Scheme before the</p>	Under discussion	Medium	

		Examining Authority. Notwithstanding this, Highways England is agreeable to entering into discussions about how this change might be achieved.			
JR emailed project team 07/09/2020	Land retention and alternative land offered for environmental mitigation – Northern Compound	<p>JR emailed 07/09/2020 offering alternative land outside of the Order limits for environmental mitigation off Mill Lane, adjacent to Hadcroft Farm west of plots 6/1c, 6/1d and 6/1e (referred to as the alternative northern mitigation land).</p> <p>The suggested northern alternative land would remove the need for compulsory acquisition of plots 6/1c, 6/1d and 6/1e. Highways England would still require the aforementioned plots on a temporary basis for use as temporary compound for construction works.</p> <p>Highways England is currently reviewing the Landowners suggested alternative. However, given that this request was received in September 2020 and the land is outside the Order limits, it is unlikely that this change will be capable of being incorporated into the Scheme.</p>	Under discussion	Low	
	From the start, we have been in strong agreement with both site compounds to be on our land. We	Highways England welcomes the support from the Landowner and his daughter.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed



	have no objection for both land parcels to be used as a site compound.				
Articles and Requirements	N/A	Highways England has not received any comments on the Article or Requirements on the draft Order from the Landowner.	Under discussion	High	

DRAFT

## Appendix A - Initials and details of individuals involved

Initials	Name	Role	Organisation
AK	Andrew Kelly	Project Manager	Highways England
HE	Highways England	Referred to when responding through M54 email mailbox/address	Highways England
JH	Jon Harvey	Stakeholder manager	AECOM
JR	Joanne Rowe	Landowner	N/A
RRa	Rob Ramshaw	Project Manager	AECOM
RRo	Robert Rowe	Landowner	N/A
SB	Sam Blaize	Principal Surveyor	Gateley Hamer
SD	Simon Davis	District Valuer	Valuation Office Agency
TP	Tamara Percy	Environment Lead	AECOM
TF	Toby Feirn	Principal Surveyor	Gateley Hamer
TB	Tom Bennett	Previous stakeholder manager	Amey