

APPENDIX B: MEETING NOTES

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Project Number	70001979
Date	06 April 2016
Time	1300
Venue	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Birmingham
Subject	Transport Aspects of Proposals for Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (Land to the South East of A449/A5 Junction)
Client	Four Ashes Ltd
Present	Neil Hansen – Highways England (NH) Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council (SH) Neil Findlay - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff (NF) Ian Fielding - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff (IF)
Apologies	None
Distribution	As above plus: Project Team

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700

www.wspgroup.com
www.pbworld.com

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>1.0 INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p>1.1 The purpose of the meeting was to commence dialogue with both Highways England and Staffordshire County Council, describe the proposals and advise of the work that will be undertaken in order to deal with the transport impacts of the scheme. Whilst initial material had been submitted to the Stakeholders, it was envisaged that a more detailed Scoping Note would be issued which will develop issues arising from the discussions.</p> <p>1.2 NH explained that the role of Highways England was to manage the operation of the Strategic Route Network (SRN) and support sustainable growth whilst following Government Policy.</p> <p>1.3 Previous meetings have been held between the scheme Planning Consultant (Quod), the host Planning Authority, South Staffordshire District Council and Staffordshire County Council as Strategic Planning Authority.</p>	
<p>2.0 SCHEME PROPOSALS & DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER APPLICATION</p> <p>2.1 The outline of the scheme was discussed with the provision of direct rail access, the Intermodal Terminal and supporting B8 warehouse units. It was explained that the full site assembly has yet to be finalised with some further land to the south east that may ultimately form part of the development.</p> <p>2.2 NH was keen to understand the position in terms of consultation with Network Rail and requested details of the contact with whom the Project Team have been discussing matters as it relates to this scheme. * Post Meeting Note – Network Rail Contact is Guy Bates (guy.bates@networkrail.co.uk)</p> <p>2.3 NH is keen to understand the position reached in terms of Rail as it relates to the scheme and the principles of the provision of rail access. It was suggested that WSP PB would keep Highways England appraised in this regard. NH is keen to present a consistent message together with Network Rail.</p> <p>2.4 The requirement for all matters to be agreed prior to the DCO examination was stressed and NH understands the need for this and has also been involved with</p>	<p>WSP PB</p> <p>WSP PB</p>

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
the DCO process for DIRFT.	
2.5 Stage 1 Consultation is due to commence in June 2016 with the DCO Application to be submitted in September 2017.	
3.0 WHAT IS A STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE	
3.1 NF explained the rationale of SRFI and the ethos that these facilities distribute goods to both local and national market places. There is a need for these facilities to be located in proximity to the Motorway Network for onward distribution of goods. There is also recognition that there is a need for a network of SRFI facilities throughout the UK in order to allow them to operate to their full potential and achieve a shift away from road based freight. Whilst the recession slowed growth of SRFI, this is now gaining pace given the expansion of DIRFT and the East Midlands Gateway approval.	
3.2 It was stressed that SRFI have bespoke traffic characteristics and given the presence of Intermodal Terminals differ in terms of their travel characteristics from typical B8 facilities given the greater opportunity for sustainable delivery.	
4.0 PROPOSED FORM OF ACCESS	
4.1 Details of the proposed form of access were presented these being as follows:- → Roundabout access from A5; → Roundabout or signal access from A449 via Gravelly Way; → Roundabout access from Vicarage Road; and → Priority Junction with A5.	
4.2 Discussions were held in respect of each option.	
Roundabout via A5	
4.3 Access from the north is proposed by way of a three arm roundabout with the A5. NH initially felt that the junction maybe too close to M6 junction 12. It was discussed that the proposed junction is over 500 metres from the grade separated junction.	
4.4 The commercial need for good access from this direction was stressed and NH appreciated this when it was explained that some existing junctions may be closed off in the future as part of the site assembly.	
Access from A449	
4.5 The need for a secondary access from this direction via the existing Gravelly Way junction was expressed particularly in order for traffic with a south westerly origin / destination to avoid the Gailey Roundabout. SH advised that SCC are introducing the works to convert the Gravelly Way junction to traffic signal control as part of the Bericote consent and are being delivered by the County on behalf of Highways England. These works would also see Gravelly Way brought up to adoptable highway standard.	
4.6 NH advised that his preference would be for the introduction of a roundabout at this junction.	
Roundabout Access from Vicarage Road	
4.7 NF made the case that there is a need for a permeable site access from operators and there is also the potential land to the south east so therefore an access is desirable from this direction.	
4.8 NH felt that access from this direction could put pressure on the A5 junction with Vicarage Road and this would need to be investigated. Access from this direction should not be the primary access and should accommodate limited HGV traffic.	

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>The restricted height railway bridge was discussed and a clear strategy would be needed to ensure inappropriate vehicles did not travel in this direction.</p>	
<p>A5 Access – Priority Junction</p>	
<p>4.9 NH view is that the number of new junctions to be introduced on the Strategic Highway Network should be limited particularly when available routes would exist – ie the new roundabout.</p>	
<p>4.10 Whilst access from this route is not being ruled out at this stage, a strong case would be needed if this is to be considered further. Showing a net reduction in points of access with the A5 would help with the case.</p>	
<p>4.11 IF suggested whether the closure of adjacent points of access would assist here, particularly if further land could be brought into the site assembly? This would ultimately need to be considered further in due course.</p>	
<p>4.12 SH questioned whether the new roads that would come forward would be offered for adoption? At this stage this is uncertain, but provision of an adopted route might have advantages as it could offer an unsigned alternative route for traffic travelling to/from the south west in order to avoid the Gailey Roundabout. SH was not uncomfortable with the provision of an adopted route provided through the site. NH advised that the A449 is the diversion route for traffic in the event that the M6 was closed.</p>	
<p>4.13 A discussion was also held as to whether Haulage Tractors associated with the development and which are used by operators at SRFI facilities could use the public highway. SH advised that this would require further consideration.</p>	
<p>4.14 SH was keen to understand whether provision would be made for accommodating HGV parking, particularly overnight. There may be a requirement on carriageway HGV parking restrictions if the new road were adopted. Thought may be needed as to whether a specific parking area could be provided for HGV layover given the proximity to the M6.</p>	
<p>4.15 Non car access was discussed and particularly the need to provide connections to existing and proposed cycle facilities. Matters were also discussed in respect of on site cycle facilities and whether on carriageway facilities would suffice? SH view was that this is best provided off carriageway. Shared cycle/footway routes provided with a width of 4 metres provided along one side of the carriageway should be considered, as these have been used successfully elsewhere in the County. Further footway provision should also be allowed for the adjacent side of the carriageway. Thought should also be given to providing connections to the Canal.</p>	
<p>4.16 NF advised that some aspects of the development would need to be gated, particularly the individual units and the Intermodal Terminal. This is needed for security and customs purposes given that some goods would arrive via the continent.</p>	
<p>4.17 In terms of non-car access, it was explained that at this stage, it is unknown whether bus operators would come onto the site. Experience from elsewhere has shown that the provision of specific operator shuttle buses allows bespoke non car travel arrangements to be provided and which can be tailored to employee catchments and worker shift patterns.</p>	
<p>5.0 STRATEGIC MODELS AND COMMITTED DEVELOPMENT</p>	
<p>5.1 NH provided details of the contacts at Highways England who run their models (JMP and Atkins) and suggested contact be made with them to understand what allowances are included within the models and whether they are suitable for use as part of our work.</p>	<p>WSP PB</p>

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
6.0 COMMITTED STRATEGIC ROUTE NETWORK IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES	
6.1 NH suggested that the Highways England website is the best source of information as to the status of current and planned schemes. It was felt that providing the schedule of improvements schemes WSP PB have identified within the Scoping Note would be beneficial.	
6.2 A discussion was also held in respect of the document RIS document "Post 2020: Planning Ahead" which explains the next steps arising from RIS1 as it leads towards RIS2.	
7.0 M54 / M6 / M6 TOLL LINK	
7.1 As the M54 / M6 / M6 Toll link is committed, it was NH's view that capacity assessment work should allow for the inclusion of this scheme.	
7.2 However, as there is always some uncertainty as to the delivery of such schemes and funding, it is NH view that an answer that addresses the position if the scheme is not forthcoming should be provided as part of the assessment work.	
7.3 However reference to this committed scheme should be included in the Scoping Note.	
7.4 In terms of the status of the scheme, whilst it is committed, further work is currently being undertaken in respect of route options and consultation.	
8.0 GAILEY ROUNDABOUT	
8.1 Monies had been set aside from the i54 development to provide for improvements along the A449 corridor. It is also understood that monies have been set aside from the Bericote consent. Whilst some preliminary design work has been undertaken, there is no specific scheme available at this moment in time.	
9.0 YEAR OF SCHEME OPERATION AND REQUIRED ASSESSMENT YEARS	
9.1 NF suggested that a year of opening assessment may not be particularly helpful in respect of this site as it takes some time for SRFI's to mature in terms of floor area occupancy and for full take up of the rail offer. Therefore there would be merit in undertaking a future year assessment sometime post 2030 and which would be more likely to align with the output of strategic traffic models.	
9.2 NH view was that a proposed year of assessment should be provided within the Scoping Note and this could be discussed further in due course.	WSP PB
10.0 PROPOSED METHOD OF ASSESSMENT OF TRIP ATTRACTION	
10.1 NF advised that the approach we would be making for trip attraction of the scheme would be by way of a survey of the DIRFT complex. From reviews of previous work that has been carried out, it is considered that this is the most comparable operation and would present the most up to date data upon which to base an assessment.	
10.2 SH felt that details should be provided within the Scoping Note explaining the comparability of the DIRFT site to WMI, particularly in terms of adjacent population and sources of potential employees.	
10.3 With regard to the distribution of trips, this would be twofold; employee trips would be based upon an assessment of Census Journey to Work data and employee catchments whilst HGV trips would be based upon market forecasts.	
10.4 Essentially, all information in this respect should be included within the Scoping	WSP PB

Meeting Notes

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
Notes where it will be reviewed by Highways England and SCC.	
11.0 KEY JUNCTIONS FOR ASSESSMENT	
11.1 NH felt the key junctions from the Strategic point of view would be M6 Junction 12, i54 junction, Gailey Roundabout and A5 / Vicarage Road. SH was of the view that it would be useful to understand the traffic implications in terms of vehicle changes first before committing to this further.	
11.2 Details of the proposed network for assessment should be included within the Scoping Note.	
12.0 POTENTIAL DE TRUNKING OF A5 / A449	
12.1 NF raised the potential of whether the A5 and A449 would remain as part of the Strategic Route Network in the event that the M54 / M6 / M6 Toll link were to come forward. This matter was raised by Planning Officers of SCC at the meeting held with Quod in March 2016.	
12.2 NH's understanding was that Highways England does not currently envisage de-trunking parts of their current network, particularly as they are now a commercial operation. However NH felt it is worth writing to him on this point so a formal response could be made.	WSP PB
12.3 NF had raised this point as from his perspective it would be useful to understand whether a less onerous approach to access could be taken if the A5 in particular was de-trunked and whether a greater number of access points could thus be introduced.	
12.4 SH was of the view that if the A5 were to become a County road, it would still be a primary route and would more than likely be treated in the same way as if it were still part of the SRN, particularly if there was the opportunity to serve the site via an alternative option.	
13.0 TRAFFIC SURVEY REQUIREMENTS	
13.1 The need to undertake surveys may to some degree be influenced by the availability of model data but any new turning counts should be supplemented by queue length data and validated by weekly counts which could be provided by way of vehicle detection loops.	
14.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
14.1 No items raised	
15.0 NEXT STEPS	
15.1 WSP PB to prepare a Scoping Note for issue to both NH and SH	WSP PB

Job Title	West Midlands Interchange (WMI)
Project Number	70001979
Date	25 July 2016
Time	10.30am
Venue	JMP Birmingham
Subject	Transport Issues
Client	
Present	Neil Hansen – Highways England (HE) Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Lee White - JMP Derek Jones - JMP Kelly Harris – South Staffs Council (SSC) Neil Findlay – WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Ian Fielding - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Apologies	
Distribution	As above plus: Andrew Johnson, SSC; Edward Fox, SSC; Grant Mitchell, SSC; Sarah Clifton, SSC; Morag Thomson, Eversheds; Will Cooper, Savills; Peter Frost, WMI; Philip Stanway, Chetwoods; Matt Royall, Ramboll Environ; Rachel Naylor, Ramboll Environ; Nick Gallop – Intermodality; Linda Taylor, Copper Consultancy; Sue Willcox, Quod; John Rhodes, Quod; Adam Coombs, Quod; James Guthrie, Quod.

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700

www.wsp-pb.com

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
1.0 STAGE 1 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK	
1.1 SCC advised that a Stage 1 Consultation response has been prepared including comments on transport and this was submitted on 22 July 2016. South Staffs have also prepared a response which was submitted on the same date.	
1.2 WSP have received HE's Stage 1 Consultation response and can cover the key issues during the meeting.	
1.3 HE received comments about congestion when M6 closes.	
1.4 Key issues raised by members and residents concern traffic matters as part of the Stage 1 Consultation process.	
1.5 Concern expressed that after East Midlands Gateway that the scheme will not seek to utilise rail freight and would be predominately road based and therefore we should test a 'worst case' of all road. This would not be the case as the Rail Terminal forms the key requirement for the development of the site.	

2.0 TRAFFIC GENERATION

- 2.1 The Applicant and NR will need to agree the availability of train paths in their Statement of Common Ground.
- 2.2 It was suggested that it would be useful to separate traffic generation into rail and non rail related vehicles. WSP advised that it is not appropriate to advise of traffic generation on this basis due to the interdependent operations at an SRFI. WSP|PB
- 2.3 Comprehensive surveys of DIRFT have been completed for a single day for the purposes of determining trip generation. Details will be submitted to HE/SCC on the proposed trip generation approach. This note will include:
- Justification that the survey day reflects typical conditions locally i.e. no problems on local roads & M1
 - Number of trains into/out of DIRFT and
 - Any other factors which may have a bearing on traffic conditions.
- 2.4 JMP suggested that there needs to be a site wide approach to non-car travel opportunities, coordinated bus services and potential vehicle caps.
- 2.5 Initial employee mode share to be based on journey to work data to Four Ashes ward, although consideration should also be given to the approach adopted at i54 and socio economic data. WSP | PB
- 2.6 May need to consider the P&R station and opportunities, although this will probably not be feasible due to rail operations and potential patronage.
- ## 3.0 TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION
- 3.1 WSP will not be using the GB Freight Model as the base data is, reflects the historic national situation and is not refined sufficiently to model the local region.
- 3.2 Distribution will be based upon the approach set out in the Scoping Report, supplemented by relevant information as required.
- 3.3 Not possible to provide specific differentiation between rail and non-rail linked journeys due to the way an SRFI operates. However the distribution of light and heavy vehicles will be considered.
- 3.4 Worth reviewing what i54 did as employee catchments may have similarities; WSP | PB
- 3.5 Traffic distribution will also be guided by socio-economic data and resultant forecast areas of employee origins; WSP | PB
- 3.6 SCC require non-technical summaries for both trip generation and distribution approaches for the benefit of lay people. WSP | PB

4.0 MODELLING

- 4.1 Should be possible to use the Atkins Saturn model for M54/M6 Link to obtain forecast flows.
- 4.2 JMP VISSIM model can be used to assess local area but it may not cover some areas of interest, e.g. A449 through Penkrige, A5 towards Cannock. Supplementary work may be required. The model is only validated for 2015 so future years will need to be produced by JMP.

Indicative Process for Modelling

- Use Saturn 2021 or adjusted to opening year if not the same
- Use Saturn 2036 for future assessment
- WSP to provide scheme flows for Saturn model
- Saturn will produce total with and without scheme flows
- Examine with & without M54/M6 Link in opening year scenario but with M54/M6 Link only in 2036 as there is every expectation it will be complete by then.
- Flows from Saturn to be put into VISSIM model for the same scenarios.

WSP | PB

- 4.3 Models to be run by Atkins and JMP respectively, access to models to be through HE, copied to JMP. WSP|PB to request modelling. WSP | PB

- 4.4 The year of opening scenario will be required, assuming the full quantum of development and the fully operational intermodal terminal. It would be convenient for this to be 2021, otherwise flows could simply be growthed by Temprow for 1 or 2 years.

- 4.5 Any mitigation required on HE routes will be based upon the year of opening assessment.

- 4.6 The 2036 assessment is required for information purposes to determine the "life" of any mitigation schemes.

- 4.7 SCC consider the year of opening assessment is sufficient, main issue is extent of junction network coverage with suitable justification provided.

- 4.8 Saturn model may identify whether any further junctions will be required for inclusion in the highway network assessment.

- 4.9 JMP will check details of existing survey information, WSP thought that some junctions included within the VISSIM model do not include for validated queue lengths. JMP

5.0 COMMITTED DEVELOPMENTS

- 5.1 Committed developments will need to be included in all assessments. The situation is relatively straight forward up to 2021. Thereafter it is complex and fluid.

- 5.2 HE/Atkins to provide details of the committed developments included in the Saturn models. These will need to be reviewed with SSC and Quod, before identifying if any further revisions are necessary.

5.3 Unoccupied areas of i54 need to be accounted for although there is a £2.4m contribution secured from i54 for A449 corridor improvements.

5.4 Unoccupied areas of I54 need to be accounted for although there is a £2.4M contribution secured from I54 for A449 corridor improvements.

5.5 It was agreed that the current Bericote application should be included on the basis that it is likely to receive consent.

WSP | PB

5.6 There is some debate regarding improvements at Gailey Roundabout as a result of the Bericote consent. Junction improvements at Gailey Roundabout are difficult due to land constraints and presence of utilities to the south west of the junction. There is a possibility that there may be a future legal agreement that any new consent at Bericote supersedes the existing consent.

5.7 For modelling and assessment purposes it is probably best to not allow for any works but it maybe other contributions can be used as part of any mitigation works.

6.0 AOB

6.1 The use and status of the access through the site will be reviewed in due course.

WSP | PB

6.2 Any land required for junction improvement mitigation measures needs to be picked up in DCO process.

NEXT MEETING

An invitation will be issued for additional meetings.

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Project Number	70001979
Date	20 September 2016
Time	10.45am
Venue	JMP, Innovation Court, 121 Edmund Street, Birmingham, B3 2HJ
Subject	Trip Generation Methodology
Client	
Present	Neil Hansen – Highways England Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council Marianne Page Wolverhampton City Council Lee White / Derek Jones- JMP Sarah Plant – South Staffs Laura Bazley – WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Ian Fielding - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Apologies	
Distribution	As above

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ
Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700
www.wsp-pb.com

		ACTION
1.0	MATTERS ARISING	
1.1	Scheme update provided in particular clarification that we are working towards scheme fix in October.	
1.2	WSP advised that responses received from the Heritage perspective have identified a requirement to position the A5 access roundabout further to the east in order to provide separation with the Canal. JMP requested receipt of the responses/advice received from this perspective.	WSP PB
1.3	There is frontage access to existing dwellings along the A5 and any betterment that can be provided here would assist, such as the potential for an alternative access to the SCC depot from within the site.	
1.4	Potential Station Drive mitigation – SCC suspect full road closure and width restriction would not find favour locally and instead suggested that thought be given to a width restriction from the A449. WSP suggested the provision of a Vehicle Height Activated Warning sign could also be considered. The key point is to do all practically possible to prevent HGVs actually turning into Station Drive although this could be supplemented by the provision of the turning head shown on the proposals. Road closure/width restrictions would also have implications in terms of traffic routing so were not favoured from the HE perspective.	
1.5	In terms of trip generation, JMP had prepared some initial comments on the Technical Note that had been submitted. It was felt that it would help if a revised TN were submitted together with details of a Change Log in order to demonstrate that comments had been tracked / captured.	WSP PB

		ACTION
1.6	Comments provided were initial questions on approach rather than a detailed review of the calculations undertaken, which would be undertaken upon receipt of the relevant responses.	
1.7	JMP will need clarification on number of trains that visited DIRFT on the day of the surveys.	
1.8	JMP requested that internalisation factors be provided for HGV trips during the peak periods as these may change during other times of the day.	WSP PB
1.9	JMP advised that further information was required on the source of the backloading factors applied. WSP stressed that the factor has been applied elsewhere and taken through the DCO process so has been tested and accepted.	WSP PB
1.10	JMP confirmed that they have submitted details of their understanding of the levels of committed development and planned growth to the Local Planning Authority's of South Staffs, Wolverhampton, Walsall and Cannock. This submission consists of the growth set out in the Atkins Forecasting report that was prepared for the M54/M6/M6 Toll Link. No responses have been received to date.	
1.11	Having reviewed the schedule Quod provided to South Staffs, it was noted by JMP that the sites in Walsall had been omitted however in the view of JMP this should be included in further traffic modelling. Key issue is that Birmingham residential overspill development is pushing circa 40,000 dwellings into areas surrounding the City.	
1.12	Overall, HE expressed a need for there to be an agreed position with the Highway Stakeholders in relation to committed development levels. This is essential so that a robust position can be provided as part of the DCO Examination.	Note
1.13	Issue to be identified is what level of further growth was included within the Atkins modelling for the M54/M6/M6 Toll link which is beyond that set out within the Development Schedule of their Forecasting Report. Understanding this point is key when determining the aspirations of Local Planned Authority growth and the assumptions previously made.	
1.14	WSP advised that there is a time pressure on moving matters forward so it could be that the assessments carried out take account of a position identified at a certain point in time.	
1.15	SCC advised that they are still keen to have a greater understanding in terms of phasing and the trip generation approach for these early stages of the development.	Note
1.16	JMP reiterated that the key test for the HE is the year of opening with full development quantum in place. However this would also need to assume full infrastructure provision. Consequently if there is a need to justify mitigation measures coming forward at later dates due to viability reasons then this would need to be justified with appropriate assessments.	
1.17	Overall, this may require some sensitivity testing of generic B8 trip rates should phasing matters require consideration, particularly prior to the opening of the intermodal terminal. However greater clarity on phasing requirements would dictate these requirements.	

		ACTION
1.18	In terms of the distribution of trips, WSP advised that details of the zoning of trips would be provided however the final routing would be provided by the Strategic Modelling work to be carried out by Atkins.	
1.19	In terms of the distribution of trips, WSP advised that details of the zoning of trips would be provided however the final routing would be provided by the Strategic Modelling work to be carried out by Atkins.	
1.20	In terms of future modelling, the assessment of the Highways England network will be based upon the VISSIM micro simulation modelling and there is no requirement for the use of standalone junction models. However SCC advised that they would anticipate a requirement for standalone junction models to head off any potential concerns. At this stage it is likely that these junctions would be identified after details of the trip assignment has been carried out.	
1.21	Concern was expressed by JMP in respect of the route through the site and whether if this has a public utility/becomes adopted highway, whether it would require its own separate DCO application. In addition, as the route would connect two separate sections of the SRN ie the A5/A449, whether the route should form also form part of the SRN if it has a public utility. WSP view was that it need not be a Trunk Route but would clarify the position further with regards to the DCO position.	WSP PB
1.22	In terms of further meetings, details of these should now be sent out via Outlook invitations and it was felt a further meeting in October would be beneficial post receipt of the updated Trip Generation Methodology Technical Note. These would be issued in due course. The need for these further meetings was stressed in order to maintain momentum on the project.	WSP PB

NEXT MEETING

An invitation will be issued for a further meeting in October to complete the review of the proposed trip generation methodology.

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Project Number	70001979
Date	09 November 2016
Time	10:30am
Venue	WSP 1 Queens Drive, Birmingham B5 4PJ
Subject	Transport Implications- WMI
Present	Neil Hansen – Highways England (HE) Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council (SCC) James Carolle - Kier Derek Jones – JMP Andrew Johnson – South Staffordshire District Council Adam Coombs – Quod Neil Findlay – WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff Ian Fielding – WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff
Apologies	Marianne Page – Wolverhampton City Council
Distribution	As above plus:

Address line 1
Address line 2
Address line 3
Address line 4

Tel: +0 (0) 0000 000 000
Fax: +0 (0) 0000 000 000

www.wsp-pb.com

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
1.1 The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update to the Highway stakeholders on the scheme as a whole and check that from a programme perspective all are moving in the right direction. The meeting would also serve as a forum to advise of any areas that may require resolution as the scheme moves forward.	
1.2 Details of the current scheme were tabled and advised that the scheme that will form the basis of the DCO submission will be the option showing the Intermodal Terminal within the western area of the site. Further work has been carried out in order to provide full 750m long platforms and potential operators are keen on the locational benefits this option gives. Points of access to serve the site remain unchanged from the principles that were set out within the Stage 1 Non Statutory Consultation material albeit that the A5 roundabout access has been relocated 30 metres to the east of its previous location.	
1.3 From the rail perspective, it was clarified that no more than 8 – 10 trains would serve the development. This has implications as the greater the number of trains, the higher the trip generation. Clarification was requested that there would be no more than 10 trains per day. It was raised by WSP that it is unlikely to be physically possible to accommodate greater than 10 trains per day.	WSP
1.4 WSP expressed that they were keen to now agree that all matters confirming committed development can now be agreed.	
1.5 SSDC confirmed that they are content with the inclusion of the further 1100 dwellings which brings the total level of residential development to be included within the 2036 analysis up to 4,900 units. This is in line with their current delivery numbers of circa 250 dwellings per annum.	
1.6 JMP confirmed that they would respond on the latest submission on committed growth.	JMP
1.7 HE confirmed that for committed developments within the study area they required the full development quantum of any site to be included within the strategic traffic model. This is essential given that that it will be necessary to robustly present details of the approach taken to the Examining Authority.	
1.8 HE advised that there is no confirmation of the preferred route of the M54/M6/M6 Toll Link however a further variant has been considered. An announcement is due sometime during November.	
1.9 At this stage it was advised that there is nothing to be gained in respect of assuming a	

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
previous route as part of the strategic traffic modelling as this is likely to prove to be an abortive exercise.	
1.10 SCC advised that Amey are currently preparing a strategic model in order to consider the implications of the redevelopment of the ROF Featherstone site. SCC would check to see if there were any common areas of interest. Contact at SCC is Chris Barker. It is understood that an application is due to be submitted in May 2017.	SCC
1.11 The preferred route to serve ROF Featherstone would be via a new road from the A460.	
1.12 A discussion was held in respect of the options to provide a public route through the site.	
1.13 WSP advised that whilst options are being considered, a key factor is the need to be able to provide an improvement at the Gailey Roundabout and also have the development afford a level of public benefit.	
1.14 In simple terms, there is not much that can be done at Gailey particularly due to the presence of the shop to the south east of the junction.	
1.15 Kier advised that having seen the proposed segregated left turn lane to the rear of the shop, they actually consider this a connector road and they would steer the scheme away from seeking to provide this option on the grounds of a number of departures in design standard, particularly from the perspective of providing an access to the SCC Highway Depot.	
1.16 Whilst thought had been given to the potential relocation of the SCC Highway Depot, Quod advised that this will be difficult within the DCO process.	
1.17 Kier consider that as a principle, the SLTL would be a benefit, however it was understood that this would require the acquisition of the shop.	
1.18 WSP explained the rationale behind the option to provide a private road through the site, particularly from the perspective of allowing Management Companies to be able to move vehicles that park on the carriageway. This would ensure free flow of traffic which may not be possible if the route were adopted and thus on street parking was not as rigorously enforced.	
1.19 WSP sought whether the provision of a private route providing for public access could be considered.	
1.20 HE view was that there is no simple answer to the question and requested a specific brief be provided setting out exactly the position that requires clarification. This should set out a number of parameters and also provide a legal opinion explaining why the proposed position would be acceptable.	WSP
1.21 SSDC advised from their perspective, the A5 access should be located as close as possible to M6 Junction 12 in order to minimise impact on the Canal. WSP view is that the location as shown currently is half way between M6 J12 and Gailey which from the highways perspective presents the best location as it minimises the level of interaction between the three junctions and reduces the potential for traffic queuing through these junctions. This approach also reflects HE advice that the site access should be as far as possible from M6 Junction 12.	
1.22 SCC advised that traffic passing through Penkridge remains an issue and this will need a clear strategy and clarification that the Freight Management Plan will actually enforce traffic to the key routes of the A5/A449/M6.	Note
1.23 Kier advised that a merge / diverge assessment will be required at M6 J12.	Note
1.24 SCC advised that provision for HGV parking is an issue locally. Clarification was provided that the scheme would provide early arrival bays, however this would only be for HGV's associated with the scheme. It is not for the proposal to mitigate existing HGV parking.	
1.25 WSP provided the example at the London Gateway scheme in Thurrock which has a strict enforcement strategy for early / late arrivals. Here, if vehicles arrive greater than 15 minutes either side of their allotted arrival time, then they are turned away. HGV parking restrictions / enforcement in this area combine to make early/late arrivals an unattractive proposition for HGV's at London Gateway. A similar strategy could be considered for MI.	

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
1.26 SCC remains concerned about this point and will require confirmation as to how HGV's will be prevented from parking on local roads.	Note
1.27 In terms of trip generation, JMP require clarification that the number of train paths assumed would not be exceeded and then this can be signed off. It is anticipated that details of the final floor area and thus vehicular trip attraction will be provided in the next iteration of the Technical Note.	WSP
1.28 WSP explained the rationale behind the use of distance as a proxy to determine trip distribution. At the request of JMP, further work has been undertaken using journey time as a deterrence factor, however this is showing a significant draw of workers from Birmingham which has not been forecast by the scheme socio economic advisers. It is considered that these arguments should be brought into the Trip Distribution Technical Note.	WSP
1.29 WSP emphasised the need for consistency between all displaces as part of the DCO submission. The socio economic position is that workers are not forecast to arrive from the Birmingham area.	
1.30 It was suggested that a review of the DIRFT employee catchment could serve as a means to identify the likely catchment of the WMI scheme.	WSP
1.31 SCC felt that from the Travel Plan perspective, work should be done to see whether the existing buses serving i54 could be used to also serve the WMI scheme.	WSP
1.32 WSP felt that this could be done however it will be important to consider journey times from specific areas. The purpose of any new bus service that may be introduced or contributions would be to serve the WMI scheme. Joining forces with another operators bus service may result in increased journey times which may be a dissuasive factor for those who may otherwise choose to travel to WMI by bus if there were a shorter journey time.	
1.33 SCC felt that it would be worth carrying out follow up traffic surveys in the area surrounding the site in order to verify the traffic data obtained thus far. This was noted.	
1.34 The next meeting is schedule for 19 December 2016 which WSP are keen to keep in the diary in order to provide updates and maintain momentum.	

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for 7th December 2016 which WSP are keen to keep in the diary in order to provide updates and maintain momentum.

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Project Number	70001979
Date	19 December 2016
Time	2pm
Venue	WSP 1 Queens Drive, Birmingham B5 4PJ
Subject	Transport Implications
Present	Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council Lee White - JMP Rob Price - Kier Neil Findlay – WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Ian Fielding - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Apologies	Neil Hansen – Highways England Marianne Page - Wolverhampton City Council Andrew Johnson – South Staffs Peter Frost - Kilbride
Distribution	As above:

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700

www.wsp-pb.com

		ACTION
1.0	MATTERS ARISING	
1.1	Kier confirmed that their role concerned the review and approval of the detailed technical aspects of the highways elements of the proposal where it affects Highways England's SRN.	
1.2	From the previous meeting, clarification is awaited from SCC as to the traffic that should be included in respect of ROF Featherstone following further Saturn assessment work that has been carried out by the developer of the site. This is required for the 2036 modelling only. SCC have previously requested this. WSP reiterated their position that in the absence of detailed output from SCC in respect of ROF Featherstone, then it would be necessary to proceed on the basis of the position previously outlined. JMP to review.	JMP
1.3	However 2036 modelling on hold due to delay in Preferred Route Announcement for M54/M6/M6 Toll link.	
1.4	As the scheme moves forward towards Stage 2 Statutory Consultation (S2SC), legal advice received is that it is not necessary to provide details of the 2036 position as there is a justification for the omission, notably the absence of the referred route for M54/M6/M6 Toll link. The 2036 analysis can follow later.	Note
1.5	JMP's understanding is that the programme of the Route is roughly similar to that of WMI. It was felt that it would be worth exchanging correspondence detailing the absence of addressing the route within the S2SC process. WSP agreed but felt that this correspondence would best be submitted to PINS, cc'd to HE.	WSP/JMP
1.6	JMP reiterated the need to wait for the preferred route given that this will have a bearing on the modelling outcome, particularly where different options would have different route	Note

		ACTION
	connections to the SRN.	
1.7	WSP advised that the scheme is being progressed on the basis of the layout which provides the Intermodal Terminal within the western part of the site. From an operators' perspective, this encourages a division between the warehouse operators which is advantageous operationally, but which is also close enough to allow interaction between the various end users.	
1.8	JMP advised that they are interested in the A5 / Vicarage Road junction and this should be shown on all plans, particularly as it might be seen as an alternative route, particular towards land to the south. Consideration and detail of junction operation should also be provided for internal junctions located in proximity to the A449.	Note
1.9	WSP also advised that the section of Gravelly Way that will be introduced as an adopted route to serve Bericote would need to be stopped up as part of the scheme given the new route that would be introduced into the site.	Note
1.10	In respect of development trip distribution, JMP advised they are generally content with the approach taken, but just require some clarification on whether the calculations assume an average of the Google Maps journey times and TomTom data. WSP confirmed that the approach remains to use the data obtained from Google maps journey times, but which has been verified by the TomTom data. JMP's preference was that their Technical Note reviewing this matter be issued and WSP respond by e-mail to this as appropriate.	
1.11	SCC receive concerns at the local level as to the anticipated forecast of new trips to local roads and that information should be presented in this regard identifying details of traffic changes on adjacent County roads.	Note
1.12	WSP advised of ongoing Saturn modelling work where details of the 2021 Do Minimum flows have now been received from Atkins. These are currently being reviewed by WSP and will be checked, then provided to JMP for input to the VISSIM model. JMP require a visible process for the issue of information in order to ensure it can be demonstrated that data received is satisfactory for assessment purposes. JMP suggested that information be sent to Neil Hansen and copied to JMP for inclusion into ongoing modelling work.	Note
1.13	WSP confirmed that at this stage the "with development" scenarios do not allow for existing background traffic to be able to pass through the site. Therefore all existing traffic traveling north along the A449 and then east along the A5 (and vice versa) would continue to use Gailey Roundabout under this assessment scenario. Once details are received from Atkins of the strategic model output for this scenario, a simple Junctions 8 analysis will be undertaken in order to understand whether it will be necessary to route traffic through the development in order to relieve pressure at Gailey.	

- 1.14 In respect of the route through the site, the response from Neil Hansen dated 14 December 2016 that confirmed that this could be provided, but would be best served as an adopted route was noted. JMP confirmed that there is no policy reason why the route should not be provided.
- WSP will review the matter of the nature of the route with the Project Team when results of the appropriate Saturn outputs have been received. Following this, the proposed approach to the route through the site will be advised to Highway Stakeholders and the next steps identified. WSP advised that the intention would be to provide a DMRB compliant route that has the following design parameters:
- 30 mph route
 - 7.3m carriageway
 - DMRB compliant roundabouts
 - 3 m wide cycle footway
 - 0.5m verge
 - Crossing points as necessary
- 1.15 SCC advised that they had no objection to the provision of an adopted route through the site and SCC to confirm above standards would be acceptable if the road was adopted by them.
- 1.16 In respect of the development site road which links to the eastern part of the scheme and towards Vicarage Road, it was clarified that this would remain in private ownership. SCC view was that this route should be provided to adoptable standards. WSP view was that this would be checked but that as the route would be private, it may not be absolutely necessary to provide a fully DMRB compliant route at all parts of the site. SCC concern was that there may be a desire to seek future adoption of the eastern development road.
- 1.17 In terms of accessibility, JMP's view was that much of the site is some way from the bus services that pass along the A449. Consideration will need to be given to provision of bespoke services in order to reach the internal parts of the site. WSP advised of emerging discussions with Wolverhampton in this regard, particularly given the level of anticipated employee draw from this area. I54 would provide an example.
- 1.18 SCC would require details of how the early phases of the scheme are treated in terms of public transport. WSP view was that personalised travel planning would have a significant role to play.
- 1.19 In terms of DCO submission details, it was advised that HE will be concerned in respect of deliverability of any highway works that were carried out on the SRN. Consideration will be needed in respect of asset protection and drainage. This has particular reference to Circular 02/13 page 49 & page 50 and the physical impact on the HE network.
- 1.20 SCC advised that in respect of the route through the site, any highway drainage will not be able to connect to a private water system.
- 1.21 The view was that relatively simple general arrangement drawings were suitable for S2SC. More engineering detail, such as drainage strategy and vertical profiles would be required for DCO submission. It was suggested that the Project Engineers would benefit from early discussions with Kier in respect of the requirements for this process. This could take place during the S2SC. It is essential to understand the next stage of detail up to DCO submission. It is considered by JMP and Kier that this exercise is required in order to demonstrate the deliverability of the DCO submission.
- 1.22 SCC advised that they now have a SPG that deals with drainage matters.

WSP/SCC

SCC

WSP

Note

		ACTION
1.23	In terms of matters moving forward, JMP advised they would respond on the request for clarity on the geometric parameters adopted for the assessment of Gailey Roundabout.	
1.24	WSP would send out suggested dates for meetings moving forward into 2017. It was agreed that it would be preferential to have dates in the diary in order to maintain momentum.	WSP

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	WMI
Project Number	70001979
Date	08 February 2017
Time	10.30am
Venue	WSP Birmingham Offices
Subject	WMI Highways & Transportation Meeting
Client	
Present	Neil Hansen – Highways England Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council Marianne Page – Wolverhampton County Council Lee White – Systra Andy Johnson – South Staffordshire County Council James Guthrie – Quod Ian Fielding – WSP PB Neil Findlay – WSP PB
Apologies	apologies
Distribution	As above plus:

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700

www.wsp-pb.com

		ACTION
1.0	MATTERS ARISING	
1.1	A scheme update was presented, advising that the route through the site between the A449 and A5 together with the route towards Vicarage Road have been reviewed against DMRB requirements. Whilst it has is not been agreed with the project team as to whether the route through the site will be offered as an adopted signed route, changes to the route towards Vicarage Road are currently been discussed with the project team in order to comply with DMRB as requested by SCC.	
1.2	Systra suggested that it is worth having drawings in a format that deals with both HE and SCC requirements in order to avoid having replicated drawings.	Note
1.3	WSP advised of current local level mitigation to be promoted which consists of changing Crateford Lane to one way only (west to east bound) and the provision of a right turn ban from the A449 to Station Drive. Changing Crateford Lane to one way only is considered advantageous as it would remove the possibility of drivers travelling northbound along the A449 turning left in order to bypass Gailey.	
1.4	The ban of the right turn at Station Drive would be required primarily in order to mitigate traffic increases due to worker travelling under the restricted height bridge and along Vicarage Road. Those movements who do need to use Station Drive for access rather than to bypass Gailey could u turn at the proposed site access roundabout.	
1.5	Systra expressed that banning the right turn at Station Drive may well strengthen the case for the provision of the signed route through the site. At present, Gailey could not cope with additional u turn turning movements who wish to travel back to Station Drive. A Technical Note should be prepared investigating improvements options that have been considered so that an approach can be agreed. SCC concerned about large vehicles but banning the right turn could be enforced by physical alterations rather than simply	Note / WSP

		ACTION
	providing a signed ban. This would require a TRO that would form part of the DCO application that would ultimately need to be considered during the DCO examination. U turn movements at the A449 site access would be need to be assessed.	
1.6	HE requested details of Stage 2 Consultation timescales. WSP advised that this is scheduled for the Spring but is very much dependent on traffic modelling outcomes. Systra advised that the approach to how Station Drive is progressed needs to be set out. WSP should also be aware that it is very unlikely that the M54/M6/M6 Toll link will be in place before WMI.	Note
1.7	In terms of modelling, it was agreed that the traffic flows obtained from the SATURN model, particularly at Gailey are not representative and these do not correlate with the South Staffs VISSIM model. Investigations have identified that mitigation is included with the SATURN model for the A449 corridor between M54 J2 and Gailey. HE advised that there are no committed schemes for the A449, although it is now understood that monies from i54 S106 (£2.4m) were included within the model. Kier are looking at what can be done along this corridor but these are focused on safety improvements. The £2.4m needs to be either spent or committed by February 2019.	Note
1.8	Overall, WSP should revert back to Atkins advising that all mitigation measures included within the SATURN model along the A449 corridor between M54 J2 and Gailey should not be included as there are no committed schemes. Essentially the SATURN model needs to reflect the existing situation in terms of traffic arrangements along this route.	WSP
1.9	In terms of model access, WSP have requested that HE confirm that Systra be provided with access to the SATURN model in order to allow the relevant data to be incorporated to the VISSIM model. This would be the most expeditious approach which is a key issue for the project programme. Neil Hansen suggested sending an e-mail to him explicitly stating that delays to the project are occurring because of the uncertainty over model access and this issue is holding up further traffic modelling. NH understood that the concern from the model team is that having access may impact on options/outcomes for the M54/M6/M6 Toll link road. WSP clarified that the purpose of having access to the model is to inform the VISSIM micro simulation process and to allow this to take place as efficiently as possible as it relates to the WMI scheme only. This would be stated within the email to NH. It would only be Systra who had access to the model. POST MEETING NOTE AUTHORISATION RECEIVED THAT SYSTRA CAN ACCESS SATURN MODEL	
1.10	WSP ran through their current thoughts in terms of public transport provision. These currently seek the provision of targeted shuttle bus services between key areas of future worker demand where these are provided at times that reflect the shift start/finish patterns.	
1.11	Public services should be considered in parallel. For example the i54 route linking Cannock is now approaching a self-sustaining service and WMI could link into these services? WSP view was that care is needed to ensure that WMI staff do not face a lengthy journey times that ultimately precludes use of non-car modes. The view of WCC is that any public transport strategy should be flexible in order to allow it to respond to changes that may arise. It was suggested that the Public Transport Strategy be prepared in order to allow comments to be obtained from Stakeholders. WCC are happy to share the lessons learned from i54.	
1.12	The Travel Plan should also focus on reducing single occupancy vehicle journeys.	
1.13	In terms of improvements to cycle routes, provision can be made for a 3.0m shared use cycle route alongside the southbound carriageway of the A449 between Gailey and along the site frontage. Where possible, a similar facility can be provided alongside the westbound carriageway of the A5 up to the site access roundabout. SCC also suggested consideration be given to cycle access via the canal and improvements to surfacing. WSP	WSP

		ACTION
	to check the position with the project team. However the canal towpath between Wolverhampton and i54 has been improved and SCC see this as a key route particularly for those who wish to avoid cycling near traffic. Provision of cycle facilities such as changing areas, clothes drying areas, showers and secure parking provided in appropriate locations should be provided.	
1.14	HE / Systra expressed the view that they will require a worst case assessment of the operation of the highway network that does not allow for any modal shift.	WSP
1.15	The access road options for ROF Featherstone were discussed and WSP would need to monitor this given that the preferred option may have a bearing on the 2036 modelling.	Note
1.16	Systra would provide details of typical conditions required in relation to highway works. Anticipated that any works that would form part of any s278 works would also need to be conditioned. Ideally, there would be a single s278 between the developer, HE and SCC.	Systra
1.17	SDDC advised that providing details of phasing is a good story to tell the public what will happen and when.	
1.18	In respect of the Freight Forum, SH would see if he could find anything more. Need to be aware that this may be something raised by locals politically rather than a specific forum where operators try and work together for a mutual benefit from an operational perspective.	SCC
1.19	Systra requested confirmation in respect of rail paths as this is inked to the approach to trip generation. WSP to chase for this response from Intermodality.	WSP

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Project Number	70001979
Date	12 April 2017
Time	1030am
Venue	Systra, Birmingham
Subject	Transport Implications
Client	
Present	Lee White / Derek Jones- SYSTRA Simon Hawe Staffordshire County Council Andy Johnson – South Staffs Neil Findlay – WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Ian Fielding - WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Apologies	Neil Hansen – HE Marianne Page - Wolverhampton City Council
Distribution	As above plus: WMI Project Team

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0) 1256 318 800
Fax: +44 (0) 1256 318 700

www.wsp-pb.com

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>1.0 SCHEME UPDATE</p> <p>1.1 NH was unable to attend the meeting. Systra could provide their views on behalf of HE but these would need to be subject to confirmation by HE.</p> <p>1.2 Main work since the last meeting (8 February 2017) has concerned the traffic modelling which has resulted in the Stage 2 Consultation being delayed slightly.</p> <p>1.3 Work has also been carried out in respect of public transport strategy and opportunities to improve accessibility to the site for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>1.4 In relation to the access to the intermodal terminal at the western part of the site, it is being considered whether there may be the opportunity to switch the access arrangements with the entrance to unit 1030. The reason for this is to provide more HGV parking for the intermodal terminal. This would see the access for the intermodal terminal being the first junction on the link road after the A449 roundabout. This change has yet to be finalised.</p> <p>1.5 LW noted that predominant HGV movements from the A449 would be from the south and any further HGV parking welcomed. AJ agreed that greater HGV parking would be seen as positive. LW asked whether a four arm signal controlled junction could be provided here, but WSP view is that this is not warranted in terms of traffic flow.</p> <p>1.6 SH requested provision of details of traffic flows at the junction and capacity analysis of junction in order to form a view. This is important if the route through will be adopted.</p>	WSP

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>1.7 In terms of Public Transport, SH has been in discussion with his colleague Geoff Barker. There is now a preference for s106 agreements to guarantee a service frequency rather than simply funding. NF was unsure how this could be implemented in terms of a commitment without any end date, also how does it allow for changes in circumstances, such as the bus operator / county changing a service. SH to send through examples of s106 dealing with this.</p>	SCC
2.0 TRAFFIC MODELLING	
<p>2.1 WSP confirmed that the SATURN strategic modelling had been amended to remove the mitigation allowances included along the A449 which are not committed. Resultant matrices incorporated into South Staffordshire VISSIM model by Systra acting on behalf of WSP.</p>	
<p>2.2 The model includes for the provision of the route through the site between A5 and A449 as being a publicly signed route, with banning the A449 right turn into Station Drive.</p>	
<p>2.3 WSP confirmed that a Validation Note setting out the process adopted for the VISSIM modelling has been received and passed for approval by HE/Systra. It was understood that it would not be necessary to pass to AECOM for further review. The technical review would be with Systra, but at a different office. HE will need to sign off any comment.</p>	HE/Systra
<p>2.4 WSP also confirmed that a VISSIM results document had been received and passed to HE/Systra. Systra will need to confirm acceptance of the modelling itself. WSP will need to present the interpretation of the agreed model for HE/Systra to ultimately agree the outcomes. From an initial review, Systra think that development traffic using the M6 J12 slip roads are low but will continue to review results.</p>	Systra
<p>2.5 WSP will prepare a turning movement diagram clarifying traffic movements to assist this process.</p>	WSP
<p>2.6 In due course it will be advantageous to produce videos of the operation of the various junctions and their interaction.</p>	WSP
<p>2.7 WSP ran through their initial comments on the results. This review was based upon a comparison of queue lengths obtained from the VISSIM model results at the 2021 Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios. These were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Gailey Roundabout is no worse than the 2021 Do Minimum, → The site access junctions operate satisfactorily with no queuing back to M6 J12. → J12 continues to operate satisfactorily → Station Drive does show an increase in queue length with the scheme but the review of the micro simulation output does show that queuing traffic generally disperses during the available green time. 	
<p>2.8 DJ asked what was the influence of the route into the site from Vicarage Road. WSP confirmed that this is not modelled as a publically signed route but it is an access for development trips. If public vehicles did use the unsigned private route then in traffic terms this is only likely to be a better case as they would be using this route because there was a benefit. Reviews have suggested that the VISSIM model is bringing in development traffic from the east into the site from this direction.</p>	
<p>2.9 LW suggested that in due course some sensitivity testing of the influence of this route may be useful, for example understanding the position if the route were theoretically severed or made available for use by the public.</p>	

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>2.10 SH made the point that consideration should be given to traffic that may use Straight Mile from the A5 at Hatherton. This area is sensitive politically. Details are to be provided where possible by way of the traffic flow turning diagrams.</p>	WSP
<p>2.11 WSP sought confirmation on how HE & SCC would want to assess the WMI impact. For the SRN, LW view is that the performance of the network will be on the basis of a number of variables. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety – related to any queueing of traffic on the SRN mainline or slip roads. ▪ Free flow of traffic - is there any adverse impact on journey times? ▪ Design – are any alterations proposed to the SRN acceptable? <p>The above points are essentially Highways England's assessment criteria.</p>	WSP
<p>2.12 As well as the local SRN junctions Systra suggested that the operation of M54 J2 should be reviewed.</p>	WSP
<p>2.13 M6 J13 should not be a concern as in normal circumstances all northbound traffic will use J12. SH stated that an HGV routing strategy would be needed and WSP confirmed this will be included. A key point is that it is unlikely that there will need to be other works to the M6 in the vicinity of the site in the short term due to the schemes that were introduced last year.</p>	WSP
<p>2.14 Ultimately, a document will be prepared by WSP setting out the position in terms of the modelling output from VISSIM. However, Systra would need to complete their review first.</p>	WSP
<p>2.15 WSP view is that this is important as ultimately there will be a need for separate Statements of Common Ground on highway matters with both HE and SCC. LW would seek clarity from HE whether a joint technical response with SCC would be agreeable and which could be appended to the SoCG.</p>	Systra
<p>2.16 DJ requested final clarification be provided of trip generation used for the assessment. WSP advised that this had been provided to LW/DJ modelling colleagues but agreed that updated technical notes will be provided for the actual numbers used for the modelling, based on the agreed technical notes on the methodology.</p>	WSP
<p>3.0 HIGHWAY WORKS - GENERAL ARRANGEMENT DRAWINGS</p>	
<p>3.1 Systra will provide a copy of HE's requirements in terms of detail for inclusion on DCO drawings.</p>	Systra
<p>3.2 LW suggested sending through details of the General Arrangement drawings so that the concepts can be considered further. LW does not want us to submit details of drawings for Stage 2 Consultation that they have not considered.</p>	WSP
<p>It was also recommended that prior to DCO submission, consideration is given to the following aspects</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical implications • Utility diversions • Lighting provision 	
<p>LW stressed it is important to consider these aspects given the difficulties in amending material submitted under the DCO process.</p>	

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<p>3.3 From SCC point of view, they do charge for Technical Reviews relating to highway works. Details of these charges were requested. CAD files of the drawings can be provided.</p>	SCC
<p>4.0 NON CAR TRAVEL & PUBLIC TRANSPORT STRATEGY</p>	
<p>4.1 WSP outlined their proposals for the provision of an improvement to the existing cycleway / footway along the A449 between Gailey and Station Drive. LW suggested investigating the presence of any services along this corridor but agreed to share the information Systra hold on this point. Other pedestrian and cycle improvements were discussed, these being the provision of an improved route along the A5 towards the site access together with a new route along Vicarage Road.</p>	Systra
<p>4.2 LW advised that it was worth checking the position in terms of DMRB compliance of the crossing of the A5 by the site access.</p>	WSP
<p>4.3 Thought will be needed to preventing HGV parking on verges/footways, the provision of a "Clearway" and design should be considered. WSP advised that parking restrictions will be promoted along the route through the site.</p>	
<p>4.4 The canal will be promoted as a secondary route for pedestrians and cyclists. Clarification is awaited from the Canal and Rivers Trust as to the approach to any improvements that could be made to the tow path to facilitate pedestrian/cycle movement. However, consideration of this approach is also required from the heritage perspective.</p>	
<p>4.5 For public transport, the current proposal is twofold; seeking the implementation of a public bus and a shuttle bus service. The improvements to the public bus service focus on the provision of an enhanced offer of the 54 service which would divert into the site. For shuttle buses the initial proposal would seek to provide connections between the key areas in terms of workers, these being Wolverhampton, Walsall and Cannock. The purpose of the shuttle bus is to keep the strategy flexible at this stage, for example there may be a desire to provide connections with Penkrige. Whilst South Staffs is a key area for future employees, the population is more dispersed which has implications in terms of providing suitable collection points. However, the Travel Plan would have an emphasis on personalised travel planning in order to facilitate non car travel.</p>	
<p>4.6 Comments was made by SCC and WCC as to whether the existing Cannock service with i54 could be utilised to serve WMI. The position is that this service is currently about to cease due to lack of patronage. Diverting the service into WMI is only likely to extend journey times with the likelihood that this makes the service even less attractive to existing users. Consequently, utilising this service has not been considered further.</p>	
<p>5.0 I54 CONTRIBUTIONS</p>	
<p>5.1 LW explained that time limits do apply to the contributions made by i54 to the A449 corridor. These time limits are rapidly approaching. To date, no scheme has been identified that provides a meaningful improvement at Gailey which the i54 monies could deliver. AJ/LW will confirm time limits of the i54 pay back clauses.</p>	SSDC/Systra

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
6.0 ROAD SAFETY AUDITS	
6.1 Stage 1 Road Safety Audits will be required for any alterations to the SRN. These will also be required for any alterations or new SCC routes. Non-Motorised Audits (NMA Audits) will be required for alterations to the SRN.	
6.2 HE do not have a list of approved Auditors, but would require details of the CV's of the proposed audit team, together with details of who the Principle Designer would be from the CDM perspective.	WSP
7.0 FEATHERSTONE	
7.1 No update in terms of traffic forecasts but AJ is aware that the applicant is seeking to submit in the summer in tandem with the submission of SSDC Site Allocations.	
8.0 TYPICAL HIGHWAY CONDITIONS	
8.1 LW will send these through on a without prejudice basis.	Systra

NEXT MEETING

10 May 2017 at WSP Birmingham (Meeting of 26 April is cancelled)



MEETING NOTES

JOB TITLE	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
PROJECT NUMBER	70001979
DATE	17 May 2017
TIME	10.30am
VENUE	Systra.Birmingham
SUBJECT	Transport Implications, WMI
CLIENT	Four Ashes Ltd
PRESENT	Neil Hansen, Highways England; Derek Jones, Systra; Simon Hawe, Staffordshire CC; James Carroll, Kier, Kristie Goffe, Kier, Ian Fielding, WSP, Anthony Tugwell, Vectos
APOLOGIES	None
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus: Lee White, Systra, Andrew Johnson, South Staffs, Marianne Page, Wolverhampton City Council, WMI project Team

MATTERS ARISING

ACTION

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
1.0 SCHEME UPDATE	
1.1 IF provided a scheme update and for the benefit of NH advised of the changes to the scheme that now see the access to the multi modal terminal provided as the first development access after the junction with the A449. The reason for the change to the access was to allow a greater level of HGV parking to be provided for the Intermodal terminal. This facility is to serve the Intermodal terminal only and not provide a wider HGV parking offer. Clarification provided that trip generation reflects provision of 10 trains per day within the intermodal terminal as advised by Rail Consultant and each train would generate 41 HGV trips. Also clarified that provision of HGV parking within the intermodal terminal is provided for approximately 70 vehicles.	
1.2 JC requested more clarification as to how the intermodal terminal operates and layover times for vehicles. Information should be provided in respect of the internal terminal road layout for review to demonstrate that HGV's can freely enter the terminal area therefore not negatively impacting on the surrounding highway. Swept path analysis of HGV movements should be provided to demonstrate HGV's can manoeuvre adequately within the proposed road layout. Modelling of the Ghost Right Turn facility and Proposed A449 roundabout must be provided to gain an operational understanding of how this part of the proposed network would operate at a worst case scenario ,when a train load arrives during the peak period.	WSP
1.3 NH raised issue of removal of A5 layby in order to deliver the A5 access. This will need to be addressed. If it is not part of the proposals to re-provide, then a case would need to be made accordingly. It was suggested that there is merit in conducting a survey of the usage of the layby. If it is removed, a specific order would be needed.	

MEETING NOTES

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
1.4 HE are currently investigating further layby provision along the A449 corridor and this is work in progress. Anticipated date of this work being completed is within the next two months. NH promised to provide.	Highways England
2.0 VISSIM MODELLING AND OUTPUT INCLUDING JOURNEY TIMES AND TURNING MOVEMENTS	
2.1 Details of the revised VISSIM had been provided to highway stakeholders during w/c 8 May. The latest iteration of the VISSIM model incorporated comments that had been made by the WSP modelling team in terms of the number of runs of the model which are needed to stabilise the assessment. The latest model also reflects the generalised distribution to ensure that the development traffic favours usage of the SRN.	
2.2 Details of the approach taken are provided within the Systra modelling Results Technical Note which WSP forwarded on 12 May. This is with DJ to review.	
2.3 NH questioned the absence of the non-adopted road connecting to Vicarage Road from the VISSIM model. In NH view, the Inspector at the DCO Examination would want to understand the influence of this route on the future operation of the highway network. WSP response is that as this is not a signed public route, it could be closed at any time to public traffic so it has not been included within the model. This was understood however as it will be available for much of the time, HE require an understanding of the influence of this infrastructure upon the SRN in the event that it is available for use and consequently requested that it be included in a further model run in order to understand its implications.	WSP
2.4 Kier required details of why this route is not to be adopted. IF/AT advised that different classes of vehicle would need to use this route plus the developer would want to retain control in terms of on street parking and have the ability to manage the usage, particularly as it will serve the majority of development floor space. Experiences from the commercial perspective at other sites such as Hams Hall have influenced this requirement. Kier understood this, but requested further clarity as to the drivers as to why it is proposed to not be offered for adoption.	
2.5 If a further model is run, then this would also provide the opportunity to re-assess the access arrangements for the Inter Modal Terminal and report on any queues shown from these points of access.	WSP
2.6 WSP to provide a response to questions raised by review of Forecasting Approach for issue to Systra. WSP to provide a copy of the VISSIM model so that outputs can be verified together with our interpretation.	WSP
2.7 SH indicated that at a meeting with South Staffs / Staffs CC Officers of 16 May, it was requested that an HGV Routing Plan be in place to ensure HGV's from WMI do not travel through Penkridge. Therefore the limited number of scheme HGV's would need to be reassigned to the SRN and would also need to be incorporated into a further VISSIM model run.	
2.8 A discussion was held in terms of vehicle flows using M6 Junction 12 slips. Generally, these peak hour flows are in the order of 600 – 700 vehicles per hour. Kier requested that an assessment of the merge / diverge arrangements be carried out. NH felt this would be useful to clarify the suitability of the existing configuration to accommodate traffic changes sooner rather than later and provide an early indication of any problems.	WSP
3.0 DCO SUBMISSION DRAWINGS	
3.1 NH was keen to understand the DCO programme from the developers perspective. He is keen that he does not want HE to hold up the process, particularly in terms of dealing with any design departures and the technical approval process. What is the period between the DCO submission and the examination? NH wants to know specific milestones so that if there is a requirement to programme HE involvement at specific times then this can be dealt with.	
3.2 Not anticipated that there is a requirement from the developers perspective to deal	WSP

MEETING NOTES

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
with the technical approval process of the highway works as part of the DCO submission. AT advised that the DIRFT DCO submission did not deal with the technical approvals of the highway works and it was picked up at a later date. WSP to confirm approach.	
3.3 However, details of the signage strategy for WMI should be dealt with now.	
3.4 Both HE and SCC are interested in the Phasing of the scheme and will need evidence on this so that they can be made aware of what infrastructure is required when and also the influence of early development plots that are to be provided. WSP to provide further information. Phasing and delivery of infrastructure is important in terms of any approvals for departures in design standard, as these only have a limited "shelf life".	WSP
3.5 Kier interested in whether any specific end users have been identified? WSP clarified not at this stage, but that parameter plans will accompany the submission together with a Masterplan indicating how the scheme could be delivered.	
3.6 In terms of the red line, NH was of the view that it is worth considering including all highway land where works are proposed to deliver alterations. This will avoid potential issues later. Where signage is referred to as part of the DCO submission then its location should form part of the DCO red line.	Note
4.0 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT DRAWINGS	
4.1 Kier have conducted a preliminary design review of the General Arrangement drawings in order to assess general compliance with DMRB. A note has been prepared which Kier will share.	Kier
4.2 Kier requested the entry angle and radius at the Crateford Lane arm of the A449 access junction be reviewed. In respect of the A449 north arm of the junction, the exit radius should be reviewed. The location of the bus stops are shown to reflect a departure from standard. As a note, Bericote had to apply for departures from standard in relation to the introduction of the signal controlled junction, which were successful. NH would provide scheme drawings of these arrangements as these should be referred to on existing layouts.	NH
5.0 A449 ROADWORKS	
5.1 A discussion was held as to whether the A449 cycle/footway scheme improvement scheme indicated would be necessary given the HE works. A small section of land to be adopted would need to be added to the rights of way plan.	
5.2 Amey would review the changes to the SCC network. SH requested CAD versions of drawings and would advise of process. SH advised that SCC would not want to continue to maintain existing site bridges with the scheme in place.	
5.3 In terms of the A5 access, the lane widths should be reviewed but the drawing had not been measured using CAD. WSP to review. Margins would need to be added to the south and this area is also likely to see an extended footway in order to provide a connection to the existing footway to reach Gailey Marina and permissive paths.	WSP
5.4 The width of the right turn median at Harrison Lane should be checked and ideally extended to the east to make it harder for traffic to perform a u turn. The usage of Harrison Lane should also be clarified given that the 70m separation with the access is not considered ideal by Kier. Notes should be added to reflect the closure of the layby and access junctions to the Quarry and an existing property served via the A5. This would also need to be reflected in the rights of way plan and TRO Plan. Finally, the ability to achieve SSD from the exit of the A5 west arm should be checked and land set aside as adopted highway to ensure this can be achieved. This should reflect the design speed of 50 mph.	WSP
5.5 In terms of HE requirements to accompany the submission, this will depend upon when the technical approval process is due to commence. Therefore matters such as street lighting, Geotechnical Investigations can be dealt with later if the s278 process comes later on in the programme.	Note
5.6 However, SCC standard details for lighting for the route through the site will be	

MEETING NOTES

MATTERS ARISING

ACTION

	needed given that there is a requirement to allow for this as part of the lighting assessment.	
5.7	Kier explained the process for the NMU's and RSA's that will be required.	
5.8	The design team should prepare a NMU Context report. This should then be passed to the organisation undertaking this audit.	Design Team
5.9	The RSA1 can then be carried out. However, RSA's can only be carried out where one member of the audit team has a Certificate of Competency issued by HE. CV's must be submitted to HE in order to confirm acceptance of the Audit team and that they have experience of working on similar projects. The RSA brief would need to be prepared by the Design Team and passed to the Project Sponsor (NH) who would then issue to the Audit Team. The Audit Team would submit a draft RSA to NH and upon approval a final version.	
5.10	Design Team should advise of any departures and provide a compliance check list for HE drawings.	Design Team
5.11	In terms of the completion of the A449 works, NH will seek confirmation from Project Manager and advise. It may also be useful for Noise Consultants to liaise directly with NH on this.	Highways England
5.12	As at DIRFT NH and AT suggested a schedule of Agreed and Outstanding matters could be prepared for Stage 2 Consultation.	Note
5.13	WSP to issue a final TN clarifying the number of trips that are included within the modelling process.	WSP
6.0	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
6.1		



MEETING NOTES

JOB TITLE	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
PROJECT NUMBER	70001979
DATE	14 June 2017
TIME	10.30am
VENUE	WSP Birmingham Office
SUBJECT	Transport Implications - WMI
CLIENT	
PRESENT	Neil Hansen – Highways England Derek Jones - Systra Simon Hawe - Staffordshire County Council James Carroll / Kristy Goff - Kier Anthony Tugwell - Vectos Neil Findlay / Ian Fielding - WSP Attendees
APOLOGIES	Apologies
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus Lee White, Systra, Andrew Johnson, SSDC, Marianne Page, WCC & WMI -project team

ACTION

1.0 MATTERS ARISING	
1.1 WSP ran through the most recently undertaken tasks which have seen the submission of revised General Arrangement drawings to Stakeholders that seek to pick up the issues identified by Kier in relation to design standards and as discussed at the last meeting.	
1.2 WSP also advised that as the scheme is rapidly moving towards Stage 2 Consultation, it has not been possible to pick up the matter of undertaking a revised VISSIM run that would include the provision of the internal non adopted road that would connect to Vicarage Road due to timescale constraints. This would be picked up after Stage 2 Consultation and would form part of the final DCO submission.	
1.3 The TA that will accompany the Stage 2 Consultation will provide modelling output on the basis of the work that has been undertaken to date and as forwarded to Systra for review.	
1.4 WSP also confirmed that the TA would provide further details of the operational workings of the Intermodal Terminal which Kier have requested given the proximity of the access as proposed to the A449.	
1.5 Kier asked for clarity as to the approach that the developer wishes to adopt in relation to the level of detail to be approved on highway plans.	

MEETING NOTES

1.6	WSP confirmed that the requirement is to deal with a process which seeks to confirm the deliverability and buildability of the highway works and that would provide a level of detail appropriate to this. Essentially, the process would seek to provide drawings that allow Approvals in Principle to be obtained.	
1.7	Kier requested clarification as to how any departures in design standard would be dealt with. HE are of the view that the Examination Inspector would want certainty that any design departures could be dealt with.	
1.8	WSP were of the view that latest drawing submission deals with all design departures, however Kier were of the view that the SRN highway works drawings did see some departures in design standard.	
1.9	WSP advised that if departures are identified, then these would need to be dealt with between now and Autumn 2017.	
1.10	HE view is that WSP should set out any departures in design standard, when they want them resolved and forward in an e-mail in order to allow the initial view to be sought from HE as to the likelihood of an application being successful. Then a formal departure submission can be made.	WSP
1.11	The NMU audit has been replaced in HD42/17 by a Walking Cycling & Horse-Riding Assessment and Review and will now be required.	
2.0	DESIGN REVIEW – A449	
2.1	Kier consider that the entry angle issue from Crateford Lane has been resolved, but keen to understand how WSP have identified the measurement of this dimension as different values have been obtained by both parties. WSP/Kier to liaise on this point.	WSP/Kier
2.2	It was noted that the entry and exit radii had been improved on the Crateford Lane and A449 north arms of the junction.	
2.3	Until further clarity is provided on the queuing at the Intermodal Access, Kier are still concerned on proximity with the A449. Systra advised that following their initial review of the VISSIM modal, no issue was identified at this junction however it would need to be remembered that the modelling assumes a different junction configuration for the Intermodal Terminal. WSP have some queue values for this junction from the VISSIM model which can be shared to show how it would operate in practice given that the layout modelled is similar to the current proposal, albeit with a different staggered arrangement. It would also be useful if WSP could provide details of trip forecasts for the Intermodal Terminal. All this information would be provided within the TA that accompanies Stage 2 Consultation.	Note
2.4	WSP also confirmed that the level of traffic associated with the Intermodal Terminal is relatively low and in fact arrival of a train does not necessarily see a great influx of HGV movements. This is because goods from the trains are unloaded and are then collected by HGV's when these vehicles arrive at the Terminal, which is spread over a 24 hour period. A significant provision of HGV parking has been provided by the Intermodal Terminal for resilience purposes, specifically as local people are concerned about the possibility of WMI HGV trips parking away from the site.	
2.5	Kier confirmed that following the relocation of the proposed bus stops, forward visibility along the southern arm of the junction accords with standard.	Note
2.6	However, given that the A449 is a 60 mph route, the proximity of the bus stops to the roundabout would be a departure in design standard. This would be a departure in standard whether the A449 is a 50 mph route or 60 mph and is similar to the position with the bus stops provided by way of the recent improvements to Gravelly Way.	Note
2.7	WSP suggested possibility of providing bus stops within the site only, given that the illustrative proposal at present is to divert buses into the site? SCC would need to discuss with Passenger Transport colleagues. Thought also given to the potential to provide on carriageway bus stops within the site as this potentially would provide greater flexibility as to their location. WSP will identify potential locations for on site bus stops to replace the A449 stops, mindful that they should not be positioned too close to the A449. These would then be passed to SCC PTU and Marianne Page.	WSP
2.8	Kier concerned about potential for queuing traffic to result from buses stopping on	

MEETING NOTES

	carriageway, given alighting times. WSP's view is that most employees would be regular users so would have passes rather than having to purchase tickets.	
2.9	However it was considered that there is merit in commencing the departure process in relation to the A449 bus laybys now given timescales.	WSP
2.10	SCC/Kier would investigate the availability of a CAD version of the Gravelly Way junction improvement that has been recently introduced so that this could be used to detail the existing arrangements at the junction with the A449.	SCC/Kier
2.11	With regard to the proposed cycleway/footway to the east of the A5, Kier questioned whether this is still proposed to be widened given the recent improvement scheme that has been implemented. WSP view was that it should still be proposed given that the proposal sought to provide a wider route than is currently possible which should make this a more attractive proposition for pedestrians and cyclists than is currently the case. The works can be accommodated within the development site and would afford the potential for modal shift. HE content that they can remain.	Note
3.0	DESIGN REVIEW - A5 ACCESS	
3.1	Kier content that lane widths are satisfactory and note the addition of the verge.	Note
3.2	Any accesses that are closed would require a TRO and would need to be noted on drawings, although the DCO would cover this.	Note
3.3	SCC suggested the possibility of relocating the proposed footway/cycleway to the north of the A5 so that it is further away from the carriageway. This would appear achievable within highway land and would offer greater separation for non car users. Kier would investigate this and WSP confirmed that from their perspective, there would not be an issue in amending the design.	Kier
3.4	Kier requested an understanding as to why a footway had been provided from the A5 access towards Gailey Marina? WSP confirmed that a car park is proposed to be provided within the site which would serve the canal as part of the measures to improve public access and this footway would link to existing footway facilities to the south of A5. This was welcomed as the existing laybys adjacent to the A5 are known to accommodate parking associated with visitors to the canal. Given the proposed removal of the laybys the proposed car park would allow visitors to the canal to continue to be accommodated.	Note
3.5	Kier suggested that forward stopping sight distances (SSD) cannot be achieved to Harrison Lane or the Gailey Marina when measured through the roundabout and would therefore require a departure. The WSP view was that the SSD should only be measured from the roundabout and on the basis that vehicle speeds travelling through the roundabout would be low so would not be a departure. Kier would seek guidance from HE standards team.	Kier
3.6	The width of the right turn median is satisfactory however consideration should be given to extending its length and providing a TRO banning U turns. Tracking should determine whether U turn manoeuvres are possible at the eastern end of the median.	WSP
4.0	DESIGN REVIEW - A449 LAYBY'S	
4.1	Kier of the view that the exit from the layby's should be a Type A with merge. WSP to check provision. Kier also raised issue of separation with access to the south of the proposed northbound facility. POST MEETING NOTE: Kier agreed the principle of a Type A with Merge layby arrangement had been illustrated post 13/6/2017 meeting however the geometry of the layby would also need to incorporate the provision of a margin in front of the kerbed segregation island together with a solid white line. WSP agreed and would review.	WSP
4.2	HE reiterated that work is being done to identify where other laybys could be provided along the A449 corridor. This information would be shared with Kier/SCC but unlikely to be made public for at least two months. Point made by WSP that given the nature of A449, it is difficult to provide laybys that fully meet standards anywhere along this corridor. It was agreed that the proposed laybys offer betterment when compared to the existing provision along the A5.	

MEETING NOTES

4.3	WSP asked whether replacement of the A5 laybys was essential. NH would prefer WSP to continue promoting the layby replacements albeit with departures to avoid the issue of loss of laybys.	
4.4	SCC's view is that if laybys are lost, they should be replaced in the vicinity of the site. This will ensure any demand for layby parking is not simply relocated elsewhere. Also worth considering accommodating on site. WSP view is that this would not re-provide layby facilities on the SRN.	
4.5	From a general perspective, Kier advised thought should be given to ensure signage can be provided within highway land in relation to proposed highway works.	
4.6	WSP suggested a response be provided by Kier to the comments raised to the General Arrangement drawings of the SRN in order to provide an audit trail in relation to the changes that have been made to the layouts. This was agreed and would be sent direct to WSP.	
4.7	SCC advised that in relation to the route through the site, Amey who are the County Highway Authority term consultants do not have sufficient information in relation to the bridge structure to allow them to comment on designs. This information can be provided by the project engineers, Waldeck, in due course.	Note
4.8	In respect of the 2036 assessment and with specific reference to the inclusion of traffic changes relating to the M54 / M6 / M6 Toll scheme, HE do not have any further update as to a preferred route which should be accounted for within assessment work for WMI.	
4.9	HE suggested that WSP write to NH and set out our suggested approach for dealing with this future year assessment. Systra confirmed that at present the 2021 design horizon provides a policy compliant test and the 2036 assessment is only required for information purposes.	WSP
4.10	In relation to the detail to be included on drawings showing highway works and required to secure preliminary design approval, Kier confirmed that the approach set out in the WSP e-mail of 6 June 2017 is satisfactory, although any details of any Vehicle Restraint Systems that may be required in relation to earth works should also be included.	
4.11	Systra confirmed that their review of the VISSIM modelling has been completed and this document is with AECOM & HE for their review. However Systra advised that the initial conclusion of their review shows that the mitigation proposed within the vicinity of the site is sufficient to address any capacity issues. However, there is an increased queue on the A462 arm of M6 Junction 11. Systra view is that this should be investigated further. Post Meeting Note Systra advised that it is possible that this conclusion could be subject to change following further anticipated modelling that will also take into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The private link through the site being used as a through route; • Addition of the correct form of access to serve the intermodal element; • The re-routing of HGV's that currently route through Penkrigde to use the SRN instead. 	Systra/Note
4.12	The formal response to the VISSIM modelling will be issue direct to WSP.	Systra
4.13	WSP would send around suggested dates for further meetings with stakeholders.	WSP

NEXT MEETING

Further meeting dates to be agreed.



MEETING NOTES

JOB TITLE	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
PROJECT NUMBER	70001979
DATE	16 August 2017
TIME	10.30am
VENUE	WSP Birmingham Office
SUBJECT	Transport Implications - WMI
CLIENT	Four Ashes Ltd
PRESENT	Neil Hansen – Highways England (HE) Chris Cox - Systra Kristie Goff – Kier Andrew Johnson – South Staffs Council (SSC) David Bird - Vectos Neil Findlay - WSP
APOLOGIES	Simon Hawe - Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Ian Fielding – WSP
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus; Lee White, Systra, Marianne Page, WCC & WMI project team

ACTION

1.0	INTRODUCTIONS	
1.1	Chris Cox attended for Lee White who could not attend.	
2.0	SCHEME UPDATE	
2.1	DCO submission to be early December.	
2.2	NF outlined his view on the recent exhibitions although full report will be produced.	
2.3	AJ noted that the protest group had been invited to engage but had not responded to date.	
2.4	Although no formal highway changes had been submitted three amendments are currently envisaged.	
2.5	A footway is to be provided along the south of the A5 from the new roundabout to the current crossing at Avenue Cottages.	
2.6	Bus stops are to be located on the internal roads, one in each direction on the public link road. These will be on carriageway. Systra requested a note on whether these stops will interfere with the SRN operation.	WSP

MEETING NOTES

2.7	It is likely that the HGV turning area will be removed from Station Drive due to local response and banned right turn from A449 addresses main issue. This will be confirmed at the end of the consultation.	
2.8	NH confirmed he will be HE sponsor for all departures. WSP to submit draft departures to NH & Kier before formal submission.	WSP
2.9	NH/Kier to liaise with SES on submission	HE/Kier
2.10	Kier agree that WSP TN21 sets out all the departures except the point raised by SES on Harrisons Lane. NF explained that following scrutiny of DMRB the WSP designers do not consider this to be a departure. HE to review with SES and confirm whether they still consider it a departure. If this is the case WSP will either need to explain their view or progress a departure.	HE (then maybe WSP)
2.11	WSP to provide evidence on existing layby usage and justify replacement on A449, including any possible alternatives on A5.	WSP
2.12	HE / Kier confirmed that overall highway proposals are acceptable in principle, subject to above and addressing some minor technical points, such as entry angles at roundabouts. NF thought that these had been answered but will issue again.	WSP
2.13	An assessment of the intermodal access and associated GRT facility is required to evidence the interaction between the intermodal access (South) and the proposed roundabout on the A449. Due to the close proximity of the Intermodal access to the proposed roundabout on the SRN concern has been raised in regard to potential congestion and highway safety. The development peak periods (shift patterns) should be assessed as well as the AM and PM network peaks.	WSP
3.0	RSA1 & WCHAR	
3.1	WCHAR is needed before RSA1 undertaken.	WSP
3.2	Kier raised a concern at the A449 access about safety of the one way from Crateford Lane. WSP to include in RSA1 brief.	WSP
4.0	2036 ASSESSMENT	
4.1	HE confirmed that it is not possible to model M54/M6 Link but it does remain a commitment in RIS and being progressed with consultation after the school holidays on revised options B & C with Preferred Route Announcement by the end of the year. The revisions are primarily alignment only.	
4.2	CC confirmed view that a 2036 assessment is needed on new infrastructure.	
4.3	In principle application of Temprow to 2021 flows locally is the optimum approach in robustness. WSP to provide Temprow factor which accommodates SSC requirement for 4,900 additional units which are location specific.	WSP
4.4	Systra to confirm on behalf of HE whether Temprow & Junctions8 analysis is sufficient or whether any further justification or note on wider area implications is needed.	Systra
5.0	PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS	
5.1	WMI to provide drafts of protective provisions with an explanation regarding their purpose and what agreement is sought at what stage.	Eversheds
5.2	CC suggested that these could be similar to East Midlands Gateway, WSP confirmed this is likely to be the case.	
5.3	NH & AJ asked whether the provisions will address the relationship between HE & SCC on the link through the site, to ensure its use as part of the overall network.	WSP/Eversheds
6.0	M6 J11 & FURTHER VISSIM MODELLING	
6.1	NF reported that the queue at J11 in VISSIM could be addressed by improved modelling, first in Linsig & then VISSIM. WSP to send Linsigs to Systra & Vectos. These timings are to be used in a revised VISSIM run.	WSP

MEETING NOTES

6.2	<p>WSP will then undertake 2 additional VISSIM runs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A definitive model which includes J11 timings, the latest intermodal access arrangement and the WMI HGVs on the A449 north – A sensitivity test which includes the internal private estate road to Vicarage Road. <p>All agreed that these should be the final models for the submission, unless there were any significant changes in traffic performance from the previous model.</p>	WSP
7.0	M6 J12 MERGE / DIVERGE	
7.1	<p>WSP submission on the merge/diverge assessments using VISSIM was acceptable to Kier. However, for operational purposes the merge / diverge assessment usually includes an assessment using latest WebTRIS data. WSP suggested that this not appropriate for the WMI application as the whole transport & traffic assessment is based on an agreed model forecasting methodology. HE, Kier & Systra will confer on this and respond.</p>	HE/Kier/Systra
8.0	STAGE 2 CONSULTATION RESPONSE & SOCG	
8.1	<p>NH set out likely next formal steps, namely a response to Stage 2 which need not include all of the detail currently being worked on. Then all parties work towards SoCGs by DCO submission, these can include items of agreement and not agreed at the time.</p>	
8.2	<p>NF requested comments from HE (and by copy of notes SCC) on the submitted transport documents; namely the TA and its associated documents, HGV Management Plan and Construction Plan. Comments have previously been provided by HE on the Sustainable Travel Strategy and Travel Plan.</p>	HE
9.0	NEXT MEETING & AOB	
9.1	<p>25 September, NF to check SCC attendance.</p>	WSP
9.2	<p>AJ raised questions from Cllr Cope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Is there an interim (phasing analysis)? NF responded that this had not yet been completed. The emphasis at present is on ensuring the complete scheme is acceptable. – Was there only an AM analysis? NF confirmed that AM & PM was analysed. The exhibition board only showed AM to minimise the amount of data for people to look at. 	



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70001979	MEETING DATE	25 September 2017
PROJECT NAME	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange	VENUE	WSP Birmingham Offices
CLIENT	Four Ashes Ltd	RECORDED BY	
MEETING SUBJECT	Transport Implications - WMI		

PRESENT	Neil Hansen – Highways England Lee White - SYSTRA James Carrol - Kier Andrew Johnson – South Staffs Simon Hawe / James Chadwick - SCC Anthony Tugwell - Vectos Neil Findlay / Ian Fielding - WSP
APOLOGIES	None
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus Kristie Goff and FAL project team
CONFIDENTIALITY	Public

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	General update provided and advised that further VISSIM modelling has been completed and issued to WSP, who are reviewing.		
2	WCHAR report has been drafted but not issued to HE/Kier. Confirmed that this needs to be signed off by HE prior to it being sent onto Road Safety Auditors. Kier confirmed no requirement for Agent from Maintaining Authority or Police to attend RSA1 site visit.	WSP/HE	
3	WMI team reviewing comments and representations made to Stage 2 Consultation and identifying how it can respond to specific issues.		
4	From transport perspective, representations received from SSDC, SCC and HE.		
5	Whilst SSDC response dealt with a number of themes, concern raised about increased likelihood of rat running traffic through unsuitable roads and inappropriate HGV parking, together with additional demand arising from WMI.		

MEETING NOTES

6	WSP confirmed signage strategy directing traffic to use appropriate routes will form part of final DCO TA. This is particularly relevant in respect of traffic using the A5 from the east and west which may have the opportunity to divert through Calf Heath towards the Vicarage Road access and Brewood areas respectively via Crateford Lane.		
7	SSC view is that confirmation of drive time differences to WMI via potential rat run routes be provided within the final TA in order to show that there is a low likelihood of this taking place.	WSP	
8	SCC consider that the Vicarage Road access does provide resilience to the overall access strategy serving the proposals.	Note	
9	In terms of HGV parking, WSP confirmed that updates are being incorporated into the Illustrative Masterplan to indicate early arrival bays that will be available in order to accommodate any vehicles that arrive in advance of their booking slot. Also, driver welfare facilities will be provided for each unit.	Note	
10	SCC still remain concerned about existing HGV parking problems. WSP clarified that it is not for the scheme to rectify existing HGV parking issues, but only accommodate increases in demand from WMI. The scheme would not increase HGV parking demand in the area as by definition WMI HGV drivers in the area will be about to reach their destination. Statutory breaks are clearly defined so drivers would be aware of when these need to be taken in relation to their drive time to WMI. This may necessitate breaks needing to be taken further afield, but not within the immediate area surrounding the site. This will be explained in the TA, in particular in terms of governance, as SCC advised of concerns of how the booking system will be secured.	WSP	
11	SCC request for link road to be classified as an A road. Systra confirmed that in their view it is appropriate that the route is a SCC road and to propose it as an HE route would be problematic at this stage, particularly as if the route were a Trunk Road, it may require its own DCO.	Note	
12	SCC confirmed that there would be no design changes required in the event that the route were classified as an A class road.	Note	
13	In terms of Sustainable Transport, SCC requires greater clarity on catchment of staff as this is linked to public transport strategy. Also require assessment of capacity of buses in relation to forecast employee numbers.	WSP	
14	WSP will send SCC a copy of the TN prepared in respect of distribution of development traffic, primarily for the benefit of James Chadwick. A request was also made to see an Employment and Skills Plan. This will be addressed by Quod.	WSP/Quod	
15	SCC will investigate turnaround time for Amey to provide a response to the horizontal design review of the highway works. Agreed that matters relating to vertical design can be dealt with under protective provisions.	SCC/Note	
16	Details will need to be provided to SCC as to why the bridge arrangements spanning the WCML and Canal need to be as proposed. WSP advised that earlier layouts required the proposed bridge structure to increase in height by 4m, which is not required by the current arrangements. SCC need to see all information justifying this approach.	WSP/FAL Design Team	

MEETING NOTES

17	In terms of the HE response, Systra clarified that the majority of comments relate to tidying up the modelling work. Systra noted that they will need to respond clarifying the approach to the 2036 assessment and growth rates.	Systra	
18	Given that further VISSIM modelling has been completed, Systra will await the formal submission from WSP.	WSP	
19	Systra flagged the unusual arrangements at Crateford Lane and require more comfort on the design. WSP advised that as specifically requested by HE, the RSA1 will specifically consider this.	Note	
20	Systra / HE / SCC will also need to agree the boundaries between the HE and SCC network on the link road.	Systra/HE/SCC	
21	Draft applications for departures have been sent to HE/Kier, confirmation for formal submission needed. In terms of draft departures, Kier will review this urgently on behalf of HE. HE will then advise whether content to support this submission. A covering statement may be required by HE given that the departures relate to a development rather than highway scheme. (Post meeting Note 3/10/17 this has been received).	Kier/HE	
22	Comments provided by Kier as to length of proposed A449 laybys. An existing layby is due to be closed at the A449, Coven Heath. Could the proposed northbound A449 layby be extended to address? WSP view that in principle, this should be acceptable, but would need to discuss with the project team. However, it may complicate the departure process as it would lead to the northbound layby being sited closer to Gailey. WSP would not want to jeopardise the WMI departures as a consequence. Kier suggested that a separate departure application could be submitted seeking an extended A449 north bound layby, which could run in tandem with the application for the shorter facility currently on the table.	Note/WSP	
23	WSP advised that following advice, a departure will be submitted in respect of the exit visibility issue at the A5 roundabout and Harrison's Lane. This is due to the uncertainty as to whether this is a departure or not. Overall, this would require the submission of two further departures.	WSP	
24	Kier advised WSP should satisfy themselves that the provision of a 3.5m running lane at the Avenue Cottages access is a relaxation, not a departure.	WSP	
25	WSP discussed the VISSIM modelling that has been carried out. This is being reviewed prior to issue to Systra / SCC. WSP clarified that amended model rectifies previous problems at M6 Junction 11. WSP clarified it appears to have led to a greater level of traffic entering the passing through the VISSIM network. Systra requested that consideration be given to where the previously identified traffic shown to queue at this junction is shown to disperse towards. WSP clarified that increases in traffic are shown during the PM peak for A5 west bound traffic. Systra required details to be provided in respect of M54 junction 2.	WSP	
26	WSP clarified that VISSIM modelling demonstrates that the access serving the intermodal terminal would not result in traffic blocking back to the A449. All other development access junctions are shown to operate satisfactorily.	Note	

MEETING NOTES

27	<p>From the phasing perspective WSP advised that it will be proposed that an element of floor area will come forward prior to the introduction of the link road, probably to be served from the A5. Initial view is that M6 Junction 12 would operate satisfactorily, but Gailey may operate worse. There are commercial challenges for the developer in terms of costs to deliver the WMI infrastructure which requires an element of development coming forward as an early phase to aid cash flow.</p> <p>Systra preference is for the link road to be open from day one, so if this is not the case, then they would need to understand what the issues would be. There is concern that if an element of floor space were introduced and the developer walked away from the site, then HE would be left in a difficult position in terms of network operation.</p> <p>WSP thoughts were that there would be a time limit as to how long a first phase could operate before the link road would be required. Systra considered that a trigger in terms of floor area would also be necessary, whichever came first.</p> <p>However, Systra would require evidence to demonstrate the position if a first phase came on line before the link road, as essentially this would form a standalone development. They would strongly recommend the submission of a VISSIM model to demonstrate the implications as it is necessary to consider the network operation as a whole.</p>	WSP/Note	
28	<p>Systra would resist a first phase of development that seeks access from the A449 without the link road. This would be due to the additional pressure on Gailey. Acknowledged that from a phasing perspective, A5 is a better option given its proximity to M6 Junction 12.</p>	Note	
29	<p>Whilst recognising practical challenges, Systra also consider that it may be necessary to write into the DCO the final approach to phasing/link road delivery.</p>	Note	
30	<p>Kier had a number of questions relating to drainage of the A449 roundabout and these would be passed to WSP under separate cover. (Post meeting Note 3/10/17 this has been received).</p>	Kier	
31	<p>Kier requested details of anticipated TRO's arising from the highway works. WSP to provide TRO plan that accompanied Stage 2 submission.</p>	WSP	
32	<p>The draft Protective Provisions that have been issued are currently being reviewed by SCC and HE legal teams.</p>	HE/SCC	
33	<p>Merge / Diverge assessment of Junction 12 – accepted that this should be assessed using VISSIM flows. The latest data from the most recent iteration of the VISSIM model should be used for this assessment.</p>		
34	<p>HE will provide contact details of relevant person who can advise of the frequency of closure of the M6 to the north and south of M6 junction 12.</p>	HE	
35	<p>Details will be required within the TA in terms of construction traffic volumes and routing requirements.</p>		

NEXT MEETING

Next meeting is 1030, WSP Offices, Birmingham, 24 October 2017.



AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70001979	MEETING DATE	24 October 2017
PROJECT NAME	WMI SRFI	VENUE	Tele-conference call
CLIENT	Four Ashes Ltd	RECORDED BY	IF
MEETING SUBJECT	WMI - Transport		

PRESENT	Lee White, SYSTRA; James Carrol, Kier; Andrew Johnson, South Staffs; Simon Hawe, SCC; Anthony Tugwell, Vectos; Ian Fielding, WSP
APOLOGIES	None
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus: Neil Hansen, HE, Kristie Goff, Kier and WMI Project Team
CONFIDENTIALITY	Public

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Systra noted that the proposed Protective Provisions were drafted and shaped around those implemented at EMG.		
2	Nothing of concern from Systra's perspective, but the devil is in the detail so it will be up to HE lawyers to provide comments. HE's lawyers will be chased for their comments, but it would be useful if details could be provided of WMI lawyers so discussions between the two can take place. Kier also suggested it would be useful if details of HE lawyers on EMG could be provided.	Systra / WSP	
3	SCC will chase for comments from their legal team.	SCC	
4	A discussion was held concerning the latest VISSIM modelling. A note had been circulated by WSP concerning the blocking of a route choice for wider traffic using the A449 southbound. The route block prevents A449 southbound traffic from passing along the Site Link Road to the A5. A normal route choice would be for south bound A449 traffic to turn left at Gailey in order to reach the A5. Systra agree that it is useful to block the route as the VISSIM model has done as it is not a logical choice. However Systra require clarity that this route is not blocked for development traffic. WSP to investigate. Once this point has been headed off, Systra should be able to clarify matters regarding impact on the network which would answer a significant question in relation to the scheme.	WSP	
5	SCC still awaiting comment from their modelling team.	SCC	
6	Systra reviewing 2036 assessments of A5 and A449 junction models. The assumptions have been previously agreed regarding the Temprow growth assumptions.	Systra	

MEETING NOTES

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
7	Systra clarified again that it is not possible to account for the M54/M6 link as part of the 2036 assessment, this would be a significant challenge at this stage. The M54/M6 link does not have a statutory status.	Note	
8	WSP would send through the modelling of the inter peak analysis of the operation of the Intermodal Terminal. This would consist of a Technical Note, together with model output and drawings demonstrating how geometric parameters have been identified. Reported that queuing is not shown to extend back to the A449 to the west.	WSP	
9	It was confirmed that WSP have instructed Systra to undertake a phasing assessment using VISSIM investigating the implications of introducing initial quantum's of floor space prior to the A449/A5 Link Road being completed and the Intermodal terminal becoming operational. Systra require details of the scenarios that are being tested to be provided, together with details of infrastructure provisions that have been allowed for within this assessment. This may have the potential to affect the protective provisions as to when the A449/A5 Link Road would be required. South Staffs are also interested to understand the implications in relation to the Intermodal Terminal.	WSP	
10	SCC will chase their colleagues in respect of the review of the horizontal design of the alterations to the SCC network.	SCC	
11	In terms of the suggestion from WSP that an HGV ban be provided along Crateford Lane, SCC confirmed that they would prefer to see any restrictions within this area dealt with by way of a holistic approach. There is concern that if HGV's are banned from one area only, then this may push HGV's onto other roads within the Brewood area. In SCC view, the matter of potential HGV bans would be best dealt with by a fund that could address any issues once the scheme were operational. Drivers should be advised not to use these secondary routes and this should be accounted for within an appropriate agreement. It was agreed that it would be worthwhile WSP sharing details of suggested signage strategy for WMI.	WSP	
12	WSP advised that the revised WCHAR is to be submitted to Kier and once agreed, passed to the Stage One Road Safety Auditors.		
13	Kier will confirm what TRO's are in place along the A449.	Kier	
14	SCC had provided a Note to WSP from their term consultants, Amey, seeking clarification of modelling assumptions in relation to WMI. This is in relation to emerging work relating to ROF Featherstone. Systra advised that Amey should be approaching them in terms of assessment scoping matters. It needs to be remembered that WMI is not a committed development and won't be until such time as a DCO is consented. South Staffs confirmed that they are working towards the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground with SCC that promotes ROF Featherstone in order to convince the appointed Inspector for the Site Allocations examination that the scheme is deliverable.		
15	Kier advised that the matter of the drainage connection from Gravelly Way to A449 would still need resolution with the scheme.		
16	South Staffs advised that they had been provided with details of the WMI daily traffic profile. They will want to understand percentage changes in traffic on certain links at specific time in order consider amenity matters. South Staffs will	South Staffs	

MEETING NOTES

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
	advise of what highway links are of interest. This may involve discussion with SCC.		

NEXT MEETING

21 November, WSP Offices, Birmingham - 1030



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70001979	MEETING DATE	21 November 2017
PROJECT NAME	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Project name	VENUE	WSP Bham Office
CLIENT	WMI	RECORDED BY	IF
MEETING SUBJECT	Transport Implications		

PRESENT	Neil Hansen, Highways England Andy Johnson, South Staffs Kristie Goff, Kier Derek Jones, Systra Ian Fielding, WSP
APOLOGIES	Lee White, Systra Simon Hawe, SCC David Bird/Anthony Tugwell (Vectos) James Carrol (Kier) Neil Findlay (WSP)
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus WMI project team:
CONFIDENTIALITY	Public

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	WSP confirmed all documentation ready for DCO submission required by 18 December 2017 so seeking final areas of agreement. Submission anticipated early 2018.		
2	SSDC advised that following the last tele con, they would seek changes in traffic flows on the mainline at the following junctions: - <ul style="list-style-type: none">A5/Vicarage RoadVicarage Road/Woodlands LaneA5/Croft LaneA449/Station Drive The traffic flows should provide a comparison between 2021 without WMI and 2021 with WMI and should consider peak hour traffic flows. This information is required from the amenity perspective. This information should be replicated for the 2036 future year. WSP clarified that the 2021 information will be in the Transport Assessment that accompanies the DCO submission but will provide for expediency.	WSP	

MEETING NOTES

3	Stage One Road Safety Audits have been completed and HE/Kier confirmed receipt of audit for SRN works. Kier to confirm next steps. HE keen to follow procedural requirements. RSA1 for SCC works also complete, but WSP awaiting receipt of this. WSP keen to receive details back from HE as soon as possible in order to enable any amendments to be made to General Arrangement drawings and Access & Rights of Way drawings in good time for DCO submission	Kier/HE	
4	Systra confirmed that clarification in respect of 2036 and inter peak assessments should be available mid w/c 27/12/17.	Systra	
5	Systra of the view that VISSIM modelling is dealt with. Suggested WSP set out position within draft SoCG with HE.	WSP	
6	WSP clarified the work that has been done in relation to the pre A449/A5 Link Road assessment however some difficulties had occurred with the VISSIM modelling that have held matters up. WSP clarified that the South Staffordshire VISSIM network as a whole was being considered, not just local junctions. Whilst the intention is to agree with stakeholders the position relating to the pre link road assessment prior to the TA being finalised this may not be possible within the available time. However WSP agreed to share the findings within a Technical Note when this exercise has been completed. This should ensure all relevant parties are aware of the results prior to submission. SSDC requested clarity over whether an assessment post link road but pre rail terminal would be provided. WSP to review phasing plans and confirm ahead of meeting on 4 December 2017.	WSP	
7	WSP clarified SCC comments in relation to design speed of the A449/A5 Link Road, which has seen amended design speeds applied, with some minor alterations required to the link road alignment.	Note	
8	Kier requested further analysis in respect of pedestrian and cycle accidents at Gailey Roundabout. This concerns that the WCHAR assessment has highlighted the crossing of Gailey along the north/south axis as an existing highway safety issue. WSP clarified that some pedestrians and cyclists may be willing to cross the A5 at Gailey in order to travel north / south, depending on ability/confidence. However for those less able/confident cyclists/pedestrians, provision is made through the proposed A5 cycle/footway linking to the facilities that will be provided through the site. Kier need to check with relevant colleagues whether the restricted width at the WCML bridge is an issue. Kier suggested TA should pick up on likely pedestrian / cycle movements at Gailey with WMI. Kier will also review with their Road Safety colleagues whether there are any specific accident remedial works identified for the junction.	WSP/Kier	
9	In terms of the removal of the A449 Toucan crossing, Kier of the view that we are down grading the facility with the proposed A449 roundabout and it is necessary for WSP to set out the process relating to the usage of uncontrolled crossings. WSP view is that given that there has been a requirement to access the site from the A449 direction via a roundabout, it is very difficult to accommodate traffic signal control pedestrian crossings with these types of junctions. HE accepted that access from the A449 needed to be via a roundabout, but concerned that there may be a net safety dis-benefit with the removal of the signal controlled pedestrian crossing. Systra's view is that a TOUCAN crossing would have an impact in terms of capacity if provided with the roundabout access. WSP considered that pedestrian movements at the	WSP	

MEETING NOTES

	crossing would be less with WMI given opportunities for bus penetration into the site and suggested a comparison could be provided setting out “without” and “with” WMI pedestrian movements at the crossing. This would account for the consented Bericote scheme given that it was understood that the purpose of the crossing was to provide better access to the relocated bus stops for future employees of that scheme. HE also requested that it be confirmed that WSP’s designs have made best use of the existing Gravelly Way highway in terms of accommodating the proposed roundabout works and the A449/A5 Link Road.		
10	WSP remain concerned that the promotion of the extended laybys would see a situation where they are positioned closer to Gailey roundabout than is shown by the current scheme, which has required the submission of a Departure from Design Standard. It is not reasonable to expect that the relocated laybys could fail a potential departure from design standard due to Kier’s suggestion that they should be extended. Kier’s view is that WMI will bring further HGV’s into the area, which may require off site parking. WSP confirmed that HGV access to WMI will be managed through the vehicle booking system and that provision for early arrivals by HGV’s will be accommodated by the early arrival bays, together with driver welfare facilities. Each unit of the scheme would be required to provide a minimum of three early arrival bays up to a provision of 1 per 7,000 sqm. These matters are discussed in the Framework HGV Management Plan and the draft TA. Therefore it is only necessary for WMI to address parking demand associated with their traffic. This was noted however Kier/HE requested details of the amended FHGVMP in order to review. SSDC suggested It would be necessary to govern the requirement for the early arrival bays within the appropriate legal agreement. Once HE/Kier have reviewed the FHGVMP, they will advise whether they believe additional layby provision will be required, which may mean the extended laybys should be pursued. Kier will also discuss with SES as to the nature of the potential departure in terms of separation with the laybys and Gailey if extended facilities were provided.	WSP/Kier	
11	With regard to the merge /diverge analysis provided, which shows a very minor breach of the type of arrangement required for the M6 Junction 12 north bound off slip during the PM peak period only, Systra of the view that the traffic flows used are a forecast, so there may be some flexibility here. Kier have also sought advice from SES and expect to hear back shortly.	Kier	
12	With regard to SOCG, HE suggested that these be sent across to themselves, together with Kier and Systra. This could include a schedule of those matters agreed and not agreed. It would be useful for HE to see the SOCG to be sent to SCC and vice versa.	WSP/Note	
13	With regard to protective provisions, HE understand that their lawyers are talking to Eversheds. If needed a meeting could be held with HE/HE lawyers on 12/13 December 2017.	Note	
14	HE confirmed they are content to continue dialogue post DCO submission if required.	Note	
15	HE/Kier requested that details be provided as to the rationale as to how the A449/A5 Link Road will be treated in the future from the signage perspective and whether there is anything from the example at Towcester that links two aspects of the SRN. WSP to provide details, but HE/Kier will also need to consider.	WSP	
16	With regard to the Transport Steering Group, HE suggested that meetings on a	Note	

MEETING NOTES

	Six Monthly cycle would be pragmatic – anything other than this would be too onerous. WSP thoughts were that the TSG would consist of representatives from Four Ashes Ltd, HE, SCC, SSDC and key future tenants. SSDC also suggested a representative from i54 would be useful and that Marianne Page from WCC should also form part of the TSG.		
17	SSDC advised of meeting with WMI team on 4 December 2017 concerning legal matters, with transport scheduled to be discussed during the morning session.	Note	
18	Next meeting is scheduled for 14 December 2017 which WSP would like to keep in the diary for now and will recirculate the invitation. Further meetings can be arranged for 2018 as necessary.	Note	
19	<p>POST MEETING NOTE – WSP & SCC discussed relevant matters via tele con on 22 November 2017. Key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions ongoing with SCC concerning VISSIM model output and a response is awaited, although this is expected imminently. WSP intend to discuss findings of the SCC review in the SoCG. • The findings of the review of the horizontal alignment of the highway works to the SCC network will be provided to WSP by 28 November 2017. • The RSA1 should be sent through to SCC. • In respect of the potential for use of the A449/A5 Link Road by overweight vehicles, if this is required from time to time, then anticipated that this could be covered by a similar process to that used when permitting the movement of wide loads. Anticipated that it would be necessary to register the route for this purpose. • James Chadwick is dealing with Protective Provisions via SCC lawyers. Hoping to have a response in advance of meeting of 4 December 2017. 	SCC	

NEXT MEETING

14 December 2017.



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70001979	MEETING DATE	14 December 2017
PROJECT NAME	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange	VENUE	Telephone Conference
CLIENT	WMI	RECORDED BY	IF
MEETING SUBJECT	Transport Implications		

PRESENT	Simon Hawe – Staffordshire County Council Andy Johnson, South Staffs Kristie Goff, Kier Lee White/Derek Jones, Systra Ian Fielding, Neil Findlay (part of call) WSP Anthony Tugwell, Vectors
APOLOGIES	Neil Hansen (Highways England) James Carrol (Kier)
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus: WMI project team
CONFIDENTIALITY	Public

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Kier have received details of a previously identified pedestrian and cycle safety improvement scheme at Gailey. Details will be sent through w/c 11 December 2017. All works can be accommodated within public highway.	Kier	
2	Kier need to discuss with Highways England SES in respect of the potential A449 Layby Extension and the implications with the departure from design standard with Gailey roundabout. Kier confirmed that it is for WSP to justify the reduced width of the proposed A5 cycleway/footway at WCML bridge.	Kier/WSP	
3	WSP confirmed that the Transport Assessment that is very close to being finalised reports that all matters relating to the modelling output in relation to the 2021 assessment of the full scheme have been agreed with both SCC and HE. Systra confirmed they are comfortable with where we are in relation to the modelling of the full scheme. SCC are still reviewing but hope to respond shortly.		

MEETING NOTES

4	<p>However following receipt of Technical Note 33 Systra are not yet comfortable with the position concerning phasing. This matter needs specific consideration in respect of how the link road will need to be delivered and how any timeline/development threshold delivery triggers are secured. Systra's view is that this would need to be included within the Protective provisions and suggested thought should be given by WMI lawyers as to how this could be achieved. SCC also requested similar clarity on delivery of the link road. WSP made point that the interim assessment using the South Staffs VISSIM model shows in general terms, operation is similar to that with the full scheme and mitigation. Point made that the link road is the core mitigation for WMI. Systra concerned that over time there could be more demand placed on the network before the opening of the Link Road, particularly in terms of traffic growth. This point has been recognised by WSP and the suggested triggers for the delivery of the link road specified in TN33 respond to this.</p>	Systra/HE	
5	<p>South Staffs sought clarity on length of time to construct the link road. WSP clarified that in relation to phasing, that the proposal is to see initial development served via the A5 access, so this would see elements of the link road brought forward during the early parts of the construction of the scheme.</p>		
6	<p>WSP clarified that trip generation for initial phase of development pre link road is based on TRICS, rather than the approach based on DIRFT surveys as set out TN5 – this is because the intermodal terminal would not be in situ at the interim stage. Systra noted this and clarified approach previously agreed via TN 28.</p>	Note	
7	<p>Systra confirmed all matters relating to the interim assessment require further consideration and they would not want to be at the DCO Examination without having an agreed position. SCC also need to review TN33. WSP confirmed a copy of the interim VISSIM has been provided to both Systra and SCC.</p>	Note	
8	<p>SCC confirmed that they are progressing with Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and this is being dealt with by James Chadwick on all matters from the County perspective, with Simon Hawe feeding into the specific transport aspects. SCC advised they are reviewing the socio-economic content as this still needs to be aligned to the Travel To Work Area (TTWA). WSP clarified that as per the e-mail sent on 1 December 2017, the TTWA was prepared together with socio economic advisors (Quod) in order to present a consistent approach. Requested that SCC provide WSP with early sight of transport aspects of SoCG on a standalone basis rather than waiting for composite SCC response.</p>	Note/SCC	
9	<p>Systra have responded to HE with their thoughts of draft SoCG. Some points of detail will need to be reviewed, mainly concerning the protective provisions and timelines for mitigation. Neil Hansen is due to issue the response on the SoCG.</p>	HE	
10	<p>WSP confirmed the current focus for public transport continues to see the diversion of existing buses into the site. Given that buses will need to be able to enter the site pre completion of the link road, the proposal suggests that the additional bus could access the site via the A5, with the existing hourly bus remaining on the A449. Once the link road is open, all buses would transfer to the link road in order to maximise penetration through the site.</p>	Note	
11	<p>Kier/SCC requested clarification concerning usage of crossing facilities at A449 and Gailey roundabout. This will be set out in the TA.</p>	WSP	
12	<p>Systra confirmed that matters concerning public transport are for SCC to consider, but any modal shift that can be secured away from single occupancy</p>	Note	

MEETING NOTES

	car trips would be considered a positive. Kier will need to respond in the event additional crossing facilities are proposed to connect to bus stops in either the full or interim position.		
13	With regard to the Stage One Road Safety Audits, WSP confirmed the Audit of the SCC network has been completed and a Designers response is being prepared. The Audit of the HE works is still awaited although it was noted there had been some discussions between Kier and the Auditors which should be clarified shortly. Kier requested it be specifically documented that the WSP Auditors clarify in the RSA1 that they are independent of the design team. Kier will advise when the RSA1 can be issued.	WSP/Kier	
14	WSP confirmed they would provide a response on the SCC horizontal alignment, but clarified no major issues. WSP also clarified that the alternative development access junctions were noted, they would not be deviating from those shown on the Highway General Arrangement drawings issued to date.	WSP	

NEXT MEETING

Details of potential meeting dates for 2018 will be issued.



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70001979	MEETING DATE	27 February 2018
PROJECT NAME	West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange	VENUE	WSP Birmingham
CLIENT	Four Ashes Limited	RECORDED BY	IF
MEETING SUBJECT	Transport Implications - WMI		

PRESENT	Ian Fielding – WSP Neil Hansen – Highways England Lee White/Derek Jones – SYSTRA Kristie Goffe – Kier Andrew Johnson – South Staffs
APOLOGIES	Simon Hawe – SCC Anthony Tugwell - Vectos
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus WMI Project Team
CONFIDENTIALITY	Public

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Minutes		
1.1	SCC tendered their apologies however WSP had spoken with them (26/02/18) and will have a further conversation w/c 05/03/18 to establish County's position in respect of a number of areas. Scheme update provided and that submission of the DCO is scheduled for Quarter 2 2018.		
1.2	Amendments have been made to the access arrangements serving the existing Bericote use, SI and other existing operators of the buildings to the south of Gravelly Way. New arrangements now provide access to SI Group via a dedicated access via the road serving unit 2010, that passes back underneath the bridge that spans the existing WCML and Canal. It has been necessary to raise the height of the bridge to allow HGV's to pass underneath.		
1.3	The Hoppe roundabout is now a four arm arrangement and a NMU connection is provided to the canal via the existing canal road bridge.	WSP	
1.4	HE requested a copy of the drawing showing the arrangements. WSP confirmed the General Arrangement has previously been sent to SCC who have no issues with what is shown.	WSP	
1.5	HE also requested that the TA confirm why the existing Gravelly Way is not used in order to access the site. This may be a question raised at the examination. This should be referenced in the TA.	WSP	

MEETING NOTES

1.6	Systra advised that the individual who has run the South Staffs VISSIM model is leaving. It is therefore in SCC interests to arrange to view the model within the next two weeks.	Note	
1.7	Systra confirmed that, on behalf of HE, their starting point is that the A449/A5 Link Road should be open to traffic prior to occupation. However, the commercial realities are understood as to why an element of floor area would come forward prior to opening of the link road.		
1.8	However Systra are concerned that the purpose of the DCO is for the delivery of the SRFI, therefore any development floor area is therefore ancillary.		
1.9	Systra therefore remain concerned that as it stands there is nothing in the DCO drafting that requires the delivery of the Rail Terminal. The proposition put to them by way of the Interim Assessment does not specify when the Rail Terminal will come forward. They will not accept a position where an element of floor area is provided, but there is no certainty as to when either the terminal or link road will come forward.	Note	
1.10	Requested that WSP engage with the WMI project team to identify whether it can be specified in the DCO when the terminal will come forward. In terms of the 5 year time limit suggested for when the link road would be required by, it was suggested by Systra that this is a sensible starting point, but would prefer a shorter limit.	WSP	
1.11	In terms of the modelling of the interim assessment, Systra's view is that this is generally acceptable, subject to the outcomes of the position in terms of the delivery of the terminal. A response on this would be provided to WSP.	Systra/HE	
1.12	With regard to Statement of Common Ground, Systra have comments which will be sent to WSP. Some comments have been made but these are largely matters of detail. At present, there are three areas of disagreement; these concerning the interim assessment impact, the phasing delivery of infrastructure and the Protective Provisions. Subject to the position reached in terms of the delivery of the rail terminal, it may be possible to reduce these areas of disagreement.	Systra/HE	
1.13	Systra also had some comments on the DCO which will be sent through to WSP. These are not the final comments on behalf of HE.	Systra	
1.14	HE requested that any e-mails issued dealing with either Protective Provisions, the DCO and the Statement of Common Ground be issued separately. This will avoid confusion.	WSP	
1.15	It needs to be noted that the DCO needs to make reference to Section 175B of the Highways Act – this is needed when forming a new access with a Trunk Road.	Note	
1.16	Suggestion that a further Plan be prepared that sets out details of the extent of land to be adopted as part of the DCO.	WSP	
1.17	HE and Kier will consider the extent of the A449/A5 link road that will form their network. They will also review the Trunk Road and County Council Highway Works Plans (Drawing 70001979-sk072 (Document 2.10). This is being done as there was some thought that the area of works does not extend far enough. WSP view was that the purpose of the drawings was to set out where the works will be located. It is not to define the overall extent of the works to account for traffic management, detailed kerb line ties and the like.	Kier/HE	

MEETING NOTES

	This is consistent with the basis of the DCO which essentially seeks to deal with detailed design later. Kier / HE to review and revert back.		
1.18	WSP confirmed that further material will need to be submitted in respect of the application for departures from design standards. HE advised that given their role as Project Sponsor, this further material should be submitted to Neil Hansen and Kristie Goffe in the first instance prior to it being uploaded to the WEBDAS platform.	WSP	
1.19	With regard to the SWHGVMP, it was clarified that the purpose of the document is to act as an operational tool to manage HGV demand. Its purpose is not to manage down peak hour HGV trips to and from WMI given that the impact of these journeys has been accounted for within the modelling undertaken to date. It was however advocated by Kier and Systra that a series of recovery / contingent measures be set out in the event that the Rail Terminal is not used or is closed in order to create a fallback position. This is in order to manage HGV demand in terms of additional journeys that may arise. This will also deal with management of the Early Arrival Bays.	WSP	
1.20	WSP advised that a requirement has been added to the draft DCO that allows for the approval of the design of the Early Arrival Bays by the Highway Authority's.	Note	
1.21	Systra's view is that all driver facilities should be free of charge for WMI drivers.	Note	
1.22	Kier / HE will consider a response in terms of what they expect to see in terms of usage of overnight lorry parks. It may be that some commentary is needed in a Technical Note that considers driver time regulations and explanation of circumstances leading to when drivers need to take breaks after visiting WMI will be needed, but this will be clarified.	Kier/HE	
1.23	SSDC confirmed that a report has been prepared considering strategic growth options within the Greater Birmingham Area and is available on the SSDC Examination web site. This report considers the 60,000 dwelling shortfall in housing from Birmingham and the Black Country up to 2036. It has identified a potential strategic site to the north of Penkridge.	Note	
1.24	Requested that WSP provide an update on SCC position after catch up conversation scheduled for w/c 5 March 2018.	Note	
1.25	<p>Post Meeting update following tele con between SCC & WSP (5/3/18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SCC may want Contingent Transport Management Fund in place during construction given potential for traffic diversion. · Traffic diversion during construction is a concern for SCC, but appreciate difficult to quantify at this stage. Point taken that some traffic may divert to other roads, but will not impact on capacity. · Suggest data should be collated on adjacent roads prior to start of construction in order to monitor any changes. · SCC will advise which roads the Contingent Fund should consider and will revert back after scheduled meeting with community officer of 8/3/18. · Potential for experimental TRO's to be provided on roads where SCC may want to prohibit HGV's, but which have yet to be defined. This is less onerous than full TRO process. 	<p>SCC</p> <p>SCC</p> <p>Note</p>	

MEETING NOTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SCC will provide comments on HGVMP.• SCC suggest that a percentage of HGV parking spaces could be set aside if required to deal with flexible use in the event of operational difficulties / need for driver breaks.• SCC would agree that driver facilities are free of charge for WMI drivers.• SCC will chase modelling colleagues as to when they intend to view SSVM. Noted that WSP are content for SCC to view the modelling work undertaken as part of WMI.	SCC Note Note	
--	--	-----------------------------	--

NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed.