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1. THE CHAIR: Firstly, thank you to HS2 for providing material on interest payments and the community fund. That’s much appreciated. If we’ve got any questions on that, we will come back later. Perhaps this is an opportune time for me to encourage petitioners, and this is not a comment for Stafford Borough Council but more going forward, to really focus on what we as a Committee can do for you as petitioners and focus your arguments in the first 10 minutes to cover off all of those points so we can then probe in more detail. All too often, petitioners are leaving some of their key arguments to the end after quite a period and after quite a period of repeating similar and relatively low-level issues compared to the principal issues that we can actually do something about. So, I would encourage petitioners to be brief, to try to do the majority of their arguments up front within 10 minutes and I would also encourage petitioners to tune in and look at a few previous petitioners and the clerk and officers can be helpful in giving some examples of good petitioners that have made the best of their arguments so we can discharge our duties to the best of our abilities. Those are general comments. They weren’t meant as an introduction to Stafford Borough Council.

2. Mr Farrington, it’s a pleasure to have you here. Sorry, we haven’t got a name tag for you but it’s a pleasure for you to be here petitioning.

**Stafford Borough Council**

**Submissions by Mr Farrington**

3. Well, thank you, good morning, sir, good morning, members. I did have a name tag but the spelling wasn’t correct and so I think that’s being remedied but, nevertheless, as I’ve said, good morning. I have had the opportunity of seeing previous presentations and note your comments about brevity and so on but thank you for allowing me as the leader of Stafford Borough Council to address you. I’m happy to say that the council’s original petition contained quite a few issues but in fact, following discussions, following clarity on various points, there’s only really one outstanding matter that I want to come on to shortly, but forgive me if I just take a couple of minutes just to outline a couple of other matters just for clarity.

4. As I said, so we have been liaising with other petitioners and in part there are...
some common issues but I hope to save a lot of your time by summarising very quickly one or two issues and I hope that you’ll acknowledge that as the leader of a local authority, it’s important that I get across messages from community groups and so on.

5. And so, as part of my council’s petition, but also areas that I don’t want to dwell on, just want to mention in passing, we appear to have had workable solutions around a number of issues like, for example, the viaduct at Great Haywood and the marina, places like Ingestre, Pasturefields Salt Marshes, Yarlet, and so I don’t want to dwell on those. I also note that there have been, and continue to be, discussions with HS2 and the National Trust around Shugborough, for example, but I do want to ask like Jeremy Lefroy did last week that local parish councils are a party to those ongoing talks and I say that for two reasons really. I know it’s true around the country but, particularly in Staffordshire and Stafford borough, our local communities and parish councils work very hard and take a real effort to be engaged with consultations and obviously have local knowledge that is invaluable to the process, so I just ask that in passing.

6. I also just want to mention one other thing that Jeremy mentioned and that relates to the prospect of Stafford’s future prosperity. He referred to the working of the Handsacre link and the classic compatible trains coming on to the West Coast Main Line and I do ask, and support Jeremy in his request, that a clause is contained in the Bill that Stafford and Stoke on Trent must always be served at least hourly, hopefully more but at least hourly, by HS2 classic compatible trains using that Handsacre link and Jeremy gave an excellent example around Penkridge station.

7. The only other point by way of general introduction is that, again, I know that to use the words flow chart, you’ve seen a couple of examples around how the HS2 service was proposed originally from Stafford through to Runcorn and Liverpool Line Street but now it’s proposed to run through Stafford, Stoke and on to Macclesfield and I saw the general discussion around that and hopefully in future, again, around perhaps the economic understandings of the operators, that will develop over time. But, in passing, Stafford Borough has a population, a growing population of 135,000 people. We have passengers coming in from Shropshire from Cheshire and, obviously, to ensure future economic viability and the success of HS2 generally, it does make sense to consider ongoing routes and beyond Macclesfield.
So, as I said, there is one issue that I would like to address you about, sir, and that is the issue covered by paragraphs 16-20 of the council’s position.

THE CHAIR: Can we get that up in front of us?

MR FARRINGTON: Sir, yes, I believe it’s contained at R97(13). The issues really are around the railhead at Yarnfield and I know that you’ve heard from a number of individual petitioners, groups and so on around that point.

MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It’s the bottom of this page.

THE CHAIR: So, point 16 around the M6 motorway.

MR FARRINGTON: So really, everything I’m about to say is predicated on the basis that the borough council has never accepted that Stone is a suitable location for the railhead nor a subsequent IMB-R proposal and has never supported that concept and you may recall that I wrote a letter of support on 19 April of this year to those opposing it and I agreed that that letter could be submitted to the Committee and I think it has been. And so, to that extent, my letter makes the council’s position clear but also points out the concerns as to traffic management and traffic flow around that area particularly.

And the council’s petition is that in the likely event that HS2 is going to be built, the council has concentrated around securing suitable mitigation and so particularly echoes the words of Sir David Higgins, that he used in a letter that he wrote to my chief executive and that is really around the concept of paragraph 16 of the petition, his words, ‘There are exciting opportunities ahead for the area with the Constellation Partnership working together to maximise the benefits that HS2 will bring. We look forward to seeing plans progress over the coming months and years’.

So, that’s the context from which I’d like to address you about this issue and, as I’ve said, you’ve heard about the problems and difficulties that already exist in terms of traffic management. We have the smart motorways going on between junctions 13 to 15 at the moment. We have proposed works at junctions 15 to 16 and the redesigning, remodelling of junction 15 and potentially, possible rail interchange down at junction 12 in south Staffordshire.

THE CHAIR: Sorry can I just check, did you say proposed or opposed? Proposed
works when you’re talking about the junction, you don’t oppose the works? I think I missed – it didn’t make sense as opposed.

17. MR FARRINGTON: I apologise, sir.

18. THE CHAIR: I think it was my hearing. I just wanted to clarify.

19. MR FARRINGTON: No, maybe my Lancastrian accent, sir, I’ll try and be a little clearer.

20. THE CHAIR: Let’s say 50/50 at fault. What was the right way?

21. MR FARRINGTON: The right way, sir, is, as I understand it, the proposed remodelling of junction 15.

22. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

23. MR FARRINGTON: Thank you. And so, as I acknowledged a moment ago, the Stone Railhead Crisis Group has undertaken some very lengthy and hard work around the issues concerning traffic load, traffic flow of traffic management and I don’t hold myself out as an expert in any way, shape or form but I was struck by the very intelligent way I thought Mr Gordon Wilkinson gave evidence around those issues, he being a retired highways officer from Staffordshire County Council and with his local knowledge I thought that he gave a great deal.

24. And so the other issue around traffic flow and so on, and we have a difficulty in relation to the accident and emergency department at Stafford, it isn’t open 24 hours per day and so when it is not open, that means that emergencies have to go up to Stoke and the A34 passing by and through Stone and Yarnfield is really the only thoroughfare through which that traffic can go. So, all of that background is really setting out what I’m about to say.

25. Very finally, not as an expert but as a member of the public, I had a look at Yarnfield again myself on Saturday and, again, I was struck by how it really isn’t suitable for haulage traffic. In just 30 seconds, I came across four cyclists. It’s a well-used cyclists’ route. It’s clearly unsuitable for pedestrians and towards the junction where the Wayfarer Inn is on the A34, there’s the very steep gradient with the s-bend
and all of the consequent difficulties that that might engender. I’m sure, sir, that you and your Committee members may have visited the site but, just by way of reminder, exhibits A117 pages 9 to 11 are just photograph reminders about the area there, Yarnfield Lane, and so photograph 9 shows the area going down towards the steep gradient and s-bend, photograph 10 is a very similar point and photograph 11 shows the area just approaching towards the M6 motorway bridge. So really, as I say by way of a reminder, all of that background creates real difficulties as to traffic flow and haulage traffic. Not that it has any great relevance but exhibits A117(1) and (2), just tell you a little bit about me and particularly (2) and I’ve been the leader for – in my fourth year and I won’t dwell on the third bullet point there but that just tells you a little bit about me.

26. THE CHAIR: We won’t hold that against you.

27. MR FARRINGTON: No, I’m very grateful sir, thank you. And so, in relation to A117(3), the bullet points just pick out the current proposals and the problems that the Bill proposes and, as you know, these propose permanent off slip roads from and on slip roads to the M6 southbound and a temporary off slip road from and on slip road to the M6 northbound and both the north and southbound slip roads connecting to a re-aligned Yarnfield Lane. So, that means in principle that the traffic to and from the railhead site will have to travel on Yarnfield Lane. It suggests that there will be a desire from local residents to use the access as a short cut to and from the motorway. It’s the council’s understanding that the proposals around those slips don’t meet current Highways England guidance.

28. THE CHAIR: Sheryll Murray, I think, has a quick question.

29. MRS MURRAY: I’ve just noticed that. Can you explain why?

30. MR FARRINGTON: I can’t. As I said, I don’t hold myself out as an expert or an engineer.

31. MRS MURRAY: So, where did you get that information from?

32. MR FARRINGTON: I can only say that I would hope that my friends at HS2 would acknowledge that that is a factual statement. I understand that that information
has been given to the council from Atkins. I’m being told that really that’s because of the proximity of the proposed slips to the services area of the motorway.

33. MRS MURRAY: Okay, now the local highways authority is Staffordshire County Council. Have you had discussions with Staffordshire County Council about your concerns?

34. MR FARRINGTON: We have had discussions. We liaised initially when drafting and presenting the Bills, sorry, the petitions. I am, of course, aware that Staffordshire County Council have latterly ploughed their own furrow, if I can put it that way, in relation to how they have dealt with their petition and so I don’t know their current thinking around whether or not the position that they’ve now adopted satisfies those concerns. I can only say that we were not consulted and that that concern remains.

35. MRS MURRAY: Thank you.

36. THE CHAIR: Sandy?

37. MR MARTIN: Yes, we did actually discuss the motorway slips with Staffordshire County Council when they were doing their evidence and their petition and, as I understand it, the reason why the motorway access, well, the two reasons why the motorway access is not in accordance with highway standards is, one, because the constraint of the site makes it impossible to have a full junction and, two, because it was too close in terms of distance along the M6 from the service area and there needs to be a certain number of miles between junctions in order to make them safe on a motorway, in which case the Highways Agency are prepared to have a dedicated slip for the maintenance depot, but only for that and not to have a full junction. So, your very correct problem with the layout there that you’ve put in bullet point 1 doesn’t sit with your request in your petition for the proposed temporary M6 slip roads to be made permanent and to be made part of a full junction. It doesn’t work, does it?

38. MR FARRINGTON: It doesn’t and in a later exhibit I will accept that, in principle, what you’ve just said is correct and also that initially when this proposal was put forward, the suggestion back from the promoter was that it wasn’t in fact technically possible to have a full junction. I will hope to demonstrate that technically it is but for the reasons that you’ve just put forward, I will talk about another option that will
hopefully or can be the thrust of what I’m saying and will, in my submission anyway, deal with all of the problems around Yarnfield Lane.


40. MR FARRINGTON: But I accept fully what you say on that point.

41. THE CHAIR: You’ve sparked our interest. Let’s get stuck into this solution if we can.

42. MR FARRINGTON: Thank you. And so, if I could move then please on to exhibit A117(4). Really that’s the point that you were just making and so I think that is a diagram of the proposed arrangements at the moment with the red highlighting showing the slips and the green highlighting showing the re-alignment of Yarnfield Lane. And so, if we move please on to exhibits 5 and 6, 5 first of all please. So, the option that effectively was being petitioned was this point about creating the full permanent junction and goes back to my introductory remarks around the Constellation and seeking the prospect of economic and other benefits but if we look at the second option, which is the option that I’m going to talk about in a little more detail, because the initial report commissioned by my council with Atkins was not really for the purposes of petitioning, it was to try and establish whether or not a junction to serve a new garden settlement proposal was possible and because the answer to that was yes, the next question asked of Atkins was, ‘Okay, thank you for saying yes. Where might that full junction be if it couldn’t be on the railhead site itself and would there be a way of mitigating and minimising the traffic flow and the management difficulties?’

43. So, moving on to the next exhibit please, number 6. So, again that’s just the point that I’ve made and accepting that that wouldn’t be appropriate.

44. Moving on please to item 7, again, I’m sort of saying that that was an argument put forward in the petition. It is possible to, we suggest, overlay a full motorway junction at the IMB-R itself but for the slip road arguments and all of the other discussions, we accept that that would be not inappropriate but less than helpful.

45. And so, moving on please to exhibit number 8, 117(8), it doesn’t, as I’ve suggested and as you’ve suggested sir, it doesn’t deal with the problem of construction
traffic and so on. So, option 2, if I can move on please to the next slide. Apologies, skipping the photographs, going on to number 12 please. It was in the context of what we’ve just discussed that the council considered another option, a better highways solution particularly would be to create a new junction further up off the A51 and in distance terms that is about 1.9 kilometres to the north of the current railhead. And so, what would that do? It would create a full permanent junction to Highways England guidance and that’s the point I was making earlier about the current proposal on the railhead site itself not meeting that guidance but a full permanent junction further up could provide that and it could also provide a haul road from the new motorway junction, directly into the railhead and as an aside, and also a better suggestion in terms of what does HS2 bring in terms of economic benefits and so on –

46. THE CHAIR: I think Sandy’s got a question, sorry to interrupt.

47. MR MARTIN: Yes, as I understand it, the main object of the slip roads in the initial instance on to the site for the IMB-R is for it to – almost all the materials that need to come by road to that site can come up the M6 and straight off the M6 on to the site. Between that site and your proposal for a junction, if we can bring up P256 please. So, you can see the site there, just north of the two service station blobs, you can see where the site is going to be, just next to it, between there is Yarnfield Lane and the proposed site of the junction with the A51 is north of that, just there, the junction between the M6 and the A51.

48. THE CHAIR: The blue road.

49. MR MARTIN: Yes, where the red road crosses the blue road. So, I’m assuming that given that there are two viaducts, or at least one viaduct, between there and the proposed site, construction site which it will be, until such time as the railway is built, it will be the major construction site for the whole area, for the majority of that time, it will not be possible to get from one side of the M6 to the other side of the M6 until the viaduct has been built, which means that for the majority of that time, all the road vehicles that come off on your new junction on the A51 are going to have to go through the centre of Stone in order to get to the new – or they’re going to have to come down the A34 anyway and then down Yarnfield Lane in order to get to the proposed site which absolutely obviates the whole point of having slip roads off the M6 in the first
place, doesn’t it?

50. MR FARRINGTON: I can assist you, sir, in that regard if I could refer you please to exhibit 118(16). That is the proposed new motorway junction as it crosses the A51 and you will see that just off the motorway is the creation of a very small roundabout with a slip road going down to the right which leads directly into the railhead and so the point, sir, that you just made about the traffic needing to go on the A51 and then down the A34 and Yarnfield Lane is completely removed by the new haul road at that point.

51. MR MARTIN: Sorry, this is the M6?

52. MR FARRINGTON: The M6 in the middle. The new junction suggested by the Atkins report as it joins the A51, the very small roundabout where the cursor is showing now and down to the right-hand side there’s a haul road, purely for haulage traffic that would feed directly into the IMB-R site and so the distance there is just over one mile and it would purely be for construction traffic. The benefit there is that none of the difficulties around Yarnfield Lane, for example the traffic difficulties – I understand one of the proposals is to close the middle of the carriageway on the A34 for about 12 months – none of that would be required and so, really, although this proposal I anticipate may not find favour with HS2 because of cost and delay, part of what we say is that it wouldn’t be necessary to build a fully functional permanent junction at the M6/A51 immediately; it could be a phased process. And so, the suggestion that admittedly the technical note which is part of the exhibit here from Atkins talks about a 10-year lead-in period, but that report is talking about a fully functioning, permanent junction. So, of course, further technical work might be required but, as far as I’m aware, you’ve had no submissions from anybody about how to deal with the issues around Yarnfield Lane and the A34. What this does is that it provides, if it’s decided that the railhead is going to go at Stone Yarnfield, it provides a much better solution in terms of taking off haulage traffic, it allows Yarnfield Lane to operate on a much more normal basis, it saves money to the promoter in terms of none of the engineering works to re-align and so on.

53. THE CHAIR: I’m going to pause you. Sheryll’s got a question and then I’ve got a question.

54. MRS MURRAY: Yes, just to say, have you had any discussions with the local
highway authority of Staffordshire County Council about these proposals?

55. MR FARRINGTON: It’s a very difficult question to answer in terms of giving the detail around that. My authority and I have had discussions with the local highways authority, with the county council, with for example wider organisations such as the local enterprise partnership and so on and, yes, we’ve had those discussions but I am aware, as I said when you asked me that same question, my position as a local borough authority is not the same as the county’s position as the highways authority and I’m aware of the separate arrangements that they have entered into. Thank you. I’ve just been passed a very helpful note from my chief executive confirming that the Atkins report that forms the technical note, of which this is a part, was commissioned by the county council.

56. MRS MURRAY: And they shared that with you, did they?

57. MR FARRINGTON: Yes.

58. THE CHAIR: So, has this dropped off the end of the negotiating table?

59. MR FARRINGTON: I don’t know how to answer that question, sir. All I can say to you is that my council has not been a party to latter discussions. I accept that there have been separate discussions with the highways authority and the promoter. My council has not been party to those. I come to you today knowing that as background but putting to you –

60. THE CHAIR: Earlier on, did the highways authority support this or consider it viable as an option?

61. MR FARRINGTON: Yes, as I’ve said, they commissioned the report.

62. THE CHAIR: And you mentioned earlier the case against it was cost. Have you got an estimation of costs in your rebuttal if it’s worth it?

63. MR FARRINGTON: Well, the Atkins report which forms the technical note as an adjunct to my main presentation contains an estimate of up to £117 million and I know that my friend will say, well, the approximate estimate is £120 million which is there or thereabouts. But my submissions are based around, first, that cost contained a 25%
contingency; secondly, there would be a significant cost saving because, if this were to happen, the cost of the junction at the railhead and, for example, the remedial works thereafter would not be required and I understand that that’s costed out at about £10 million and, as I have said, I accept that it is not necessarily the overall remit of your Committee to say ‘yea’ or ‘nay’ but there is a wider economic benefit around HS2 and I suppose that I’m saying to you, as I said a few moments ago, I’m not aware of any other proposed alternative to all of the upset and all of the difficulties that would be caused by the junction being at Yarnfield and the closures and the traffic management flows and so on.

64. THE CHAIR: Okay, shall we take some final questions and come to Mr Strachan?

65. MR FARRINGTON: Thank you. May I just make one other point because I think it’s important? Obviously if the junction were, as I am suggesting, not at the IMB-R itself, again, I’m aware that you’ve heard from other petitioners that space at the IMB-R is at a premium. Without the junction there, that would create more space and more help, more assistance to the operation of the railhead at a later date.

66. THE CHAIR: Okay. At some point it would be useful if HS2 could put up a map that shows this with the IMB-R alongside so we can get an idea of scale and so forth. Martin?

67. MR WHITFIELD: Thank you, it’s really just a point of clarification. As we’re looking at A118(16), the A51 at the bottom there, that goes on there to be crossed by HS2 as per the original plan, isn’t it? So, it’s the A51 diverted to a new junction and HS2 just off this map is due to cross the A51 at the roundabout with the A53, is it?

68. MR MARTIN: 519.

69. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry, 519, thank you. That would still stay the same in your proposal?

70. MR FARRINGTON: As far as I’m aware, this proposal doesn’t affect that in any way.

71. MR WHITFIELD: Right. And then if we look to the north of the new junction,
the small roundabout, that’s effectively going to try and join the haul road that’s going to be built anyway.

72. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No.

73. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry? You envisage, in essence, a new road running parallel with the motorway to – sorry, yes.

74. MR FARRINGTON: Sorry, I anticipated –

75. MR WHITFIELD: There would be a new road, sorry, that would run parallel with the motorway into the maintenance depot and you estimated that at a mile, was it?

76. MR FARRINGTON: A mile and a bit. It’s 1.9 kilometres.

77. MR WHITFIELD: It’s just shy of two kilometres; that’s fine. And can we see on this map where your proposal for the new housebuilding is or anything? Because you say it’s obviously to feed an economic development of HS2 or is that still too far away?

78. MR FARRINGTON: It’s very early days.

79. MR WHITFIELD: Yes, I appreciate that.

80. MR FARRINGTON: There isn’t a map that I’m aware of in terms of showing exactly where it is but I can tell you that it is on land currently occupied by MoD and south of this diagram –

81. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Do you want me to try and pull it up? It’s 256.

82. MR WHITFIELD: Thank you.

83. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And if you move the cursor, it’s in this area here.

84. MR MARTIN: Around Mill Meece?

85. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It’s quite a big area but, yes, to the right of Mill Meece and then down below in the land down here and across here to Stourbridge.

86. MR WHITFIELD: Yes.
87. MR FARRINGTON: And so that area, as I say, it’s currently occupied by MoD. The council is in discussions with a view to declaring that land as surplus.

88. MR WHITFIELD: So, almost equidistant between your proposed junction and the existing proposed junction from HS2? So, both would satisfy?

89. MR FARRINGTON: Yes. I think helpfully, as I said earlier, the Atkins report is not commissioned at all really with a view to a petition to support here but was originally a high brow report, just looking at the art of the possible. But within the report, the Atkins report does talk about the number of traffic flows, the number of anticipated vehicles flows and so on and, perhaps more helpfully, the Atkins report future proofs some expansion of traffic flow that would be generated by a new settlement. Additionally, and I think also importantly, it comments that the local traffic that currently uses junctions 13 to 15 to get off the motorway and get to Stone and the surrounding villages by a new junction there, that would take away, I think, the estimate was about 7,500 other users and so that would take the stress off the other junctions that are currently being used for that purpose.

90. MR WHITFIELD: So, your proposal would satisfy a number of queries, not just HS2’s. My final question is, under your proposal, Yarnfield Road would continue in its old route through, effectively, the depot but wouldn’t suffer any of the heavy usage that it might do under the first proposal?

91. MR FARRINGTON: My understanding is that, yes, that’s correct.

92. MR WHITFIELD: It would just continue as a – yes, sorry, your understanding. Excellent, thank you.

93. THE CHAIR: Thank you. I think we’ve no more questions so we’ll come to Mr Strachan. If we could have the best possible map that HS2 have got that has the IMB-R, the new junction and HS2. I must admit, I’m sure others aren’t, but I’m struggling.

Response by Mr Strachan

94. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, I’ve got Mr Smart to cover any technical points but shall I just try and give you a brief outline of why the two requests, either
option 1 or option 2, and I’m not sure option 1’s being pursued anymore, but why they just don’t work and then you can ask any technical questions that arise.

95. THE CHAIR: Can we see the map first?

96. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Absolutely. P257(6) is the construction plan for the depot and you can see, for the purposes of construction, here’s Stone, the Stone IMB-R, here’s the M6 motorway and during construction, what happens is there are constructed as early as possible, slips off the motorway both southbound, that’s the southbound slip, and northbound, that’s the one here, in order to gain access to the M6 as early as possible. And as Mr Martin pointed out, the reason for that is there’s a lot of traffic being generated by the railway generally.

97. THE CHAIR: So, where is the new proposed junction on this map? This is what I want to see, on the one map. At the moment, I do need to see roughly where it is because I don’t understand at the moment. I need to understand.

98. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, well, let me try this plan then, P261(2). So just to orientate that the second option is proposed. I hope this helps. So, we’ve just translated what we think is the council’s second option request and they’re proposing that you order the construction of a new junction at 14, what they call junction 14a at the A51 and then the IMB-R, they say, would be served by ordering the construction of a new haul road that runs all the way down, that’s the yellow road, for 1.5 miles back to the IMB-R. And the basic problem with that, leave aside the number of other things such as costs etc, the basic problem with that is provided in Atkins’ own report to the council. It will take a minimum of 10 years to build a new junction, a junction 14a, which of course immediately defeats any possible benefit for the construction Phase 2A because we are proposing to be up and running by 2026, not starting construction in 2026 and so it—

99. MR WIGGIN: That’s an extraordinarily long time to build a junction.

100. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, you say to build a junction, I imagine the building itself is quicker but the planning of going through the necessary plans for constructing a new junction and then integrating it on to a busy motorway and constructing it is no easy challenge, let’s be clear.
101. THE CHAIR: Sheryll Murray has a question.

102. MRS MURRAY: Yes. Mr Strachan, we’ve heard today that the Atkins report was initially to look at a new housing development.

103. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

104. MRS MURRAY: And so, the timescale of 10 years we’d probably be looking at a completely different situation to the situation we have now if HS2 were to take that. Can we have some idea as to if you were to propose this, and I’m not suggesting you should, can we have some idea as to how long the planning situation would take to make sure that it met your timetable because, clearly, you’ve quoted from a report not to use this junction for HS2 but that was commissioned to look at housing in the longer term.

105. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I think it’s anticipated you could abbreviate the period if it went into a Bill by about three years so you could do it in seven years.

106. MRS MURRAY: Okay.

107. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): But that’s about as far as you can accelerate it. Before you get there, just if I can make this point, you’re already presupposing that there should be a new junction in this location to serve a new settlement which, as yet, is an emerging idea which hasn’t yet been through any of the required planning processes.

108. MRS MURRAY: I wasn’t presupposing.

109. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I mean, sorry, that’s the council’s – I’m saying you, one is presupposing that there is going to be a new junction required in this location.

110. THE CHAIR: Let’s be led by Sheryll rather than presuppose.

111. MRS MURRAY: I think we should look at the situation of, this is an alternative that HS2 could realistically consider and the timescales that you have just given me is because, for the purpose of the Atkins report which was commissioned to look at new housing. Could you tell me if you did consider this and your reasons for just basically saying, we can’t do that, without saying that the Atkins report says it’s going to be 10 years down the road because, what I’m trying to get at is, have HS2 considered this as a realistic option to serve the railhead?
112. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, we have. Let me just walk you through the steps, if I may.

113. THE CHAIR: Let’s just make sure Sheryll’s finished her question. I would caution anyone talking over Committee members. Sheryll Murray.

114. MRS MURRAY: I just feel that you have dismissed this out of hand without actually looking at it as an option that could benefit the community in the future if you were to do it and I need to be convinced that you’ve actually considered that.

115. THE CHAIR: Mr Strachan?

116. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, the answer to that question is, yes, we have considered it and if you allow me just to take you through the steps as to why it doesn’t work, having considered it and why we consider it doesn’t work for the objects that are said to be driving it. And can I just show you quickly, if we go back to PE257(6), the proposal is to construct Phase 2A and the reason we’re considering this Bill now is to construct it urgently and to have it, as I’ve indicated, up and running, ideally by 2026. This Stone IMB-R acts as a railhead and thereafter as a maintenance depot but the key traffic movements arise from construction of the railway and the purpose of obtaining access to the M6 for this railway is to get the construction traffic off the local roads and therefore we need to access to the M6 in the construction period of the railway, in order to construct it by 2026. What this proposal which is in the Bill does, is gain that access to the M6 by the creation of temporary slips, as I’ve just explained, for the principal period of construction. There is traffic on Yarnfield Lane, of course, and you looked at, you will recall, those histograms which show that that principally, the main bulk of the traffic, occurs in the start-up period while we get the Stone depot up and running and to construct the slips.

117. MRS MURRAY: I’m not 100% convinced that you’ve actually considered, you keep talking about temporary slips, we know they cannot be permanent.

118. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

119. MRS MURRAY: If you took the option to create a permanent junction as we’ve seen, then that will actually benefit the community in the long term and probably
provide better value for money and I need to be absolutely convinced that you’ve looked at this seriously and at the moment, from what you’re saying, it doesn’t appear that you have.

120. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, forgive me, I haven’t finished because I’m just taking you through the process. So, those are the required –

121. THE CHAIR: We’ll try to let you finish –

122. MRS MURRAY: Yes.

123. THE CHAIR: And I know Sandy has got a question so we’ll try to exercise some restraint.

124. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, just to be clear, I am answering the question but I’ve got to tell you what the requirements are for the construction in order to answer your question. That’s why I’m taking you back to the construction requirements. So, that’s the construction requirement. It’s achieved through this scheme by the creation of temporary slips and, as you’ve just identified and Mr Martin referred to, those temporary slips are, indeed, temporary. They are not intended as public use slips and, as was correctly pointed out, you can’t have public use slips in this location because it’s too close to the service station. So, option 1 as the council suggested doesn’t work, which was to create a new permanent junction in this location and that’s confirmed by the Atkins report in the document that they commissioned at A118(33). Now, it’s described, confusingly, here as option 3 but if you trace it through the Atkins report you’ll see that. But if you just look at that paragraph, this is the council’s own commissioned report, there are various reasons and you get to their headline conclusion at the end of the sentence ‘For these reasons, we’ve concluded that a junction in this location is not a viable option’. So, that’s the permanent junction at Stone.

125. Option 2 they’re now suggesting which is the new junction at junction 14a doesn’t work and we have considered it because, in order to create access for construction of the railway back on to the M6 to avoid all the local construction movements, you have to gain access on to the M6 either by a dedicated haul road or slip road or, using the local road network. As I understand it, the council aren’t suggesting ‘Use the local road network’; otherwise that would defeat the object of creating these slips. So, option 2,
which is the map if we go back to page PE261(2), is what they have suggested we do. In order to do that, we would have to create a new junction on the M6. That is build a new junction on to the M6 because whilst the haul road, the newer haul road they’re suggesting which is the yellow line, would also have to be constructed. That only takes you to the A51. You then have to build a whole new motorway junction in order to gain access to the M6. The Atkins report has a timeline for achieving –

126. THE CHAIR: I’m so sorry, that’s exactly what they’re asking for. You’re repeating what would be required and what’s required is what they’re asking for, so it doesn’t seem to serve the point or I’m missing the point.

127. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, only – the point being, you have to construct a new junction on the M6 before you could even begin construction of the HS2 –

128. MRS MURRAY: But you’re constructing slip roads.

129. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): You’re not constructing slip roads.

130. MRS MURRAY: Temporary slip roads.

131. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, they’re suggesting the construction of a new junction, not a temporary slip road.

132. MRS MURRAY: No, what I’m saying is, you’re already going to, in your proposals, construct temporary slip roads.

133. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, yes, that’s right, at a cost of about, I think the total cost is about £10 million and those slip roads occur in the location of the IMB-R and then they’re removed, the one in the north’s removed and the one in the south’s retained for HS2 traffic only. This proposal, if it were to be done, would involve the construction of a new hallway, the yellow) so we have to build that first or at the same time and then the construction of a new junction at the A51, okay, a new motorway junction. We can’t actually get any construction traffic on to the M6 at the A51 without creating either temporary slip roads which doesn’t achieve what the council want, or a whole new junction of the type they’re suggesting here, which they say would be the legacy.
134. And there are a number of reasons why we’ve looked at that and we don’t think that’s a viable option. The first is the timescale because in order to build a new junction on the M6, Atkins indicate a minimum of 10 years through ordinary processes. We’ve estimated you could potentially accelerate it to seven years if you were to order it in a Bill, but that, of course, takes us way outside the timetable for delivery of the –

135. THE CHAIR: Sheryll?

136. MRS MURRAY: I’m not a highways engineer, okay. However, the full junction could take seven years but could you not do the temporary slip roads in this location, which could be utilised for the eventual provision of a permanent junction? Rather than putting slip roads somewhere else and then just saying, ‘Well, that money’s thrown away’, surely it would make more sense to use this location for the temporary slip roads so that they can be used in the future to benefit the local people.

137. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, I think if that’s the suggestion it’s a suggestion we don’t understand because –

138. MRS MURRAY: I’m just asking if it can be done.

139. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, well, we don’t understand how it could be done because in order to get your slip roads on to the M6 itself you’ve got to create the necessary structures to gain access to the M6. They’ve got to be sufficiently compliant with standards and, in effect, they’ve got to, in essence, provide the characteristics of a junction to carry construction traffic on and off them. The temporary slips at the IMB-R do not, because they’re temporary and, for example, they don’t have to meet the public use requirements of the weaving distances we talked about earlier because they’re not intended for public use, they’re intended for construction activity, they won’t be used in the future. We have not seen any proposal and Atkins don’t present a proposal of how you could build what is, in effect, a temporary junction which would then become a permanent junction, which isn’t, in fact, a permanent junction to start with. I’m not even sure conceptually how that –

140. MRS MURRAY: So you haven’t looked at that option.

141. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, we don’t think it is an option that you can –
142. MRS MURRAY: Have you looked at it and dismissed it? Or have you just said, ‘We want our plan so we’ll go ahead with our plan, end of’?

143. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, we have – do you want Mr Smart?

144. THE CHAIR: Yes.

145. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I think it’s very simple –

146. MRS MURRAY: That would be very useful. Thank you.

147. MR WIGGIN: We always like Mr Smart.

148. THE CHAIR: Thank you. I will try to restrain myself and I would recommend the Committee to do likewise. So just five, 10 minutes and let’s hear the evidence.

Evidence of Mr Smart

149. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Would you like – I think Mr Smart probably knows what the issue is but I could just articulate it or if Mrs Murray wants to –

150. THE CHAIR: Can you help us, Mr Smart?

151. MR SMART: I will try, sir, as far as I understand it. Shall I just start?

152. THE CHAIR: Mr Strachan said continue.

153. MR SMART: The key thing here is for us to get access into what is the IMB-R for our railhead as quickly as possible. Now, we already have some slips there which are emergency access slips, which enable us or go some way towards fulfilling that for us. We’ve got to change them but we can use certain provisions in that area. If we were to build temporary slips in the vicinity of the roundabout that Ms Murray is talking about, as Mr Strachan has pointed out, we would have to configure – if they were going to be used for a later point we’d have to configure them to be compliant with highway standard, which, of course, ours are not, which would be quite a lot of work, actually. It wouldn’t be quite so straightforward as just landing some slips there; it would involve quite a bit of land take.

154. Furthermore, you’ve actually got to build them there and we’ve got to get
construction plan and lorries there, so that would be another demand on the roads. But also the haul road that we would then have to build between that and the IMB-R, if you just build what we call haul roads for mass haul, which is, if you like, earthmoving plant, that can be quite a low standard but we would be wanting to bring a lot more than just earthmoving plant into our IMB-R for a railhead. Therefore, that would have to be quite a good standard road and that in itself would demand more construction traffic and more plant to actually build that.

155. But all of that, the key thing is all of that would take time and it would put pressure on the local roads. What we’re trying to do, and I do appreciate there’s some pressure on the Yarnfield Lane while we get the slips in but the whole point of those slips is to get them in as quickly as possible to relieve as best we can the most of the Yarnfield Lane except for that central section, which is in the vicinity of the IMB-R and we are looking at ways in which we can mitigate that by putting perhaps a temporary provision there as well as part of the ongoing design.

156. So that, in a nutshell, hopefully might explain the conundrum we have. It’s time, as Mr Strachan’s pointed out, is one of the key things but there’s also quite a lot of construction we’d have to do which adds to that time but, more importantly, adds traffic onto the road.

157. THE CHAIR: Mr Strachan, with your permission, can I exceptionally ask Mr Farrington if he’s got any questions for Mr Smart?

158. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Of course.

159. THE CHAIR: Because that might assist the Committee rather than us trying to do the work without the knowledge.

160. MR FARRINGTON: Thank you. I have no direct questions in terms of his expertise but I had hoped to make one or two comments that might assist, particularly in relation to the timescale issue and the issue around –

161. THE CHAIR: If you could – that either comes afterwards or via questioning Mr Smart. One or t’other. And actually giving you the opportunity to ask questions is quite exceptional. It’s a little disorderly but I thought it would be helpful. Let’s leave your
points to the end.

162. Mr Strachan?

163. MR FARRINGTON: Sorry, sir, I apologise.

164. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That’s all right. I’m just going to –

165. MR FARRINGTON: Sorry, I perhaps ought to ask a question of Mr Smart. I’ll try not to be too long. I think it’s right that we’ve heard a concession that it would possibly take about seven years for a permanent junction rather than the 10 in the Atkins report as set out. Is it possible to create a junction in a lesser period of time than seven years that would not on its face be a permanent junction at that point but would assist in connection with the haulage along the haul road? Is it possible to construct something off the M6 that would serve that purpose and a permanent junction would be a phasing prospect at a later date?

166. MR SMART: I suspect it is, but I think the issue with that would be that to make it anything that was going to be any use for a permanent junction it would have to be configured with all the sightings and the distances that would actually convert into a permanent junction. And, therefore, it would still be quite a significant construction undertaking not just a much more simple slip that we have used elsewhere in Phase One on the M25 and we are proposing here at the IMB-R because it’s only here for a temporary use and, therefore, we can get derogations for those distances, the sighting distances. So what we would end up doing is putting in something that would look very similar to the IMB-R slips but at that point and then we’ve got the issues I have said of getting there. And I don’t think – I haven’t looked at all the layout, we haven’t looked at all the layout of how a temporary slip could be converted into a permanent slip but I suspect all it would do would allow some access for the construction of the full roundabout once it was decided to go ahead with that. But the DfT policy certainly with respect to roundabouts for any development is that development should use existing infrastructure.

167. MR FARRINGTON: Sir –

168. THE CHAIR: If everyone’s happy for the petitioner to take a question. Are you
happy?

169. MR MARTIN: Sorry, I thought Mr Farrington had asked a question and you’ve got a supplementary question.

170. MR FARRINGTON: I’ve got just one –

171. THE CHAIR: Yes.

172. MR FARRINGTON: – issue that Mr Smart has raised that leads to a follow-up question. I thought he said that they had not looked at the suggestion that I’ve made. I just ask him to confirm whether or not that’s the correct sentence –

173. MR SMART: In terms of whether we construct a temporary slip and then use – well, we’ve certainly looked at options in the SIFT. What we have not, I would need to go back, sir, and double check that this is on the record, but we would have not worked up a solution that said, ‘How do we make a temporary connection that could be turned into a roundabout?’ We would have looked at how we would have done that in general terms and that would have been eliminated at what we call our sift process where we look at quite high level a number of things, including construction times, cost, complexity and a number of others, and, looking at this, you can quite easily imagine how we would have said, ‘We need to get in quicker’, and, therefore, it’s a suboptimal option for us.

174. THE CHAIR: Sandy Martin?

175. MR MARTIN: Yes. Thank you. We looked quite a lot at the temporary things but can I ask Mr Smart and Mr Strachan about the final permanent situation because I’m not sure that I’m absolutely clear on this. I ought to be. Sticking with this map here –

176. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I was going to get the other permanent map up but that’s fine.

177. MR MARTIN: No, this will be fine. This will be fine. Am I right in thinking that once you have the permanent position, once the IMB-R is up and running as a maintenance depot rather than as a construction depot, once the north slips have been taken away you will still to continue to use the south slips off the M6 for the depot; that
there is no intention of using Yarnfield Lane as the main route to the maintenance depot after you’ve got the slips on the M6. Is that correct?

178. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It’s partially correct. It’s correct for HS2 livery traffic but for workers who are working at the depot, for example, and making their way to their daily work, wherever they live, they will come not through that access but through Yarnfield Lane.

179. MR MARTIN: Right.

180. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And the numbers of workers, I think there are 100 workers predicted to be at the IMB-R.

181. MR MARTIN: So that’s at the depot once it’s up and running as a depot.

182. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

183. MR MARTIN: But there will be, to all intents and purposes, in relation to the depot there will be no HGVs using Yarnfield Lane. They’ll be coming straight off the M6.

184. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That’s – Mr Smart, confirm that? I understand.

185. MR SMART: It is an exceptional use so anything that is badged as a maintenance vehicle with HS2 on the side or whoever the franchisee is would be able to use that. And I should say, sir, that –

186. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Be able to use – sorry?

187. MR SMART: Able to use the southbound slip into the depot, which would be permanent but restricted use. And I mean certainly when you’re maintaining a railway exceptional loads are usually – most of the feeds come from the railway itself so we are talking about when we’re delivering long things like welded rail or long switch replacement switches and crossings. So it’s not heavily used and, therefore, that’s why it’s able to be accepted. Most of it is workers.

188. THE CHAIR: I think we’ve got a lot more clarity than we had before you took – when we were taking evidence from you. Thank you, Mr Smart.
189. Do we – Mr Martin?

190. MR MARTIN: I also have a question for Mr Farrington. Mr Farrington, it seems to me that the main function, the main purpose, of the junction on the A51 for you is to provide a junction for new development and for Stone, which is on the M6 and which is closer to the new development between Mill Meece and Yarnfield and for Stone, rather than anything to do with the IMB-R. Would that be correct? I mean given that, clearly, from the point of view of local traffic, the closest that the slips on the M6 can be to the IMB-R the least local traffic there will be. By having the slips on the M6 at the location of the IMB-R you are minimising the amount of heavy traffic on the road network. Isn’t that correct?

191. MR FARRINGTON: As I hopefully said at the beginning, the original purpose of the Atkins report was not for this purpose.

192. MR MARTIN: Yes.

193. MR FARRINGTON: And so I accept in principle that that was the reason for the report. However, having had the first question answered in the affirmative and accepting, as I do, that this Atkins report is a high-level report, it does what it says on the tin and I accept that further work would be required with further detailed costings and so on. But, in fact, I also would hope that you would accept the idea that a very important collateral purpose of this proposal is that, in fact, if it worked time wise, and I’ll come on to that in my final remarks, if I may, if it worked time wise it would take all of the traffic management or the very great majority of the traffic management issues out of the local villages, out of the local road network because of the haulage road because that feeds directly into the IMB-R.

194. MR MARTIN: I’m sorry, Mr Farrington, I don’t understand your answer because if you are going to build either a route into the IMB-R from the – looking at this map which is in front of us, you’ve either got a route into the IMB-R from the M6 where it says, ‘HS2 proposed scheme access from M6’, which is, I submit to you, about the shortest possible distance you could possibly travel from the M6, or you’ve got a route from your proposed junction to the left-hand side. I can’t understand why it would be easier to get from that one into the IMB-R than from that one in the IMB-R and I can’t understand how the one on the left-hand side would minimise local traffic on local roads
whereas the one which is absolutely slap next to it wouldn’t.

195. MR FARRINGTON: Because under the current proposal by the promoter, the use of Yarnfield Lane and all of the difficulties that we’ve heard from me and from others would be in place. You would have significant traffic management issues. Again, I’ve not pretended to be an expert in those matters, you’ve heard from others about that, but all of the local groups and petitioners are extremely concerned about that issue in particular. And so by, for example, taking away those problems by having it in a different place and having the haulage traffic from that proposed new junction it serves a number of purposes, one of which is, as I’ve said, to assist with possible junction for a garden settlement but also I am not aware of any other proposal that takes away the volume and significance of traffic other than this proposal.

196. MR MARTIN: I’m sorry, Mr Farrington, I’m completely mystified here. The junction off the M6 onto the IMB-R at the place at which HS2 is proposing it will take virtually all the HGV traffic from the M6 onto the IMB-R and there won’t be any more HGVs going up and down the Yarnfield Lane once that junction is in place. The use for the Yarnfield Lane, as I understand it, maybe I have misunderstood Mr Strachan’s answers, but the use of Yarnfield Lane is for the construction of the slip roads. So if the slip roads weren’t going to be constructed there, if the slip roads and a great long haul road from your proposed roundabout and, I have to say also, there would have to be a bridge over the M6 at that point, even if it was only a temporary bridge, in order to get traffic from one side of the M6 to the other onto your proposed haul road alongside the M6, if all of those things were going to be constructed, don’t you think that the use of the local roads while those things were being constructed would be for a longer period and for a greater number of HGVs than the ones that will be using Yarnfield Lane up to the point that simple slip roads directly into the site would be used?

197. MR FARRINGTON: Thank you. I’m sorry. I misunderstood your question.

198. MR MARTIN: Okay. So let me give you an analogy. Let me give you an analogy. You are trying to put in a new window in your house and you’ve got two choices. Either you can construct a little tower, which is right next to the house, which enables you to get to the window or you can construct a tower halfway down your garden and then a bridge across from the tower halfway down your garden across to the
window in your house. During the course of the construction of the towers you have to use a ladder. You want to minimise the use of the ladder. I cannot see how building a tower halfway down the garden and then building a bridge across is going to minimise the use of the ladder more than building a tower right next to the window. You still have to use the ladder.

199. MR FARRINGTON: I suppose the only answer I can give to you in terms of post-construction traffic is that, firstly, the A51 itself is a major A road; secondly, as I understand it, we have received a suggestion that there will still be the use of local deliveries to the site post construction. They’re the only answers I can give to you in relation to the question.

200. MR MARTIN: Okay. And my other question to you, Mr Farrington, is I can see why you would want to have a permanent junction on the M6 there. It would obviously make a lot of sense both for the people of Stone and, indeed, for the new development between Mill Meece and Yarnfield. Have you had any discussions or do you know that there have been any discussions with the Highways Agency about whether they would be happy to have a permanent junction on the M6 there for those purposes? Because, clearly, the M6 is in the responsibility of the Highways Agency; it’s not in the responsibility of Staffordshire County Council.

201. MR FARRINGTON: The simple answer to that question is yes, we have had discussions with the Highways Agency. We have had discussions with a number of different government departments about these proposals. But, to answer your question, yes.

202. MR MARTIN: Right. And did the Highways Agency suggest at any stage that that would be helpful for the operation of the IMB-R? Or did that come into it at all?

203. MR FARRINGTON: I think the answer I can give is that we have been encouraged to continue to investigate the feasibility around these proposals. In terms of your direct question around helping the IMB-R I’m pretty sure that the Highways Agency have not given a direct answer to that point.

204. MR MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
205. THE CHAIR: Martin?

206. MR WHITFIELD: Yes. Mr Smart, I’ve just got two questions. The first is the option one M6 junction is out with the scope of this Bill, as you understand it. That’s right, isn’t it?

207. MR SMART: Correct.

208. MR WHITFIELD: And, secondly, I think this is your opinion as much as anything, obviously the option one M6 junction would have a huge economic effect on the whole area surrounding this whereas actually HS2’s proposal about the IMB-R is, and perhaps some would say rightly, concentrating on the cost element and the construction time for the railway itself.

209. MR SMART: Correct.

210. MR WHITFIELD: Yes. Thank you.

211. THE CHAIR: Are you happy, Sandy? I think the Committee are happy with what we’ve heard on both sides and I think we have an understanding so, with your permission, Mr Strachan, I –

212. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. I was just going to make one very brief point –

213. THE CHAIR: Do so.

214. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): – just because, following up from the questions that were asked, we are aware, of course, of the council’s aspirations for a new settlement and the desirability for that settlement to have a new junction. None of what is being done by HS2 precludes the delivery of a new junction in this location, even when that settlement comes forward, which it no doubt would be funded by, amongst other things, developer contributions. So I just wanted to make that clear.

215. THE CHAIR: Helpful. Thank you. I think we’re there. I think everybody’s had a good crack at things so let’s end it there. The Committee may –

216. MR WHITFIELD: I just have one question, Mr Farrington. It was just about the
original petition. There was a discussion about temporary structures in the schedule 17. Is that resolved? In the original petition you were talking about temporary structures and whether or not they came under schedule 17 and you were concerned.

217. MR FARRINGTON: I’m being briefed that that’s probably been picked up by the county council’s position.

218. MR WHITFIELD: Excellent. Thank you.

219. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.