APPENDIX 31: SECTION 47 AND 48 CONSULTATIONS – RESPONSES FROM PUBLIC CONSULTATION

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX 31 VOLUME 5.2 SECTIONS 47 AND 48 CONSULTATIONS – RESPONSES FROM PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
Noise				
15/12/2014	268	Page 4-14 Improving a Traditional Motorway: Environmental Barriers 4.2.43 Environmental barriers, in the form of fencing to mitigate noise and visual impacts, will be included within the Scheme where the EIA identifies that this form of environmental mitigation is required. This is addressed in greater detail in Chapters 8 and 12 of this PEI Report. & Page 4-29 Nearside and verge works 4.5.16 Work in the central reserve and off side lanes in this section of the motorway is similar to the work proposed for the section from junction 12 to junction 11. Where necessary, the existing hard shoulder will be strengthened to enable it to carry motorway traffic. Other verge features included in the Scheme are: underground ducts to carry power and communication cables, steel safety barriers around hazards, drainage modifications, lighting (at junction slip roads only), environmental barriers and replacement planting. 4.5.17 Where the motorway passes over Mill Lane, to the northwest of Sindlesham, there will be200m of new 2m high noise fence in the northern verge and 50m in the southern verge. Carriageway resurfacing 4.5.18 On completion of central reserve and verge phases of construction the adjacent lanes, i.e. the nearside and offside lanes of each carriageway, will be resurfaced in TSCS (low-noise surfacing). In addition full width new TSCS will be provided as follows: a) 620m on each carriageway just east of junction 11 to reduce the noise impact to residential properties on Whitley Wood Lane and Babbington Road to the north and Brookers Hill to the south. b) 1370m on the eastbound carriageway and 90m on the westbound carriageway as the M4 passes between Winnersh to the north and Sindlesham to the south. & Page 12-36 Operation 12.6.10 Additional noise barriers have been incorporated into the Scheme, as follows: a) E/B carriageway, chainage 48950m to 49020m, height 2m b) E/B carriageway, chainage 49020m to 49070m, height 2m (on bridge) c) E/B carriageway, chainage 49070m to 49150m, height 2m d) W/B carriageway, chainage 49020m to 49070m, height 2m (on bridge) 12.6.11 Additional low-noise surfacing has been incorporated into the Scheme, as follows:	Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA process. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area, except for two short lengths of barrier where the motorway crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES submitted with the application for a DCO ("Application"). Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the ES. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	313	I live within 0.5km of the M4 (between J10 and J11) at Sindlesham. At present there are no noise prevention barriers in this location. An additional lane and more traffic make such barriers essential. I would like to be assured they will be erected. Low noise surfacing is not sufficient.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed to the area around J10, except for two short lengths of barrier where the motorway crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area, including Winnersh and Sindlesham, with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
21/12/2014	337	We live at Pingewood on a lane of 6 houses. They all get affected by the motorway noise. We have just been told by [the Scheme's noise consultant] that all 4 lanes might be made into low noise surface. How this will reduce the noise we dont know until the development is completed. What would help all of us down Kirtons Farm Rd, Pingewood is to have noise reduction barriers put up as they have half a mile down the M4 at Whitley Wood. Already it is significantly noisy. *15 minutes after talk to [the Scheme's noise consultant] , he has just told us that he misinformed us and infact there will only be 3 out of 4 lanes being made with low noise surfacing. Overall, the thing that will make the biggest difference to noise for us and our 5 neighbours will be the tall wooden barriers, the same as at Whitely Wood. They would reduce noise and we wouldn't have to see the traffic, now which is going to be even closer to us. Proposed existing farmland at the end of the A33 Old Basingstoke Road is to be used as a construction compound. This areas is already being built on for "3 car parks". We are hoping that this has nothing to do with the Highways Agency as we are still in consultation period? This area will cause major congestion during rush hour as there isn't any alternative route to J11 M4.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this location. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this location. The construction works in the compound 3 area are for a park and ride facility that is not related to the Scheme. Therefore, use of the compound area would be subject to agreement with the local authority. Whilst the construction compounds will provide some additional traffic, the majority of the construction traffic will use the M4 to directly access the works and compound traffic would naturally avoid the A33 during congested periods where practicable (e.g. for routine inspections, etc.) to minimise journey times travelling to the works areas. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan ("CTMP") (Document Reference 4.5, Annex F), which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO.	Yes
21/12/2014	343	It provides the opportunity to reduce noise levels by provision of proper sound barriers long needed in the Wokingham, Winnersh, Sindlesham residential areas	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed to the area around J10, except for two short lengths of barrier where the motorway crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, Nit is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area, including Winnersh and Sindlesham, with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	404/565	Also, the new lane could mean that at one end of the Myrke we will lose established vegetation and the lane being built next door to the houses, only metres from them. Will there be sound proofing barriers in place to eliminate the noise from the M4? From the plans we understand a new bridge is to be built alongside the current Datchet Road bridge and then the old bridge removed. The current approach to the road will then become redundant and trees could be planted which will help as a sound barrier, however, not only will these young trees take years to mature but the type of trees planted will be important to the residents. We would want to avoid an open parkland which could attract fly tippers and loiterers something we do not have now. A dense ever green will provide noise reduction and encourage wildlife. The existing vegetation should not be touched as it is already established and no need to spend money replacing something that already exists.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, an additional noise barrier is proposed to this area. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between J3 and J12 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation. Planting proposals are provided in the Environmental Masterplan, submitted with the Application, which sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. Any lost vegetation will be replanted with locally-appropriate, native species of trees and shrubs and wildflower meadow, with particular emphasis on fruit-bearing varieties in order to provide support for native species of fauna.	Yes
21/12/2014	405/566	My house is situated next to M4 and the noise of the cars its very loud and having the M4 widen will add to an even greater noise in my house. If the plans is to go ahead i would want to se NOISE SCREENS TO BE INSTALLED on M4 otherwise the noise will drive us out of our house, if the plans went ahead and nothing gets done about the noise and the air pollution it will be unliveable in my home. please consider NOISE SCREENS ALONG THE M4.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J4 and J4b. There are existing noise barriers in this location, which will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
19/12/2014	421/582	If the proposed widening of the motorway goes ahead it will mean an more traffic using the motorway. The traffic will be nearer to our home. There will be additional noise. There will be more air pollution closer to home. Regarding the noise problem maybe a noise barrier would partly help with this problem. An environmental barrier may help to tackle the issue of air pollution.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J4 and J4b. There are existing noise barriers in this location, which will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation. Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes
06/12/2014	459	Noise pollution is a problem with the M4, for us particularly with a southerly wind. We support the installation of barrier fences and landscaping between the A327 bridge and junction 10.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this area. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/01/2015	485	Many are anxious at the impact of increased noise and air pollution and at the lack of adequate measures to mitigate these problems. I share these concerns and have for some time now been pressing for a noise barrier and plant screening to tackle both noise and air pollution. I would like to meet with the relevant officials to discuss a mitigation scheme for my constituency.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, a small number of additional noise barriers are proposed for the Scheme. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES submitted with the application for a DCO. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme. Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes
05/12/2014	492	I wish to raise the following concerns about your proposal, particularly as it applies to my property, which with my neighbour, as our properties are within 50 yards of the motorway. 1. The traffic noise will increase - as volumes will be greater, then there will be a 33% increase in traffic volume - is this accounted for in your studies? 2. As someone who has studied wave theory to PHD level - I know that not all noise is generated by the vehicle tyres, some is by the air resistance of the whole vehicle, so the overall noise level will not be significantly minimised by the new tarmac, as your consultants claim, which in turn wears out and degrades quickly. In light of above I would like you to seriously consider installing sound barriers - we could then perhaps have an intelligent conversation in our gardens - our houses were built in 1901 and are blighted by noise the only real time it stops is when the traffic is backed up!	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Noise assessments have been carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of the EIA process. The results show that no additional noise barriers are required in this area. Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES submitted with the application for a DCO. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the ES. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
19/12/2014	584	I live next to M4 J3 and I am very concerned of the impact it will have on me and my family. The main concern in the noise as well as air pollution which is quite high already. Please make sure noise barriers and an environmental protection scheme is incorporated into the plan for the M4.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. No additional noise barriers are proposed between J4 and J3. There are existing noise barriers in this location, which will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
01/01/2015	627	Thank you very much for your interest towards this matter as it can play an indispensable role from residents nearby. I am writing to you about the M4 junctions 3 to 12 motorway is undertaking proposals to widen the M4. I am worried that many local people, who live near the motorway. This will mean not just more traffic using the motorway but also the traffic being much closer to my house with all the additional noise. I understand the Highways Agency wants to widen-up the use of M4 by allowing traffic to use the shoulder on the motorway and we have been asked to contemplate towards this matter. As you have raised the issue with regards to installing a noise barrier an environmental protection scheme, my view towards this matter is negative, the reason why it is already very noisy and so, I cannot imagine after widening the M4. In my opinion, it will be very much noise pollution to all the residents surrounded by, predominately my dwelling is just 25-30 feet approx. plus my wife is severe lung disease patient. Once again, innumerable thanks from my side as I have granted an opportunity to express my view towards the scheme.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. A small number of additional noise barriers are proposed for the Scheme. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme.	Yes
06/01/2015	628	We received a letter from our local MP regarding the widening of the M4. I live next to the M4 and I agree with him about a noise barrier being installed. As this is already a bad area for both of these things.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, a small number of additional noise barriers are proposed for the Scheme. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme. Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES submitted with the application for a DCO. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that, generally, there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme.	Yes
21/12/2014	336	My concern is after removal of existing bridge (Datchet Road) will the embankment and road be removed behind houses in The Myrke. Ideally the road only should be removed and the embankment left or even raised. It is a sound barrier for the M4. Could a sound barrier be constructed on south side of M4 between bridges	The new bridge will require embankments, as does the existing bridge. This will provide comparable noise shielding to the existing embankment. A new overbridge, with approach embankments, will be constructed in this location. The noise shielding to the rear gardens of properties on The Myrke will be maintained. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways for Scheme opening. Additionally, a noise barrier will be provided to the M4 at the northern end of The Myrke. It is predicted that properties on The Myrke will experience negligible change / minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation.	No
Construction				
11/11/2014	207	All of that is also AFTER we have endured months of construction traffic wheeling back and forth along the A4 and the inevitable consequential noise and dirt resulting from the construction.	Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, but it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. Construction traffic is likely to access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads. An Environmental Management Plan which includes an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ("Outline CEMP") is included with the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. The Outline CEMP sets out mitigation measures to reduce impacts on noise and air quality due to construction of the Scheme.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	223	How much noise will the works make?	Noise impacts of the construction works have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme and are reported fully in the ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, but it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. An Environmental Management Plan which includes an Outline CEMP is included with the ES which accompanies the Application. The Outline CEMP sets out mitigation measures to reduce the effects of construction noise on residents and businesses. As part of this, a site liaison officer will be appointed for the construction period to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders.	No
15/12/2014	227	Certainly during the construction period there is bound to be a huge amount of dust making conditions unsuitable for us to work in.	The Outline CEMP, which is provided as part of the Application, sets out mitigation measures to reduce impacts on air quality due to the construction of the Scheme	No
19/12/2014	273	-The noise pollution that would be created again, very near our home, at unsociable hours to widen the current bridges.	Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, but it cannot be removed completely. Proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application. As part of this, a site liaison officer will be appointed for the construction period to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders. The Agency will also work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
07/12/2014	292	Noise and dust from construction: Many residents will be directly affected by noise, dust and disturbance of the construction work taking place if the scheme goes ahead. There is a need to consider placement of Construction Compound 8 further away from housing, as well as appraising householders of the controls inbuilt into contractors specifications and how these will be overseen and monitored by Highways personnel.	A Contractor has not been appointed to the Scheme yet and may not require all the potential compound areas identified. However, construction compound 8 is likely to be required as it is directly adjacent to Datchet Road and Recreation Ground overbridges which will be replaced as part of the Scheme. The Outline CEMP, which sets out the mitigation measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme, has been submitted with the Application. This will be developed into a final Construction Environmental Management Plan ("final CEMP") by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. A site liaison officer will be appointed for the construction period to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders.	No
Cranford Park				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	402/563	The proposed measures are insufficient and inadequate to mitigate existing and future air, water and noise pollution and adverse visual impacts. Along much of its length through LB Hillingdon, the M4 will remain essentially an urban motorway planned, designed and built to the standards and environmental performance of the 1960s. There would be only minimal attempts at mitigation even though the project is to adapt the motorway to serve C21st traffic flows. There would be insufficient mitigation and protection to recreational and open land, residential and community uses, Conservation Areas and heritage assets, both in close proximity and in the surrounding areas. There would be additional adverse impacts arising from the increase in potential traffic flow capacity of the widened motorway and from additional traffic on feeder roads. Road widening is shown on the south side of the motorway beside Cranford Park where the entry road from J3 is about to join the through carriageway. This stretch of the motorway has an open fenced boundary and as it descends from the J3 flyover it spreads widespread noise and disturbance across the park and its heritage assets, including St Dunstan's Church. No mitigation is proposed. The roadside and embankment are clothed in trees which afford a degree of screening but whose future may not be assured. Elsewhere long stretches are enclosed by slender, modestly high feather edged close boarded fencing of the sort more suited for the back gardens of suburban housing than for the enclosure of a 6 or 8 lane motorway. They simply demark property boundaries and do not provide effective noise attenuation. Adaption of what are now the hard shoulders into running lanes may necessitate the removal of adjoining trees and shrubbery in order to maintain clearance from traffic. These trees and shrubs presently afford a degree of screening of the motorway. These observations have been reported to a public meeting of the Cranford Park Friends. It was agreed that the motorway is a serious noise polluter to the park and that adequate noise barriers and drainage improvements are essential. This submission is therefore not only the representations of myself as an individual, but include the views of the Cranford Park Friends in the event that the Secretary has not separately submitted representations. My representations are more geographically extensive than simply Cranford Park.	The assessment of the Scheme's predicted impacts on noise, air quality ,water, drainage, heritage assets (including the Church of St Dunstan), ecology, traffic and Conservation Areas have been undertaken as part of the EIA process and are reported fully in their respective chapters of the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on the noise assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J3 and J4. There are existing noise barriers in this location, which will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation. Planting proposals are provided in the Environmental Masterplan, submitted with the Application, which sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. Based on the air quality assessment, the effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant. A Drainage Strategy Report and Flood Risk Assessment have been prepared and submitted with the Application, which address water and drainage impacts. An Outline CEMP, which sets out the mitigation measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme has been submitted with the Application. This will be developed into a final Construction Environmental Management Plan ("final CEMP") by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. A site liaison officer will be appointed for the construction period to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders.	Yes
Earley/Winnerish				
21/12/2014		It was good to meet you recently and to be able to chat about the proposed change of the M4 motorway between junctions 12 and 3 into a Smart motorway. I am very pleased that it has now been decided that all 8 lines of the motorway that passes through Lower Earley and Winnersh will be resurfaced with a "quiet tarmac". This will please many residents who live near to the M4.	Following the public consultation, a decision was made to resurface the whole of the M4 from J3 to J12 with low-noise surfacing as part of the Scheme.	Yes
11/12/2014	034	We live close to the M4 in Earley, Reading. There is considerable noise from traffic on the M4 which has a negative impact on our lives. The introduction of two additional lanes will increase traffic volume and resulting noise levels. Can you please assure me that the Scheme will include resurfacing all eight lanes of the M4 with 'noise reduction' tarmac to lessen the noise impact of the Scheme?	The Agency can confirm that all lanes of the Scheme will be resurfaced with low-noise surfacing and it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
26/11/2014	042	For several years now I have been watching with interest the ongoing promises to provide a Smart motorway solution along the M4 so when I saw that the HA were having an exhibition at the Mad Stad I went along. I have been a longtime supporter of the concept and so went along feeling very supportive. However I very soon discovered that they were proposing to do very little along the scheme to attenuate the excessive noise that the M4 produces now let alone in the future. I asked a lot of questions and found out that: Through the Earley residential areas and elsewhere there were no new noise barriers proposed. They are only proposing low noise surfacing to the lanes that they are working on or that need surfacing.so lanes 1 and 4 through Earley as the other two have been resurfaced recently and so do not warrant it! So two "quiet" lanes and two noisy! Low noise surfacing I am told reduces noise by 3 dBA which I believe is a barely perceptible change to the human ear and a drop in the ocean in reality. The scheme differs from other smart schemes in that 4 running lanes is the norm unless an incident of some sort requires a lane closure...the revers of schemes such as around Birmingham where the 3 lane is the norm except where heavy congestion occurs. I imagine that the police are very concerned about this. They are putting up noise barriers somewhere but they could not tell me where! They were unable to tell me what traffic flows they had designed for! However the government is suggesting a general increase of 40% on all roads by 2014. This I believe would wipe out any noise reduction from surfaces and then some. The staff attitude was that noise would be no better and no worse through Earley than at present...motorways are noisy. The scheme is valued at between £750 and 850 million.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Low noise surfacing reduces road traffic noise by up to 3db(A) which is the aural equivalent of doubling the distance between the noise source and the receiver. A small number of additional noise barriers are also proposed for the Scheme. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). It is predicted that, generally, there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme. Noise mitigation measures are detailed in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, and are depicted on ES Figure 12.2. A detailed response has been provided separately in a letter to John Redwood MP dated 23 January 2015. In respect of emergency services, such as the police, an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway) can be created and traffic can be managed with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. It is expected that the overall risk of the new specification is likely to be less than that on a dual three-lane motorway with a hard shoulder. The Association of Chief Police Officers has signed the National Strategic Agreement, which establishes the broad principles of operation and communications between the Emergency Services and the Agency on Managed (now smart) Motorways. The Agency is also working with local Emergency Services to develop a Regional Operating Agreement. Traffic flows are currently around 130,000 vehicles per day and are predicted to increase to 160,000 over the next 20 years.	Yes
12/12/2014	221	Largely I do support the plan .Its much needed with the current housing and enterprise expansion along the M4 corridor. However this is also a residential area, and factors of noise and air quality are crucial. Also these factors need to be looked at in conjunction with the heavy air traffic at play in these areas. I have a specific concern for a new primary school: Wheatfield primary school in Winnersh, between Junctions 10 and 11. It is close to the motorway. There were recent reports about not building schools close to motorway due to air pollution and noise concerns. There are some studies linking noise and air pollution, to have an impact on health and intelligence .Can "enhanced" noise reduction and air pollution capture technology or other such smarts be used around such specific parts of the motorway, to address the concerns for children at these schools.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation. It is assumed that the design for Wheatfield Primary School included a detailed noise assessment and resultant mitigation strategy. An assessment of air quality impacts has been undertaken and reported in the ES. The results show that there is no significant effect on air quality as a result of the Scheme. The new Wheatfield Primary School building is located approximately 250m from the M4 (240m from the playing fields). The study area for air quality impacts from road traffic is limited to 200m in the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Guidance for Air Quality. This is because the effect of pollutants from road traffic reduces with distance from the point of release, and beyond 200m these are likely to have reduced to a concentration equivalent to background levels. Therefore, the Agency does not anticipate that this location would be affected by changes in air quality due to the Scheme. Specific mitigation measures are therefore not required for the school.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	224	Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Matthews Green Farm could result in increased noise levels at the site. We also request a copy of any noise assessment work that has been undertaken to assess the changes to road traffic noise that may result from the proposed works to the M4 and A329(M) motorway (both construction and operational) as well as from changes to traffic on the feeder road network. In addition to the above we seek your assurances that where the changes to road traffic resulting from the Smart Motorway Project will increase road traffic noise, appropriate noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into your scheme proposals and designs.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. This assessment shows that no additional noise barriers are required for this area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Although Matthews Green Farm is outside the detailed study area, it is predicted that there will be negligible changes in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
08/12/2014	225	Our clients have an interest in land that has the benefit of planning consent for up to 433 new dwellings, a Primary School and associated infrastructure. Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Hatch Farm Dairies could result in increased noise levels at the site. We also request a copy of any noise assessment work that has been undertaken to assess the changes to road traffic noise that may result from the proposed works to the M4 motorway (both construction and operational) as well as from changes to traffic on the feeder road network. In addition to the above we seek your assurances that where the changes to road traffic resulting from the Smart Motorway Project will increase road traffic noise, appropriate noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into your scheme proposals and designs.	Noise assessments have been carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES. These assessments show that no additional noise barriers are required for the Winnersh area, except for two short lengths of barrier where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels at properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
21/12/2014	317	Consider extending noise reduction surfacing across all lanes not just 1 and 4 where M4 passes adjacent to residential developments at Lower Earley.	Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.	Yes
04/12/2014	365	My only concern is the level of Motorway noise one can already hear at this end of Lower Earley. The only time it has been reduced to a lower level, other than when at a standstill, is when a temporary 50 MPH limit was in operation a few years ago during roadworks. This drop in speed actually gave a much reduced noise level in my part of Lower Earley. I Notice parts of the M4 by Whitley have has a wooden noise barrier installed along the side, I think if affordable this would add to the quality of life for those of us in this area .	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Lower Earley area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Lower Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
21/12/2014	408/569	There are places where the M4 runs very close to houses where there is little noise abatement and I would like to see these areas given additional protection. In particular I would like noise protection added to the sections running close to Lower Earley.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Lower Earley area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Lower Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
20/12/2014	415/577	The M4 already creates a noise corridor as it passes though Berkshire and traffic roar is very evident at some considerable distance from the motorway. It is very evident in Lower Earley, the area in which we live. Additional traffic flow on four lanes will create greater noise and reduce the environmental quality and quality of life of residents. Whilst road users may benefit from increased traffic flows the impact of the additional noise on residents should be mitigated by: 1. A low noise road surface. 2. Sound barriers - fencing, earth bunds and tree cover 3. Soundproofing bridges.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Lower Earley area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Lower Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
15/12/2014	429	I have lived near to the northern side of the motorway for around 20 years and the noise has grown despite vehicles becoming quieter. I am greatly concerned that the proposals will enable higher speeds, higher volume of vehicles and, consequently even higher levels of noise. I would like to see not only "quiet tarmac" but also a noise barrier where the motorway is close to our houses in Lower Earley	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Lower Earley area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Lower Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
08/12/2014	455	I am sorry not to have gone to an exhibition, but I am glad to have this opportunity to express my very strong wish that the maximum effort will be made to reduce the already high volume of traffic noise in the Lower Earley area. This has been a source of discomfort bordering on occasional distress since we moved here 20 years ago, but my wife and I now fear enormously that the probable increased traffic volume and increased width of the M4 road surface to be used will exacerbate this problem. The real dream ticket would be that not only were less noisy surfaces introduced but also effective sound barriers installed in the Lower Earley area. It would be so nice to be able to sit in the garden in the summer and consider it a restful rather than a stressful experience. Can the motorway be smart enough to solve the problem rather than intensify it?	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Lower Earley area based on this assessment. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Lower Earley with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
Junction 10				
10/11/2014		Adequate noise reduction along the section junctions 10 - 11	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported fully in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, the existing noise barriers between J10 and J11 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to all residential areas between J10 and J11 with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
05/12/2014	014	My house looks out onto the M4 near junction 10. The traffic noise throughout Winnersh is unattractive. Do you propose to include any sound barriers to protect the communities close to the road from the noise and are there any proposed for the Junction 10 area?	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported fully in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths of barrier where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	076	I heard on the news last night that the M4 is being widened from Junct 12 to West London. I am worried about the noise levels at junction 10 that are sure to occur. Since the Poyle Interchange opened traffic has increased 10-fold and makes for a disruptive nights sleep and summer family gatherings in the garden. What measures are in place to ease the noise level around Junct 10?	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in the area around Junction 10 with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
14/11/2014	146	Actions need to be taken to reduce Motorway noise around Jn10 (Wokingham/ Bracknell)	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in the area around Junction 10 with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
21/12/2014	282	I wish to comment on the proposal to convert sections of the M4 to a smart motorway. I live in the Emmbrook area of Wokingham which is fairly close to J10 of the M4. I have lived here for 30 years and the noise from the M4 has increased considerably since that time. Residents in the local area have been asking for sound prevention measures for most of the time since we have lived here and each time there has been a different excuse as to why nothing could be installed - embankment problems, expense, not enough in the budget to cover it etc etc. When a new housing estate was built about a mile from us (Winnersh Farm) money was found to put up fencing on the estate side of the M4 protecting the estate but sending the traffic noise onto the opposite side on which I live. The area I live in was extensively developed in the 1960s and 1970s when, presumably, the traffic flows were considerably lighter and it was deemed unnecessary to install any fencing to absorb the traffic noise. I understand that it is still regarded as unnecessary to construct any noise prevention fences or similar along this stretch of the motorway which is very close to a lot of housing in both Wokingham and Winnersh. I cannot see that your proposal to increase the capacity of the traffic enabling it to run in four lanes instead of three is going to produce less noise, even if some of the road were to be resurfaced in any way to reduce the road noise. Your whole proposal is to take more traffic moving at a greater speed than is currently the case.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. Based on this assessment, additional noise barriers are proposed to the area around junction 10 in two short lengths of barrier where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
Junction 3				
11/12/2014	027	Two the noise from the Motorway is constant day and night will these changes, which I believe will increase traffic flows, have an impact on noise, which especially difficult at night.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in the area around Carfax Road with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	222	I am writing to you in response to this on behalf of our Committee, and following my visit to your exhibition at Heston Imperial Sports Ground when I spoke to a number of HA officials about our concerns. We are concerned about the noise pollution in the park from the M4 and its slip roads, the specific location being from Junction 3 westwards to the Fuller Way subway, Harlington. The existing noise pollution from the M4 and approach, particularly in the above environs, is currently excessive. It is spoiling enjoyment of the park and rendering it almost impossible for staff and volunteers to address groups of visitors, for example. It will also be a limiting factor in finding a community use for the above mentioned stable building, which is our intention. Do you agree that the existing noise limiting arrangements on this stretch are inadequate and below what would be expected in a Countryside Park in an urban environment? Will the situation be improved by the proposed smart motorway plans? The indications are that noise pollution will be worse. We would like to make representations for the installation of absorptive noise barrier walls along the boundary of the Conservation Area in order to mitigate road and traffic noise. We believe it will be more cost effective to do this at the same time as the 'smart motorway' alterations than at a later date.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J3 and J4b. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
01/12/2014	232	Thank you for your letter dated 10th November 2014 the contents of which I note. Whenever there is road extension or expansion, it enhances the problems for the residents living close by. We live beside the Junction 3 and we already have enough of it. It is only possible you fund for my house windows for triple glaze. Look forward to hearing from you.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. With the provision of low noise surfacing across all lanes of the Scheme, the retention or replacement of existing noise barriers and the provision of a small number of additional barriers, it is predicted that implementation of the Scheme will result in noise level decreases or negligible changes. Based on the assessment of noise impacts in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, no properties qualify for noise insulation under the Noise Insulation Regulations as a result of the Scheme.	No
20/12/2014	412/573	The proposal would increase Noise and Air pollution at well over Gov guide lines, We already suffer from excessive noise and Air pollution. We are only approx 200 yds from the M4 east bound traffic lanes. Ministers must also consider that we have always suffered from considerable noise and air pollution from the north runway Heathrow Airport, WILKINS CLOSE and parts of CRANFORD DRIVE, are only approximately 1 mile from the east end of the North runway, can be quite noisy when planes take off, also the resulting exhaust pollution when the wind is coming from a S /W direction. Also to be taken in to account, is the proposal and position of the 'Third Runway , are ministers aware that the resulting Flight Path would come over or (be very near to) Wilkins Close / Junction 3 of M4 adding more misery to the local residents Something must be done to protect the local residents, Noise barriers would be a start, this excessive Air Pollution is a job for the experts Trusting that you will do something constructive to overcome these local problems when carrying out the widening of the M4.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J3 and J4. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation. Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes
Junction 4				
25/11/2014	099	As per your letter dated 10th November 2014 I have filled out the online questionnaire requesting additional information regarding the works on Junction 4. I would appreciate if you could please advise how my Client is likely to be affected from these works including potential increase in noise pollution.	The Application includes an Outline CEMP which contains mitigation measures to minimise the effects of construction on the environment and residents/businesses. The contractor will required to employ best practice to minimise noise and dust levels during the works. There will also be close liaison between the Contractor, the Local Authority Environmental Health Officer and affected residents and commercial operations to ensure that disruption during construction is effectively managed. It is predicted that there will be a minor decrease in operational noise levels to the Premier Inn with the Scheme in operation. This is a consequence of the provision of a low noise surface across all lanes of the Scheme. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration which accompanies the Application.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	594	Noise and pollution is bad enough as my garden backs on to the slip road for Junction 4. Sound and pollution barriers need to be erected to reduce the current levels let alone when the work is completed.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed between J4 and J4b. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES Chapter 6: Air Quality. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes
Junction 8/9				
22/02/2015		Noise Levels I was told by Agency staff that it has been estimated that the new scheme will only add 1 decibel to the current noise levels in our area, and that no sound barrier is therefore proposed. However, since we moved here in 1981, levels of noise and vibrations have increased dramatically, to the front, the side and the rear of our property. With the added noise from light aircraft, helicopters and the Heathrow jets, this could be 1 decibel too many! Noise levels also increased when a bund was erected on the opposite side of the motorway to us, by some home owners. As no real noise survey has been carried out, how do you know what the noise levels actually are and whether or not sound proofing of some sort is required? Also, under new Government proposals, aren't local communities supposed to be involved in how new road schemes best fit in to their area?	A full and detailed assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this area. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation. Local communities have been afforded the opportunity to give input into the Scheme through the consultation and, should the Application be accepted for Examination, local communities will also be able to participate in the Examination.	Yes
08/12/2014	219	Furthermore, it was made clear to us by one of your representatives during the recent session on 8th December in Iver, that there were no plans to carry out any works to the barriers or borders in this (J8) area of the motorway, and that the motorway widening project was going ahead regardless of the substantial negative impact to us and our neighbours.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed in this area. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	229	The DOT's agency's present proposals represent the second time such a nuisance to residents has erupted from a similar source in 20years. ....."Great work. / And if it fails? - They start again." In fairness, there have, of course,been other agencies with ambitious offerings to improve the area of the old Amerden Estate. It now appears that owners of private property in this area should expect to suffer repeated attacks from 'agencies' containing what Betjeman used to term "Plansters". The NRA's Flood Relief Runnel in particular has had disastrous, albeit remote consequences because the perpetrators were overconfident in their wrong predictions and arrogantly dismissive of warnings from those with local knowledge. This experience was quite sufficient for the assurances of future plan promoters to be viewed, here, with no little scepticism. The DOT's last sally failed ignominiously but, of course, expensively with the advent of a Labour government in 1997. However, a possibly more potent factor at that time was an acceptance by the Public that the DOT, its planners in 'agencies' and the massive Road Lobby had been pushing a false premise for decades. The opposing view had become generally accepted; that more and wider roads were productive of more and more congestion on the improved roads and throughout their immediate area. See attachment img 126. Maidenhead Advertiser, Dec 24th.1994 & Road Rage, PE Dec 12th.2014. This was a considerable volte-face and a rare consensus for a counter intuitive view. See attachment img 125: M A, Oct 21st.199 To save any further tedium of repetition, may I refer you to the correspondence which set out the Amerden residents' arguments of some 20 years ago against a then egregiously ambitious scheme? These are : 20th. Oct. 1993 to DOT. 28th. Dec. 1993 submissions from neighbours. 24th. Feb. 1994 to Minister of Transport. RH John MacGregor MP. 11th. Nov. 1994 to John Watts MP a minister in that Dept and, then, MP for Slough. 28th. Nov. 1994 to Highways Agency. 6th. Dec. 1995 to Highways Agency. The following specific points however might perhaps be emphasised for the second time in 20 years : [1] NOISE. {a} A Victorian garden is not an afterthought to such a house as Amerden, it is a crucial part to life here. Joy in its use is undermined by road noise. On certain summer days it cannot be used for entertaining those guests not inured to grossly intrusive noise. It appears that this factor is completely without all DOT considerations and its concern with 'first floor windows' and 'facades' has no relevance, here, to this significant and alien blight. {b} Twenty years ago the DOT planners selection of a Northern side extension to the bridge over the Thames was vigorously opposed. It appeared then, as it does now, that no consideration had been given of the small group of houses on an ancient historical site at Amerden, which takes the full force of the noise and vibration from this bridge and its elevated embankments. There are no houses as close and vulnerable on the Southern side. The planners, then, described "Trumper's field" as a traditional hay meadow, when it was, and is, merely waste created by the construction of the Motorway. It was photographed then to graphically establish the serious bias exhibited by this planners' very pretty encomium.	No additional noise barriers are proposed to this area. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation. Further detailed information requested can be provided separately. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentration at sensitive receptors (residential properties) located at Bray Wick is predicted to be a small increase. There are four sensitive receptors which are just below the annual average objective value with the Scheme in place (A118, A119, X39 and X40) on Holyport Road. As the air quality objective is not predicted to be breached, this is not considered to be significant. All other sensitive receptors in Bray Wick are predicted to be below the annual average objective value with the Scheme in place, therefore experiencing a negligible change in air quality. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at three sensitive receptors near Meadow Lane (X36), Old Marsh Way (X37) and Lake End Farm (X35) is predicted to be a medium increase. Annual average NO2 concentrations are predicted to be above (X35 (Drawing 6.10) and X36 (Drawing 6.10a)) or just below (X37) the objective value with the Scheme in place. These changes are driven by the proximity of these receptors to the M4 and the anticipated increase in vehicle flows along this link (approximately 14,000 vehicles per day). Consistent with IAN Guidance 174/13, X35 and X36 have been considered as part of the overall evaluation of significance for operational air quality. Dorney County Combined School (N989) is predicted to experience an imperceptible increase in annual average NO2. All other sensitive receptors (residential properties) in these areas are predicted to experience a small increase in NO2 concentrations and are below the annual average objective value with the Scheme in place, therefore experiencing a negligible change in air quality. It is anticipated that exceedances of the 1-hour average objective are unlikely to occur in this link as annual average concentrations at all sensitive receptors are less than 60 µg/m3.	

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		{c} No noise abatement barriers were provided for the benefit of these Amerden houses when such were erected on the Motorway, Eastwards towards Old Marsh Lane. {d} In an Email dated 15/12/2014, I requested data concerning noise and pollutant levels predicted at Amerden if current plans were executed. Please would you express the figures in the same units as those used by your predecessors on 31st March1995, or supply clear conversion factors, to rectify an unintentional muddying of the waters caused by unit changes. I note that the polluting chemicals thought important by planners, then, have also changed somewhat in your present estimates. This does not speak well for the relevance of their predictions. However, whatever the prevalent ideas on selection of airborne toxins or the units in which they are to be expressed, old trees here certainly do not like the vehicle emissions from the M4 and are probably a superior guide to toxicity than guesstimates in whatsoever units.		
21/12/2014	281	Further to the letter dated 10 November 2014, for the above reference project, my main comment relates to the inevitable increase in traffic noise that the increase in fully active traffic lanes (by using the hard shoulder) will cause and the impact that will have on residents of the Bray area (around Junction 8/9 of the M4), whose enjoyment of their properties and surrounding area will be adversely affected. The traffic noise from the M4 between Junctions 8/9 and 7 is already significant and an extra active lane (the current hard shoulder) will potentially increase the noise by 1/3. Given the above, I would very strongly request that appropriate sound barriers are erected along those lengths of the M4 where traffic noise penetrates local residents areas, in this case specifically running back from Junction 8/9 to Junction7, on the Bray/Maidenhead side of the motorway.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this location. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this location.	Yes
21/12/2014	310	Concern at noise impact- it will increase (although studies say only minimal) - hence sound attenuation boarding should be included around J8/9 to J7 - an increase is an increase and minimisation action should be included.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this location. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this location.	Yes
15/01/2015	482	Having attended consultation information meetings in Slough and Hollyport I'm convinced the project will proceed whatever the public say albeit not many of the public appear to attend the information days. As a resident who is currently plagued by noise from the M4 the best I can hope for is that the surfaces are the best available for noise control and that the barriers are erected to minimise the inconvenience of the motorway "moving" closer to us. I'm not hopeful this will be achieved as when pointing out that we have barriers only on one side near Junc 8/9 I was told the factory our side of the motorway formed a natural barrier - not so the factory was demolished years ago and we can see the cars flashing by on the replacement units put in after the factory was demolished. Please please ensure you have your facts right and that local residents are considered when you look at sound issues emanating from the road.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Based on this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed in this area. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). Regarding the demolished factory mentioned, this was not incorporated in the noise modelling work which was used to calculate the effects of the Scheme. The replacement units mentioned were incorporated in the noise modelling work. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
Junctions 11/12				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
14/11/2014	144	We'd like to take this opportunity to put on record our concerns regarding the expansion of the M4 into a 'Smart' Motorway between junctions 11 and 12 at Reading. We live right at the side of the motorway and as such already suffer greatly from the environmental impacts of both noise and air pollution. Over the last couple of years we have been in correspondence with John Redwood MP who is greatly supportive of our efforts to try and reduce the impact from its already excessive current levels. As I'm sure you realise, the addition of another two carriageways and its further encroachment towards our property concerns us and all in our community greatly. We'd be very interested to hear your proposals to mitigate not only the increase in noise and air pollution but reducing them from the unacceptable levels we currently endure.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor/moderate decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
23/12/2014	315	Concerned over air and noise - too noisy at present so scheme will not address this at junction 11 and south of motorway. Not sure if widening is needed junctions 10-12 westbound.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, a small number of additional noise barriers are proposed for the Scheme. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that, generally, there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme. Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES Chapter 6: Air Quality. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes
Junctions 6/7				
10/11/2014	199	My main concern is with road noise in the area near slough, between junctions 6 & 7. I would support maximal use of low-noise surfacing & sound deadening fencing/barriers at the roadside.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, the existing noise barriers between J6 and J7 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). An additional barrier will be installed between J6 and Wood Lane Overbridge to "fill in the gap". In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
Myrke Road				
14/11/2014	049	The scheme will bring the noise of the M4 closer to my home as the fence at the bottom of my garden is the motorway boundary. What measures will be taken by the Highways Agency to reduce this noise?	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application for a DCO. Based on this assessment, some additional noise barriers are proposed between junction 5 and junction 6. The existing noise barrier will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	227	The plot already suffers from a lot of traffic noise and as I do spend a considerable amount of time on my plot any increased noise will make cultivation very unpleasant. What plans are there to build a permanent barrier that will reduce this noise level and protect us from vehicles breaking through the fence?	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 5 and junction 6 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition) and some additional noise barriers will be constructed in this area. In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
19/12/2014	595	Noise protection is a number one and in The Myrke there is a very high noise and with the added pollution levels. Have requested for years for effective screening and always been ignored or fobbed off.The'quiet' resurfacing placed back in 2000, is well passed it sell by date. Do not need to inform you of the flow of increased traffic that is on the M4 and will be increased more if proposal goes ahead. The Myrke and surrounding area must be protected by Acoustic Screening along the motorway section. (Even the allotment has some screening) You need to include houses adjacent to the motorway in Datchet, the allotments and right along the two new bridges and around the whole length of The Myrke road area.You see it installed elsewhere, along the motorway. I invite you to come and sit in our rear gardens and our first floor back bedroom, we cannot have the window open due to the unbelievable noise levels. You would not put up with it, so why should we. From when we moved here 18 years ago, the noise levels have increased 10 fold and this is not acceptable and has caused distress and health problems. Your exhibition showed just very little protection near the new bridge. NOT GOOD enough.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, an additional noise barrier is proposed to this area. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between J3 and J12 will also be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
OB Marsh Lane				
19/12/2014	284	2. Sound Barriers, low noise asphalt surfacing and Noise Levels: • Some sound barriers currently exist along certain stretches of the M4 between Jn7 and Jn8/9. I believe these were erected in 2000 at the time of the Jubilee River. Height is only 1.8m and placement is sporadic making little difference to the background motorway noise level audible in the village and particularly noticeable on Oak Stubbs Lane. • In Oak Stubbs Lane, from an easterly direction the motorway is elevated, noise reduction barriers are completely absent on the southern side in this section and the noise is carried and amplified by its passage over the water of the Jubilee River and unimpeded by the open fields. From the northerly and westerly directions the elevated sections of motorway have only the existing inadequate 1.8m noise reduction barrier. • Noise levels are dependent on a variety of conditions: prevailing wind direction, humidity, weather, vegetation (seasonal?), etc. On a good day noise levels from the motorway can be measured at 65dB, on a bad day I have recorded background highway levels at 85dB. • When I attended the exhibition on 26th in Datchet I spoke with one of HA's noise consultants. He showed me plans (not yet publically released) that showed the noise mitigation measures proposed by HA so far as part of the M4 smart motorway improvements in the area of Jn 7 to Jn8/9. I would like to point out: That there were no additional noise reduction barriers proposed on these plans by the HA, nor was there a proposal to replace/improve the heights of the existing inadequate 1.8m noise reduction barriers anywhere along the sections between Lake End Road and Monkey	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Based on this assessment, the existing noise barriers through Dorney Reach will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels across Dorney Reach with the Scheme in operation. Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme as reported in the ES Chapter 6: Air Quality. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		Island Lane. • There was a proposal for low noise asphalt surfacing, but only on lanes 1 and lanes 4 and only in minor sections of motorway - not along the entire elevated stretch, and certainly not from Jn7 to Jn8/9. This was confirmed by the URS consultant although in fairness he stated this was the HA proposal so far at this point in the consultation process! • At the Eton Dorney Parish Council meeting on 9th Dec, concerns were expressed by long standing residents, parish council members and representatives of the Dorney Village School regarding previous assurances by the HA prior to year 2000 that noise mitigation measures (to include low noise asphalt and adequate noise reduction barriers) would be implemented and that disruption to the school and village as a result of motorway noise would be negligible. • These noise mitigation measures never happened and understandably the village residents, parish council members etc are now wary of the further increased noise and air pollution levels		
Road Surface				
20/11/2014	114	I am sure that there can be some environmental benefits factored into the improvements that will come about because of this work. Many residents have expressed opinions about the noise levels so I would know the options that there are to have tarmac that reduced noise and what other measures to reduce noise are available. These would be a very high priority for me.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
18/12/2014	256	We write now in response to your letter of 10th November 2014, to stress that the noise levels from the M4 have increased considerably since we moved here 11 years ago, and unless the scheme utilises all noise reducing measures at its disposal, especially 'quiet surface' road finishes, it is likely that we shall no longer be able to enjoy our home and garden at all, and we will be blighted. Others living nearby are likely to be in the same situation.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. All existing noise barriers along the Scheme extent will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
15/12/2014	268	In addition we feel the additional low-noise surfacing should also be extended by a minimum of 50m, again on the E/B carriageway from chainage 49140m to 49190m. See drawing below.	It has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.	Yes
17/12/2014	271	From my reading of the plans available online, you intend only to use noise abating road surfacing in lanes 1 and 4 of the proposed scheme. This makes no sense to me at all. Surely to be effective, the noise reduction measures need to be laid in all four lanes? I would be grateful if you would explain. As a resident who lives within 1/3rd of a mile of the M4, my family and I currently suffer daily due to the lack of any efforts at noise abatement such as physical roadside barriers and road surfacing which we have seen on other major UK roads, such as the M3, and seem commonplace in other European countries. In contrast the M4, while providing an essential transport link for the national benefit, is currently a dreadful blight on surrounding localities such as ours. It seems to me inexcusable that if major works are to be carried out on the M4, the opportunity is not taken to put in the best available noise abatement measures on a comprehensive basis.	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. The assessment has shown that additional noise barriers are not required in this location. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	291	We live between J10 & J11 - Mole Road, Sindlesham, large areas of concrete surfacing currently = huge noise. Need noise reduction surface. Noise barriers in place currently are not effective. need to be extended to the west to counteract noise from the prevailing wind. need to be increased in height to reduce noise	The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the Application. Additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). In addition, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation.	Yes
Open Ended				
19/12/2014		Road expansion can never be smart	A key driver of the Scheme is the future forecast of traffic which is anticipated to increase from the current level of 130,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of the M4 if nothing is done. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required. The concept of smart motorways introduces active traffic management ("ATM") techniques to increase this capacity by the use of variable speed limits and hard shoulder running. Benefits of the Scheme include smoother traffic flows, more reliable journey times, fewer road traffic collisions, and reduced noise and harmful vehicle emissions. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The Thames Valley Multi-modal Study ("TVMM") published in 2003, looked at the contribution that all modes of transport and traffic management might make-including road, rail, bus and light rail. The TVMM sought to identify the most effective means of addressing current and future transport-related problems in the Thames Valley. The TVMM recommended demand management measures on the M4 either in isolation, or in combination with increased levels of public transport provision. Some of these public transport projects have either been completed or are currently underway. Alternatives to the Scheme have been considered and are reported in the ES Chapter 3: Design Iterations and Alternatives. The Scheme has been concluded to be the most appropriate method of achieving the Scheme's objectives.	No
14/11/2014	148	I hope this project is successful.	The Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided.	No
17/11/2014	154	I believe that the proposed scheme will help alleviate congestion especially during the morning commute and on Sunday evenings. The congestion each morning, for example between Junction 6 to 4b, creates a domino effect and causes delays and sudden braking results in accidents. The accident statistics are there to provide enough evidence that this proposal is a blessing in disguise. As congestion reduces so will the pollution caused by stationary vehicles. The ugly landscape, especially old bridges some of which no longer serve the purpose they were built for, will pave the path for clearer skies.	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit.	No
26/11/2014	185	I know it will go ahead because it has the support of our rotten politicians. Whilst you're all choking on the fumes and fed up with the overpopulated south east, I'll be selling up and emigrating somewhere where the air is clear and population sparse. Oh and better weather!	The Agency has assessed air quality as part of the EIA process and reported the results in ES Chapter 6: Air Quality. The assessment shows that there is no significant impact to air quality as a result of the Scheme. Proposals to control potential air quality impacts of construction are set out in the Outline CEMP, which is included with the Application.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
29/11/2014	191	I'm currently happy with the work taking place	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided.	No
16/12/2014	392	Long overdue - welcome to improve roads and traffic flow	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided.	No
20/12/2014	398/559	Scrap it immediately!	The Highways Agency acknowledges the objection to the Scheme made.	No
Operations and Safety				
Emergency Refuge Areas				
14/11/2014	045	Regarding this proposal I generally consider it a great idea to reduce congestion but with the following recommendations: 1) The loss of the hard shoulder for breakdowns is a major concern on such a busy motorway. It would be a major safety risk if a vehicle did break down. I would like to propose that you install laybys every 1/4 or 1/3 of a mile where cars and lorries can coast into and pull out of the way of flowing traffic. It also means the laybys can be built quickly, with minimal disruption and can be moved to where the terrain allows (e.g. away from a verge or built up section.	In accordance with the Agency's design standards, refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built emergency refuge areas ("ERAs") as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network. At a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge approximately every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an emergency refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
11/12/2014	077	Concerned about small number of refuges. The road will operate at high speed and high density meaning there is no scope for escape in the event of sudden car failure.	In accordance with the Agency's design standards, refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network. At a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge approximately every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an emergency refuge area. Vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
24/11/2014	175	Emergency refuge areas are becoming further and further apart as well, increasing the chance of serious accidents. Having broken down on a motorway before, I can tell you that the prospect of being stranded in an immobile vehicle with no means of escape is terrifying. I would urge you to look again at your plans for this stretch.	Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes that are to start main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer large structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed. The design changes are based on experience of designing and operating smart motorways for more than five years. This experience and detailed assessment has demonstrated that increasing the spacing between refuge areas will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user. Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to a refuge area in an emergency, even when the distance is increased. Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
			Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	
01/12/2014	196	The spacing of safety areas in my opinion is too large and the space from overhead signs compared to locations of safety areas leads to very dangerous scenarios for broken down vehicles.	Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
21/12/2014	309	Have concerns over emergency services not gaining access to an incident when heavy congestion occurs. Lane 1 should be alot wider, would help. Lorry joining the motorway from an ERA will not be up to speed as the ERA length is too short. Concerns that gantry speed signs and additional notification signs are a distraction. Too many. Information needs to always be up to date with work and closures etc when and where it happens.	Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes that are to start main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer large structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed. The design changes are based on experience of designing and operating smart motorways for more than five years. This experience and detailed assessment has demonstrated that increasing the spacing between refuge areas will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user. Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to a refuge area in an emergency, even when the distance is increased. Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
21/12/2014	332	2.1.3./ ERA policy flawed: 2.5km distance between takes no account of emergencies requiring an immediate and full stop on the carriageway e.g. punctures/fire/electrical faults/clutch/gearbox failure etc.	Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	597	I also think that 2.5km between ERAs is much too far, though this is a disagreement with the Smart Motorway specifications more than this specific scheme.	Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes that are to start main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer large structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed. The design changes are based on experience of designing and operating smart motorways for more than five years. This experience and detailed assessment has demonstrated that increasing the spacing between refuge areas will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user. Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to a refuge area in an emergency, even when the distance is increased. Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
17/12/2014	618	Please do not make the hard shoulder a running lane. Refuge areas are not adequate.	Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes that are to start main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer large structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed. The design changes are based on experience of designing and operating smart motorways for more than five years. This experience and detailed assessment has demonstrated that increasing the spacing between refuge areas will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user. Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to a refuge area in an emergency, even when the distance is increased. Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
Gantries				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	065	Will the display boards be seen all the time? Like if you pass one will the next be visible immediately to be able to tell you if all is clear or a lane is closed as to a car broken down, or are they going to run into you, even the RAC do not think this is a good idea.	Information displayed via the overhead signals or message signs located in the verge will be located at regular intervals through the Scheme. The Scheme will provide the driver with the correct (i.e. relevant, timely and accurate) information, at the right location, at the appropriate time, thereby promoting appropriate and intuitive driver behaviour. Information will be highly visible throughout the Scheme extent. After passing one signal there may be a small gap before the next message sign or signal is visible. However, this information will be displayed to the road user in an appropriate location so that the driver is provided with the required information to enable them to react and behave accordingly in response to any lane closures. In accordance with the Agency's design standards, refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network. At a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge approximately every 90 seconds. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. It is expected that the overall risk of the new specification is likely to be less than that on a dual three lane motorway with a hard shoulder.	No
14/11/2014	144	In addition to these we also suffer from a diesel generator powering a gantry sign that sits at the end of our garden and runs 24 hours a day. Whilst we've had repeated lapsed promises that this will be removed, it still adds to the poor quality of life presented to us by the motorway.	The existing gantries in this location will be retained as part of the Scheme. The gantries will be linked to the national electricity grid so there will be no need for a diesel generator.	No
25/11/2014	180	Many drivers find it difficult to cope with three lanes and a hard shoulder. With the addition of many gantries issuing instructions, there will be greater confusion.	Although the smart motorways specification allows driver information signs (mounted on gantries) to be spaced up to a maximum of 1500m, this is only in locations with very good visibility. Signals over each lane are only required at the start of a link (each junction-to-junction section), i.e. at each junction. These are located on what is known as a 'gateway' gantry. Large electronic matrix signs (known as "MS4s") will be mounted in the verges. These will display information for road users, including the motorway speed limit, which lanes are available and advice to road users, such as 'incident ahead'. Wicket type signs are already commonly used on the road network to inform drivers of road works and on signs placed within the central reserve. The move to more pictorial based signs and signals allows all road users (including foreign drivers) to understand what instructions they are being given more easily. The red 'X's will be used on the MS4s when certain lanes are closed. The red 'X's will also be used where we have signals over lanes, and one of the lanes are closed. The different gantry designs are presented in the Gantry General Arrangement Drawings (Doc. ref. 2.9).	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	268	Page 4-30 4.5.20 Gantries on the eastbound carriageway: a) One gateway gantry positioned shortly after the junction 11 entry slip road. This gantry will carry a single variable message signal type MS4 and a set of four AMIs, one positioned over each lane, to display lane availability and speed limits; b) One intermediate gantry similar to the gateway, but positioned half way along the section; c) Nine additional variable message signals (one MS3 and eight MS4s) positioned over the nearside lane at regular intervals; d) Two ADS positioned at 1 mile and ½ mile in advance of junction 10 showing the exit destinations of Reading (E) Bracknell and Wokingham; and e) One final direction sign on approach to junction 10, showing exit destination as above and M4 through traffic destinations of Greater London and Maidenhead. Question What type and size of gantry will be positioned just prior to Mill Lane underbridge on the Eastbound carriageway and how much ground work will be required to support it, as indicated on M4-PEIR_Drawing_04-1_Scheme-Plan_Sheet-01-19_J12-J10.pdf Sheet 16, bearing in mind the close proximity (approx. 15m) of 'Hillside' to the indicated location ?	The gantry proposed to be positioned just prior to Mill Lane underbridge on the Eastbound carriageway is a gantry type 3, superspan cantilever. A superspan cantilever is likely to be about 4.5 x 4.5 m, sticking out of the ground by about 1.6m. The different gantry designs, including type 3, are presented in the Gantry General Arrangement Drawings (Doc. ref. 2.9).	No
21/12/2014	314	An concerned that there is a gantry so close to Shinfield Footbridge. If it imposes when crossing that footbridge it will be significantly negative for many local people.	Gantry G8-22a is located a short distance (approximately 10m) west from Shinfield footbridge. The gantry is a 'gateway gantry' at the start of the J11-10 Eastbound link and is required to provide information to road users on the mainline but also to those that have merged at J11. The gantry must be located in this position due to the footbridge. Should the gantry be moved further west of the bridge, then the gantry would be located over the merge which would be distracting to the motorists merging and may result in an increase in incidents. Accordingly, it is not possible to locate the gantry the other side of the bridge as the visibility of the signals would be obstructed by the bridge. This gantry will be approximately the same height as the footbridge and carry 1 message sign mark 4 and four advance motorway indicators. The effects of gantry G8-22a and gantry G8-22 were assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, due to their proximity to the footbridge. These assessments show that the new gantries will result in a moderate adverse significance of effect on views for users of the footbridge during construction and operation (opening year) and Design Year (2037). The results are fully reported in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the DCO application.	No
Incident Management				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	065	On my way from junction 12 to 3 on Saturday I counted 5 cars broken down and 3 coming back at 22hrs Saturday is not the busiest day due to it being a non working day for many people. How do the emergency services get to people who have broken down or worse have had a heart attack or need lifesaving assistance no hard should to get to them quickly, you might say they will display a sign to close the lane but that will take longer, and time could be precious mins wasted.	Research (Safety on hard shoulders on D2 and D3 motorways – TRL unpublished report PR/TT/069/98) on the use of the hard shoulder on motorways, shows that illegal stops outnumber breakdowns by between eight and ten times. These are usually drivers stopping to use their mobile phone, read a map, etc. During 24 months to 30 September 2010, the Royal Automobile Club ("RAC") attended 2,233 cars and light commercial vehicles. Analysing the fault codes they estimated 71 per cent of vehicles suffered faults that would have allowed them to drive to an ERA (not affected by ERA spacing). Of the remaining 29 per cent there would be a percentage that was able to reach an ERA exit the network or reach a hard shoulder intra-junction (if present). It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. Where traffic flows permit, Traffic Officers and emergency services will use the running lanes to gain access to an incident. This will be possible for the majority of incidents, due to the provision of an additional lane as a result of ALR. Where that is not possible, signs and signals will be set to close a lane for access. Traffic Officers and emergency services also have the option to drive 'through' the traffic, something they already do on other motorways and dual carriageways. The final option for the most severe incidents is to implement reverse access/reverse flow. Based on this, the Agency does not anticipate the emergency services' response time to differ from that existing.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	108	Recently there was an accident involving a lorry and a bridge. There were three lanes of standing traffic but the emergency services were able to attend, as was a breakdown truck because they used the hard shoulder. If all traffic is using the hard shoulder as a fourth lane how do the emergency services arrive? Only the ambulance can come by air. There are going to be refuges for broken down vehicles. Mechanical breakdowns will not occur opposite a refuge; a puncture may be safe to drive to the next refuge but a failure of the engine or an engine fire needs immediate evacuation from the highway or there will be a multiple accident.	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The aim of the Scheme is to prevent traffic flow breakdown and keep it moving at busy times. However, on smart motorways, speed limits are adjusted during busy periods to control the flow of vehicles and prevent traffic grinding to a halt. The current speed limit will be displayed on signs over or at the side of the carriageway. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. m. It is expected that the overall risk of the new specification is likely to be less than that on a dual three lane motorway with a hard shoulder.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	109	A project representative was interviewed on BBC Radio Berkshire, and there were some calls from the public expressing serious concerns about the proposed scheme for the M4. Unfortunately, the responses from your representative were unconvincing. This is very worrying, as personal safety is involved. For example: He said that passengers should stay in the vehicle in case of breakdown. This completely contradicts advice in the Highway Code. He also said that the warning signs would be switched on, but there will inevitably be a time lapse. We sincerely hope that you will re-consider the whole concept, as it just seems a recipe for disaster and chaos. We would be very reluctant to use any Smart Motorway, as the risk is just too high.	Research (Safety on hard shoulders on D2 and D3 motorways – TRL unpublished report PR/TT/069/98) on the use of the hard shoulder on motorways, shows that illegal stops outnumber breakdowns by between eight and ten times. These are usually drivers stopping to use their mobile phone, read a map, etc. During 24 months to 30 September 2010, the RAC attended 2,233 cars and light commercial vehicles. Analysing the fault codes they estimated 71 per cent of vehicles suffered faults that would have allowed them to drive to an ERA (not affected by ERA spacing). Of the remaining 29 per cent there would be a percentage that was able to reach an ERA exit the network or reach a hard shoulder intra-junction (if present). It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. The operators in the regional control centre will be altered through CCTV and the vehicle detection and flow measurement system. There will be a time lapse but it will be of a very short duration This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. During peak periods the traffic on the M4 would be managed by variable speed limits and, as such there, is little difference to existing managed motorway schemes (which have a good safety record). Those who breakdown (particularly at night) and cannot get off the carriageway or to an ERA should put on hazard warning lights to help other drivers and Agency staff see them. Rather than in all circumstances, if for any reason a person cannot exit the vehicle, or believe it is unsafe to do so, or there is no other place of relative safety to wait, they should remain in the vehicle with their seat belt on.	No
18/11/2014	156	Please do not do this. Please pay attention to the views of the emergency services and the motoring organisations.	The Highways Agency has been talking to the emergency services (police, fire and ambulance services) about the new specification for smart motorways, who have indicated their overall support for the Scheme. To learn lessons from the current schemes in operation in the West Midlands region, we have held workshops with practitioners from the emergency services. The feedback provided through this consultation is reflected in the design of the Scheme.	No
15/12/2014	178	I still have concerns that the emergency services could struggle to get to a major incident, if it happens when all lanes are busy, no amount of signage/ inner lane closure would leave free access. At least with a hard shoulder they currently have a lane clear. The M6 north of Birmingham which has now incorporated the hard shoulder has worked well each time we have used it, time will tell !	he improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	180	I cannot this scheme working sensibly in the event of a breakdown or collision. for example, how will rescue services get to the site on a busy day? I believe there will be an increase in accidents due to the removal of the hard shoulder. In addition, emergency services may find it difficult to attend quickly.	The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
19/11/2014	249	In the Maidenhead Advertiser I read about the proposal to improve M4 junctions 3 to Junction 12 to a Smart Motorway by turning the hard shoulder into a permanently running lane. Listening to "Radio Berkshire" on occasions the M4 becomes congested both East and West, and sometimes both, for various reasons, so then I suppose something has to be done to ease congestion. What causes me some concern is that there will be no hard shoulder to use in the event of a breakdown or accident, either to us or other people, so what does one do should this happen, so we then have 4 lanes of congested traffic and not 3. How do the emergency services or breakdown recovery gain access to the site of an accident or breakdown when all 4 lanes are at stand? I do note that you will provide "emergency refuge areas", so what happens if you have an accident or breakdown between refuge areas?, do you stay with your vehicle which you are advised not to do, or what? So yes, I believe that something has to be done to ease congestion but not by abandoning the hard shoulder. You say signs and signals will be provided, the signals in use now are not always reliable. Finally I heard one of your representatives talking on Radio Berkshire saying currently the hard shoulder is mainly used by drivers checking their maps or answering their phones, I would have thought that this was not the intention of the hard shoulder.	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The aim of the Scheme is to prevent traffic flow breakdown and keep it moving at busy times. However, on smart motorways, speed limits are adjusted during busy periods to control the flow of vehicles and prevent traffic grinding to a halt. The current speed limit will be displayed on signs over or at the side of the carriageway. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. Research (Safety on hard shoulders on D2 and D3 motorways – TRL unpublished report PR/TT/069/98) on the use of the hard shoulder on motorways, shows that illegal stops outnumber breakdowns by between eight and ten times. These are usually drivers stopping to use their mobile phone, read a map, etc.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	296	Please make sure that the way in which emergency vehicles need to make use of the motorway in case of an RTC is considered in conjunction with Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service and London Fire Service.	The Agency has been talking to the emergency services (police, fire and ambulance services) about the new specification for smart motorways. To learn lessons from the current schemes in operation in the West Midlands region, the Agency has held workshops with practitioners from the emergency services. The Agency has been having regular meetings with the emergency services and they are supportive of the scheme. This engagement will continue into the future. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
21/12/2014	351	Smart motorways are not good for breakdowns on the motorway. Also when traffic is queued the hard shoulder is the only route for emergency vehicles. The smart option was chosen by the HA purely on cost. More consideration on safety aspect. Hard shoulders are a convenient place to pull into when you are broken down. Breaking down in any other traffic lane should not be allowed. I do not agree to loosing the hard shoulder. All motorways should have a hard shoulder.	Alternatives to the Scheme have been considered and are reported in the ES Chapter 3: Design Iterations and Alternatives. The Scheme has been concluded to be the most appropriate method of achieving the Scheme's objectives. Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The aim of the Scheme is to prevent traffic flow breakdown and keep it moving at busy times. However on smart motorways, speed limits are adjusted during busy periods to control the flow of vehicles and prevent traffic grinding to a halt. The current speed limit will be displayed on signs over or at the side of the carriageway. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
20/12/2014	416/579	London Fire Brigade would normally use the hard shoulder to approach an incident on a congested highway. Consideration must be given to how the Highways Agency will ensure the London Fire Brigade can access this section of smart motorway in a timely manner.	The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
08/12/2014	452	FIRSTLY, No consideration for alternatives to hard-shoulder for emergency vehicles access when lanes are blocked with traffic - this is a question of life and death. I would like to know that if there is even one life which happens to be lost because of emergency vehicles not able to go through who is legally and morally responsible and how do they plan to reinstate lost lives??? (Can they even??) . Any approval to this scheme should include the name in the individual capacity and explicit approval that 'lives' are being traded for 'convenience' with this proposal.	If and when an accident occurs, this will be thoroughly investigated and the cause determined. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. Alternatives to the Scheme have been considered and are reported in the ES Chapter 3: Design Iterations and Alternatives. The Scheme has been concluded to be the most appropriate method of achieving the Scheme's objectives. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly.	No
16/12/2014	623	1. How will the emergency services get to incidents quickly when there is no hard shoulder?	The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
Main Carriageway				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	020	My (limited) experience as a driver of over 30 years regarding hard shoulder operations was on the M42 at junction 4. I found that some of the junctions were poorly signposted such that the use of the hard shoulder for the next exit was not clear, with the signs (overhead and on road) indicating to use lane one. This meant that when in lane one and wanting the next exit, this was prevented by the solid white line dividing lane one and the hard shoulder. This line only became a broken line very late (150m) before the junction exit, which meant a late move and braking at speed was necessary as the signs indicted to remain in lane one. This problem was compounded by motorists on the hard shoulder undertaking lane one which therefore prevents drivers moving from lane one to the hard shoulder in order to exit. If the exits are not redesigned to allow for hard-shoulder operation and the rules allow the motorist to effectively ignore a solid white then it will always be ambiguous as to who has right of way. My solution would be that the speed limit for the hard shoulder should be 10mph lower than the rest of the motorway. This will reduce the risk of accident, which if it were to occur at such an exit would create huge congestion very quickly, along with the inability of the emergency services to reach the scheme.	The first smart motorway scheme was introduced on the M42 J3a to J7, in 2006, as a pilot scheme, known then as active traffic management ("ATM"). Through experience and evidence of operating the M42 and M6 schemes, the Highways Agency has been able to evolve the smart motorways design concept to the next level, where the hard shoulder is converted to a running lane on a permanent basis and less infrastructure is needed. This eliminates the issue you raise concerning white line markings on approach to junctions and also the confusion of drivers not knowing when to use the hard shoulder.	No
11/12/2014	037	I would like to suggest the installation of electronic signs, at entries to motorway junctions that display traffic conditions on the motorway, to advise people of any delays, accidents etc., thus drivers can choose to take another route, rather than block the motorway even further. It would in the case of a motorway belong blocked avoid unnecessary fuel consumption waiting in queues. I have to say I haven't read the documents so whether my suggestion was included or not, I don't know, but I think it is worth consideration.	Smart motorways have the ability, through the latest generation of variable message signs to inform drivers of unexpected conditions, including accidents and to detect the presence of slow moving vehicles and to warn approaching drivers of the potential for queues ahead. Prior to joining the motorway, Entry Slip Signals ("ESSs") will also be provided at all junction on slips. The ESSs will provide drivers with information relating to traffic conditions on the M4 prior to them joining the network, thereby allowing them to make a decision on whether or not they wish to join the motorway or seek an alternative route should the ESS be displaying a low speed or lane closure information. The Agency is not responsible for the local road network, but will continue to work with local authorities as the Scheme progresses.	No
14/11/2014	045	3) I have my doubts over needing to rely on the electronic signage. The amount of times I see signs broadcasting misleading, incorrect or out of date information. This is particularly important if there is a breakdown on the hard shoulder as mentioned above.	Understanding the needs of road users is an integral part of the Agency's operations and it is continually working to improve the delivery of messages to road users. Informing the road user in advance of incidents or delays allows the user to manage journeys a great deal better. Experience gained from previous smart motorway schemes shows the automated systems employed will be accurate and timely in setting the appropriate signs and signals for the prevailing traffic conditions.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	108	There are more accidents occurring these days where traffic enters or leaves a junction on the section between junction 11 and 5. If traffic is travelling on the hard shoulder the junctions are all going to need widening to ensure there are not more such accidents. Perhaps that is why junction 11 eastwards was built with an extra leaving lane!	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The aim of the Scheme is to prevent traffic flow breakdown and keep it moving at busy times. However on smart motorways, speed limits are adjusted during busy periods to control the flow of vehicles and prevent traffic grinding to a halt. The current speed limit will be displayed on signs over or at the side of the carriageway. Widening to enable hard shoulder running will be achieved by widening into the central reservation. Most of the junctions are suitable for all lane running, the exceptions being junction 7 and junction 5 where there are discontinuities in the hard shoulder. At these locations, and at locations of bridges with hard shoulder discontinuities, the structures will be demolished and replaced with longer span structures.	No
20/11/2014	165	I disagree with the complete scheme for safety reasons	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 scheme shows that accidents more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme launched – the severity of accidents also dropped significantly. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. The aim of the Scheme is to prevent traffic flow breakdown and keep it moving at busy times. However on smart motorways, speed limits are adjusted during busy periods to control the flow of vehicles and prevent traffic grinding to a halt. The current speed limit will be displayed on signs over or at the side of the carriageway. The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers.	No
01/12/2014	196	Also a concern that accidents due to proximity are more likely to involve damage to barriers with increased risk of debris being thrown into neighbouring properties where residents including children will be put more at danger. The outside lane must not encroach on neighbouring properties with substantially safer environment barriers.	The Vehicle Restraint System ("VRS") has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design will take place in the next stage of the project, and will be based on the Agency's risk-based Road Restraint Risk Assessment Process ("RRRAP"). This will assess the risks alongside the M4 and specify the type of barrier required.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
20/01/2015	309	Have concerns over emergency services not gaining access to an incident when heavy congestion occurs. Lane 1 should be a lot wider - would help. Lorry joining the motorway from an ERA will not be up to speed as the ERA length is too short. Concerns that the gantry speed signs and additional notification signs are a distraction. Too many. Information needs to be up to date with work and closures etc when and where it happens.	The improved reliability of modern vehicles means that a significant number of drivers are able to reach a refuge area if they need to stop. Research (undertaken by the Highways Agency on the M1, M3 and M25) shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary. Replacing the hard shoulder with refuge areas eliminates these stops, along with the associated risk. It is expected that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes will be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder, as a significant proportion of breakdowns will be able to get to a refuge area. When a vehicle is exiting the ERA, the Regional Control Centre will close lane 1 (by displaying a red X on the gantries) to enable the vehicle to exit safely. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. The smart motorways specification allows driver information signs (mounted on gantries) to be spaced up to a maximum of 1500m, but this is only in locations with very good visibility. The positioning of each gantry/sign is carefully considered. The positions are selected to ensure that road users receive information at the right time to prevent late decisions on lane changes and erratic manoeuvres. CCTV cameras will be installed to along the whole length of the Scheme to monitor traffic and manage incidents from the Regional Control Centre. Smart motorways have the ability, through the latest generation of variable message signs to inform drivers of unexpected conditions, including accidents and to detect the presence of slow moving vehicles and to warn approaching drivers of the potential for queues ahead.	No
26/11/2014	325	Should get traffic through the area quicker, less pollution. As long as plans are in place to use both carriageways in cases of major delays. If handled correctly this scheme must be beneficial to the motorist so should be encouraged. Motorists may need a bit of education to use the system safely and correctly.	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. In respect of educating motorists, the Agency has developed national campaign material to help deliver the smart motorways message which is located on its website at the following address: http://www.highways.gov.uk/publications/smart-motorways-campaign-material/ In addition, the Agency is delivering an information campaign – Get smart, know your motorways - which will use a wide range of channels to show what smart motorways will look like and what drivers should do, encouraging understanding of the signs, compliance with speed limits and the red 'X' and what to do in a breakdown and good vehicle maintenance. As part of the campaign the Agency is working closely with organisations to explore partnership marketing opportunities, making a toolkit of materials available for use when talking about smart motorways to their audiences.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	332	2.1.2./ TJR policy flawed: driver unfamiliarity will cause cutting in and abrupt lane changes to a far greater degree than at present	Through Junction Running ("TJR") is being implemented at all junctions with the exception of J3, J4b, J10 and J12. Junctions 3 and 12 are the terminal junctions of the Scheme and require a lane drop/lane gain arrangement as through the junction the hard shoulder is retained. Junctions 4b and 10 are motorway to motorway interchanges and therefore with the volumes of traffic leaving and joining the M4 at these two junctions they require a lane drop/lane gain arrangement. All other junctions will operate with TJR. The inclusion of TJR at every other junction on the scheme creates an environment of consistency which may improve road user behaviour along the corridor. TJR will allow long distance, strategic traffic to remain in lane 1 and not make successive lane changes, prior to and after each junction. It is not expected that the design will result in sudden lane changes or late weaving. At J4b and J10, and the terminal junctions, there will be clear signage to indicate that lane 1 is a lane drop.	No
19/11/2014	347	Warning signs - reduction of carriageway width: Signs should be located TWO miles in advance of the junctions where the width of the carriageway is reduced. The first notification at a distance of ONE mile is inadequate. The relevant locations are Junction 3 eastbound, junction 12 westbound, junctions 4B and 10 in both directions.	The current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) are to have 1 mile and 1/2 mile signs, wherever possible, on the approach to junctions. It is not considered appropriate or necessary to have 2 mile advance direction signs. Generally a 1 mile sign is generally considered appropriate warning so that drivers have sufficient time to start maneuvering into the correct lane for their destination. At some junctions, i.e. at J3 and J4B, having 2 mile signs would mean that the signage would be located within the previous junction, which is likely to be confusing for motorists.	No
Variable Speed Limit				
19/11/2014	163	I hope that the variable speed limit will operate better than on the M25. On the M25 I tend to find the speed limit varies over quite a short distance when the traffic density has remained the same. Even seeing reductions when little traffic is about. I think the effect of variable speed limits to smooth flow is generally a good idea, so with updated technology & more loop sensors in the road I hope this can be achieved.	In order for the concept of smart motorways to operate effectively, variable speed limits are used that will adapt to traffic conditions, including the national speed limit. To achieve this, the smart motorways seek to address the concerns that the respondent has have raised, by using the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly in order to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Experience from monitoring both the M42 and M6 demonstrates that in heavy traffic, when speed limits are posted, a road user's actual speed is also influenced by other traffic. In this way traffic speed generally self regulates to the posted speeds and speed compliance has been very good on the existing smart motorway links.	No
01/12/2014	194	My concerns outlined in my response to Section 6 on page 1 are explained as follows: 1. The M25 variable speed limit often goes up and down like a yoyo, instead of being set to a steady speed. The up and down causes bunching of traffic and sudden braking. 2. The M25 variable speed limit is sometimes suddenly set unrealistically low, when there is no visible cause or reason provided on VMSs. Sometimes, if one obeys the limit there is a very real risk of being rammed in the rear. I'm frequently undecided whether it is safer to stay in lane (as one is supposed to), or move to lane 1 as quickly as possible, so as to be out of the way of others. 3. Often, a limit is imposed without there being any reason or congestion.	Understanding the needs of road users is an integral part of the Agency's operations and it is continually working to improve the delivery of messages to road users. Informing the road user in advance of incidents or delays allows the user to manage journeys far better. Experience gained from previous smart motorway schemes shows that the automated systems employed will be accurate and timely in setting the appropriate signs and signals for the prevailing traffic conditions. The speed limits that are displayed are generally as a result of traffic conditions downstream and reducing speeds enables the traffic to flow through the section more smoothly. The signals rules on smart motorway schemes will enable speeds to be reduced safely and will help road users to avoid sudden signal changes that may result in braking suddenly.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/11/2014	208	Time again we are brabed to believe that smart motorways are a success in improving road safety, whilst there may be less fatal collisions only due to the fact traffic is often near stationary more frequently anyway, the system isn't accurate, lower limits are often left remaining for hours after the incident/congestion has completely cleared and resumed to normal status creating a longer recovery time for traffic, and often it only takes into account average speed of traffic, it doesn't take into account other matters where appropriate speed is a significant part in road safety such as in wet/foggy conditions there may be no signs up to reflect yet in dry conditions there may be signs reduced to 60/50 even in relatively light conditions without any need and other times. Better police patrol and improving sufficient transport to London from outside of London to allow more commuters to use alternatives would be a far better spend of money than a ridiculous scheme like this that will do no more than cause unnecessary havoc.	A key driver of the proposed Scheme is the future forecast of traffic which are anticipated to increase from the current level of 130,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of the M4 if nothing is done. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required in a safe and appropriate manner. The concept of smart motorways introduces ATM techniques to increase this capacity by the use of variable speed limits and hard shoulder running. Benefits of the proposed Scheme include smoother traffic flows, more reliable journey times, fewer road traffic collisions, and reduced noise and harmful vehicle emissions. Evidence from the M42 pilot demonstrates that using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not compromised safety. Further, the TVMM published in 2003, looked at the contribution that all modes of transport and traffic management might make-including road, rail, bus and light rail. The study sought to identify the most effective means of addressing current and future transport-related problems in the Thames Valley. It recommended demand management measures on the M4 either in isolation, or in combination with increased levels of public transport provision. Some of these public transport projects have either been completed or are currently underway. Alternatives to the Scheme have also been considered and are reported in the ES Chapter 3: Design Iterations and Alternatives. The Scheme has been concluded to be the most appropriate method of achieving the Scheme's objectives.	No
18/12/2014	272	We are concerned that adequate resources are not in place to deal with enforcement issues when variable speed limits are introduced. We fear that pressures on roads policing budgets may mean that enforcement of smart motorway speed limits may prove challenging. While we accept that the use of speed cameras is part of the solution, in the view of the RHA, cameras are not a complete substitute for the deployment on the ground of roads policing professionals. We are concerned that a proportion of drivers of commercial vehicles may ignore the new speed limits and tailgate other vehicles driving within the limits. The RHA has in the past issued clear guidance to members advising that drivers must be told to comply with the appropriate limits however the RHA is only able to influence the conduct of those hauliers in membership. In our view, a visible presence of traffic police would help to promote compliance on the M4. As a final point, we would urge the government to remain committed to funding an adequate level of roads policing and commercial vehicle enforcement activity from DVSA. While smart motorway schemes appear to work well overall, we are convinced that they do not remove the need for proper policing and enforcement by properly trained and resourced professionals. December	The Scheme will introduce camera enforcement along the M4. Enforcement through speed cameras is considered to be one measure that will help to achieve an acceptable level of compliance. Other measures will include road safety education, display of accurate information through the signs and signals and the presence of Highways Agency Traffic Officers. There will also be enforcement signs located along the length of Scheme to encourage adherence to road rules. Through these measures it is anticipated that an acceptable level of compliance will be achieved. Should there be an issue with the levels of compliance on smart motorway schemes then there may be a requirement for further measures to be considered. This may include increasing the level of enforcement or alternatively increasing the presence of the Traffic Officer Service or Police.	No
21/12/2014	357	M4 Improvement Scheme. (i) Junctions 3-12. Although the scheme itself is sound enough, it is not sufficiently ambitious. The eastern part of the M4 is inadequate to the point of being a laughing stock. The speed limit on all sections of all motorways should be 70 mph, but the M4's approach to London is slower than many country lanes. All parts of all motorways should be improved to 70 mph, standard and, from a purely national prestige point of view, those bringing traffic to the London area should have priority for this work.	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit. A key driver of the proposed Scheme is the future forecast of traffic which are anticipated to increase from the current level of 130,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, without compromising overall safety on England's motorways, which are among the safest roads in the world.	No
Other				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
10/11/2014		No comments recorded	N/A	No
10/11/2014		No comments recorded	N/A	No
14/11/2014		No comments recorded	N/A	No
17/11/2014		No comments recorded	N/A	No
04/12/2014		No comments recorded	N/A	No
11/11/2014	002	No comments recorded	N/A	No
11/12/2014	022	Thanks for your letter which I read with interest. I am pleased to inform you that I have approved the project and you may proceed with it ASAP.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided	No
11/12/2014	039	I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time	The Highways Agency acknowledges the interest in the Scheme indicated	No
12/11/2014	102	No comments recorded	N/A	No
12/12/2014	103	I would like at this point to register our interest to respond, and if you could put my name as a contact that would be appreciated. We have a meeting scheduled for Wednesday 3rd December with regards this document and the M4 proposals in general, so we should be in a position to respond at that point.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the interest in the Scheme indicated	No
01/12/2014	119	Thank you for your letter of 10 November 2014. Please note our change of address.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the interest in the Scheme indicated	No
12/12/2014	236	Please be informed that we have no specific comments or concerns on the scheme.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the interest in the Scheme indicated	No
20/11/2014	248	I can confirm that the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided	No
16/12/2014	285	No comments recorded	N/A	No
23/12/2014	312	Just think that it will be much improved for the residents of Slough	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided	No
21/12/2014	341	It will very good and help	The Highways Agency acknowledges the support for the Scheme provided	No
12/11/2014	371	No comments recorded	N/A	No
02/02/2015	395	M4 Traffic Management plan Sorry to be a nuisance but I've just been looking on the Highways Agency web site for delays on the M4 westbound and discovered a web chat (now closed) about the proposed Traffic Management plan. I'm confused because I was under the impression that the work was meant to be done between junctions three and twelve, so why does the heading of the article mention junction fourteen, as show below: Blogs Highways Agency Blogs and Web Chats will be listed on this page. November 21, 2014 M4 J3 -14 Smart Motorway proposal: Have your say We will be hosting a web chat here from 1pm to 2pm, Tuesday 2nd December 2014 to answer your questions, live, about the proposed scheme.	The Scheme is for improvements to the M4 between junctions 3-12. The reference to junction 14 on the web-chat was a mistake. The Scheme's dedicated project website can be found at the following url: www.highways.gov.uk/roads/road-projects/M4-Junctions-3-12	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		Would you be able to clarify, please?		
12/12/2014	420/553	No comments recorded	N/A	No
12/11/2014	444	No comments made	N/A	No
04/12/2014	463	No comments recorded	N/A	No
04/12/2014	464	No comments recorded	N/A	No
03/12/2014	466	No comments recorded	N/A	No
24/11/2014	468	No comments recorded	N/A	No
02/12/2014	472	No comments recorded	N/A	No
02/12/2014	474	No comments recorded	N/A	No
27/11/2014	502	No comments recorded	N/A	No
26/11/2014	505	No comments recorded	N/A	No
17/11/2014	529	No comments recorded	N/A	No
16/11/2014	531	No comments recorded	N/A	No
12/11/2014	548	No comments recorded	N/A	No
11/11/2014	552	No comments recorded	N/A	No
20/12/2014	574	No comments recorded	N/A	No
Other Environment/ES Related Responses				
23/12/2014	001	Providing a porous road surface is laid across all lanes adjoining Shurlock Row this to correct a previous failing and highlighted by HA previously. Opportunity to achieve environmental gain.	The Agency has confirmed that a low noise surface would be provided for Scheme opening across all lanes of both carriageways. This modern low noise surface provides comparable reductions in road traffic noise to more porous, traditional materials used for road surfaces.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
02/03/2015	033	2. Air pollution impacts detailed in the Preliminary Environmental Information report Air pollution assessment methods The information on the impact of the scheme on air pollution is given in Chapter 6 of the Preliminary Environmental Information report.4 Air pollution evaluation is a constantly evolving topic and the subject of much research. For example, the most recent EURO VI standards designed to reduce vehicle emissions have already been called into question in terms of the real-world reductions they will bring in the future.5 Many other factors are also involved in determining the concentrations of pollutants experienced by people living near busy roads. We note therefore that one of the Highways Agency's Interim Advice Notes (IANs) giving guidance on the methodology used to carry out the assessment is currently suspended, with a new note pending – the suspended note is IAN 175/13.6 Another advice note on the treatment of pollution emissions with changes in speed during congestion has also recently been updated in January 2014 – IAN 185/15. We request that the final Environmental Statement is completed using the newest advice and emissions data before the scheme is submitted as a planning application. Specific locations of concern Within the PEI report, we are concerned to find a number of locations described as facing nitrogen dioxide pollution above the legal limit of 40 µg/m3 with the scheme in place, when they would otherwise have been within legal limits in 2022. The details of the modelled effects on nitrogen dioxide concentrations at each location are given in the Appendices to the PEI report (Table 6.4 pages 50 to 525).7 A list taken from these tables of example locations of concern – which would either see a breach of limits with the scheme, compared with the base case, or a worsening of the level of pollution in an area that would be over the limit without the scheme – is shown below. The existence of any receptors that would experience this kind of impact is not acceptable, but the damage caused by the scheme is not limited to these sites. In addition to people living at these locations, many other receptors that would be above the legal limits in 2022 are expected to experience a lower magnitude of increase (for example most receptors from reference N500 to N575). These smaller changes across a wide area are not considered significant in terms of the current methodology but – importantly – will mean air pollution for many people not being brought within legal limits as soon as possible, due to the effects of this scheme. This is why we are arguing that the scheme should be amended until its effect on air pollution is entirely neutral in the short and long term. [Table inserted]. The conclusions of the Preliminary Environmental Assessment report Page 6-58 of the PEI report summarises the evaluation of the significance of the scheme's effects on air pollution. It concludes that there is a risk that environmental standards will be breached, but concludes that not many people will be affected and the effects are not significant	The air quality methodology utilised for the Scheme is presented in Chapter 6: Air Quality of the ES and associated Appendices. The air quality assessment has been undertaken utilising the Highways Agency approach to the evaluation of future air quality rates of improvement (IAN 170/12 v3). This approach is more conservative than the rates of improvement in air quality currently assumed in Defra guidance (i.e. Local Air Quality Management Guidance). Therefore, not all the improvements in air quality over time anticipated by Defra have been assumed in the Scheme air quality assessment. IAN 175/13 is listed on the Department for Transport Interim Advice Note web-page as pending a new version. A new version is not yet available and the IAN 175/13 is available for use upon request from the Highways Agency for Highways Agency Schemes. Further work will be undertaken in the pre-examination phase and examination phase to establish any differences in air quality predictions with the updated IAN 185/15. IAN 185/15 was not available at an early enough stage in the EIA process to allow the incorporation of this approach within the ES for the Scheme. The air quality assessment has considered the significance of the results described with respect to the air quality objectives and the approach outlined in IAN 174/13. This approach indicates that the Scheme does not present significant impacts overall in relation to air quality. Compliance with EU Limit Values and the dates for compliance with these Limits has been undertaken based on the approach outlined in IAN 175/13. This approach indicates that the Scheme will not adversely affect compliance. On the basis of the above evaluation the use of either a dynamic hard shoulder scheme which does not permanently operate as a traffic running lane or as a scheme which operates at 60 mph at all times are not being pursued as air quality mitigation options.	No
19/12/2014	038	3) The impact of the scheme on the Local Communities. 4) The adverse effects of the scheme on the local area. The impact of the process on the local community is concerning. As there is little information on the process in this consultation it is impossible to get an accurate understanding of its actual impact. It is assumed that this issue will be considered and factored in with correspondence with Local Authorities once the constructors have been chosen.	The impacts of the Scheme on local communities have been considered as part of the EIA process and reported fully, together with proposed mitigation measures proposed, in the ES, which accompanies the Application. An Outline CEMP, which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to minimise impacts on local communities, has also been submitted with the Application. These measures will be developed into a final CEMP by the by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
26/11/2014	042	Particularly the visual impact is a massive issue. Currently, the motorway is raised up by about twenty feet from our property we see from about the top of the wheel arch up. With the hard shoulder in use we will see absolutely all of the vehicle. I'm also not really sure that the mapping takes this into account either but it's certainly a very unwelcome sight.	The visual impacts of the Scheme, including on sensitive residential receptors, are reported in Chapter 8 of the ES, Landscape. The property referred to at Pingewood, Reading which is closest to the M4 (Eastbound side, at Scheme chainage 57500.00). The curtilage of the property, at its closest point is approximately 50m from the carriageway edge. There is a line of intervening mature conifer and deciduous trees along the southern boundary closest to the M4, although there are filtered winter views out between the coniferous tree canopies to the traffic on the M4. Beyond lies a clump of deciduous vegetation on the adjacent M4 embankment.. This property has been identified as receptor 2.1.4 in the Visual Effects Schedule and is shown on the Visual Effects Drawing 8.2 (sheet 2). The Scheme proposals indicate that the works at this location will be of a limited nature. The main screening vegetation within the Order limits will be retained (see Appendix 8.4: Schedule of Vegetation to be Retained), although it is anticipated there will be some works within the verge up to 3m from the edge of the existing carriageway, The nearby gantries to the east (G9-09 and G9-08 will be retained. It is considered that the visual effects of the traffic running on the new fourth lane, albeit closer to the property than at present, will have a no change in magnitude of impact on the filtered winter views resulting in a neutral significance of effect. The Scheme will be screened by the intervening vegetation during the summer months.	No
12/11/2014	139	This will also enable the occupants of higher positioned vehicles to see over the current fence, straight across our garden and in to our conservatory. The motorway is approximately 5 metres higher than the ground level of our property, enabling direct line of sight from vehicle occupants in to the first floor bedrooms should the motorway be widened and the traffic be brought that much closer to us. Clearly, when we purchased our property, part of the attraction and financial value was attributed to the privacy that the property offers. At present, our property is not overlooked from any angle, and we have paid a premium for that privilege. Should this motorway scheme go ahead, it will dramatically reduce both the attractiveness and market value of our investment. It is possible that should the Highways Agency invest in additional protection for our property, this risk could be somewhat mitigated, but we were promised a visit and survey during the summer months on 2014 to investigate these options, and that has since not happened. We strongly believe that the risk to our property and environment should be reduced before any works commence.	The assessment of visual effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Mitigation proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. Construction work in the vicinity of the residential properties will be of a limited nature (i.e. typically will comprise works at the top of the embankment within 3m of the carriageway with the existing vegetation on the embankment retained). The new gantry G6-17 and associated site clearance work to construct it, taking in to consideration any site micro siting requirements, will be located no nearer than 100m to the west of residential properties at its closest point. It is anticipated that the Scheme will result in minimal visual intrusion at this location during its construction and operation.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/11/2014	151	I live near J10 of the M4, and i can see and hear it from my house. The noise from the motorway, during certain atmospheric and weather conditions can be at a level that causes blight. I am therefore very keen to ensure through this consultation that given the high level of investment being made, that suitable measures are taken to not worsen the visual impact of the motorway and to reduce the noise levels generated by tyre noise. Suitable screening should be erected to reduce noise, and to ensure that light pollution from additional signage and street lighting does not further impact on my property, and those of my neighbours in Winnersh. A new primary school has recently been opened by Wokingham Council, which is even closer to the motorway than my house. I would expect that this will also factor in the need for improved noise reduction and visual screening measures.	The assessment of visual and noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is recognised that properties along the south east edge of Winnersh have a view to the M4/A329(M) J10. Existing vegetation within and along the edge of that junction help to reduce the visual intrusion of the traffic and highway infrastructure in views from the urban edge. There is also some intervening hedgerow vegetation within the adjacent fields which also provides a degree of filtering in some but not all views. However, the Scheme will result in the re-alignment of the J10 eastbound off-slip, between the Southern Region Winnersh underbridge and a point approximately 520m to the east of the underbridge the associated works will result in the loss of existing vegetation on the embankment slope, making the traffic on the M4 and slip road a noticeable transient element in the view. The lost planting will be replaced as part of the Scheme mitigation. The existing gantry at chainage 46790.000 will be removed and a new gantry (G8-02a) will be installed at chainage 46630.000 (i.e approximately 160m further east of the existing gantry to be removed). Planting proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme, and beyond to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise and visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. The transient traffic on the slip road and gantry G8-02a, will form a minor intrusive feature in the view at Opening Year, (022) but overtime as the vegetation lost on the embankment will be replanted and will establish to form a similar feature as the present situation, the gantry will become less noticeable so that by Design Year (2037), the effects of the Scheme would be similar to the situation that currently exists. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the area around J10, except for two short lengths of barrier where the motorway crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced where they are in poor condition).	Yes
22/11/2014	170	I think generally a lot of good work has gone into this but still a few more environmental tweaks are needed.	Impacts of the Scheme on the environment have been assessed through the EIA process and mitigation has been proposed where appropriate. The impacts of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES that accompanies the DCO application. Mitigation proposals are set out in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways for Scheme opening. Additionally, noise barriers will be provided to further address noise impacts associated with the Scheme. The ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme and beyond. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
24/11/2014	177	My main concern is around the Noise, air and visual - please can you address this and improve it.	The assessment of visual, air quality and noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in close proximity to the Scheme route. Planting proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures, in order to reduce visual impacts. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise, dust and visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. Properties at the north edge of Lenham Close have existing views across open grassland and allotments to the tree lined embankment slopes on the westbound side (south side) of the M4 between Reading Road Underbrodge and Southern Region Winnersh Underbridge. Construction work on the westbound side of the M4 between the underbridges will be of a limited nature (i.e. typically will comprise works at the top of the embankment within 3m of the carriageway with the existing vegetation on the embankment retained). It is anticipated the Scheme will result in minimal visual intrusion on the residential properties at Lenham Close during its construction and operation. Air quality has been assessed as part of the ongoing preliminary design and the results show that there is no significant impact to air quality as a result of the Scheme. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Measures to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP and will be refined in the final CEMP.	Yes
28/11/2014	189	I am very concerned by how vibrations will affect the foundations of my house and noise will affect where i live.	The assessment of noise and vibration effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. A new overbridge, with approach embankments, will be constructed in this location. The noise shielding to the rear gardens of properties on The Myrke will be maintained. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways for Scheme opening. Additionally, a noise barrier will be located to the motorway at the northern end of The Myrke. A range of good site practices will be adopted in order to mitigate construction phase noise and vibration effects on adjacent properties. These will be secured in the CEMP, an 'Outline' version of which accompanies the DCO application	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
01/12/2014	196	Also, using the hard shoulder will mean MPV's and large vehicles will be visible from neighbouring roads. Vehicle occupants will be able to overlook neighbouring properties for 100 meters due to the raised motorway embankment.	The assessment of visual effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Mitigation proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening of the Scheme as planting matures. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. Some properties at Bray Court have existing short range views to short lengths of the vegetation on the adjacent M4 westbound embankment (south side). Construction work on the adjacent westbound side of the M4 will be of a limited nature (i.e. typically will comprise works at the top of the embankment within 3m of the carriageway with the existing vegetation on the embankment retained). It is anticipated that the Scheme will result in minimal visual intrusion on the residential properties at Bray Court during its construction and operation.	No
11/12/2014	223	How will the area be left?	Effects of the Scheme on the environment have been assessed through the EIA process and mitigation measures have been proposed where appropriate. Mitigation proposals are included, relevantly, in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible. Further planting, using native species, to replace removed vegetation will be provided to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	229	[2] THE WELL. This supplies water for those who live at Amerden House. It carries no mention in the proposals. I would be interested to see a formal agreement in which the DOT proposes to guarantee the quality and quantity of my private drinking water supply. To these may be added new concerns associated with these present plans : [i] The recent evidence concerning small particulates emitted from diesel engines represents yet another consequence of previous erroneous assumptions inherent in transport policy. The recent German research is persuasive: one in three [1/3] acute Myocardial Infarctions admitted to a Cardiology Unit came straight from a precipitating exposure to diesel traffic pollution. [ii] The question of Health and Safety. It is not difficult to imagine a disastrous progress of a seriously overtired foreign lorry driver, who may or may not had an hours sleep on the ferry, through this proposed piece of progress in Smart Motorway Management. Amongst a veritable plethora of predictions, are those for future accidents, fatal or otherwise, available for comparison with current figures? Reference to the system in the Midlands may not be entirely germane to the London conurbation. However, roads, the transport system and their lobbies, far from being matters of mere technicality, have found themselves embroiled in serious political questions during the last 25 years. It was stated in the Nineties of the last century that, under strict economic criteria, no road could be built or widened if proper, fair compensation was offered to all owners of affected properties. Schemes were only made feasible by artificial, creative, limitations, such as the distance from the centre of the road inside which properties might be deemed to be damaged by a myriad of nuisances ; whilst other properties lying outside these arbitrary measurements, were deemed to be absolutely unaffected. Thus alterations to roads are subsidised by the arcane abstraction of value from properties and an artful interpretation of the principle that the polluter should pay. It is this sleight of hand which will usually set owners' faces against road schemes, which do appear to depend upon deceitful financial practice against private property. This also results in the more active lobbying of Members of Parliament and Ministers and other activities, in what appears to be a cycle with a periodicity of twenty years. With increasing human longevity, this may be too short for all of the opposition and their once cogent arguments to have departed. However, it would be instructive to learn how many Public Employees, in agencies or Departments, that worked on the earlier scheme are still in place. This document is in memory of Felix Fonteyn, who took the rights of private property to be paramount. A view rather enhanced when his sister's well at Amerden Bank, which had supplied 230 Acres for a millennium, without failure, was permanently poisoned by what road people termed “run off”. This occurred shortly after the M4 bridge was first opened in the Sixties but, of course, had not been predicted by its projectors.	The ES which accompanies the application for a DCO sets out measures to minimise the risk of the Scheme to groundwater as a result of construction of the Scheme. With these measures in place, along with the predicted reduction in accidental spillage, it is highly unlikely the well that supplies water for Amerden House would suffer from any increased risk of loss in quality or quantity. Amerden House is set approximately 280m back from the M4. The study area for air quality impacts from road traffic is limited to 200m in the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Guidance for Air Quality. This is because the effect of pollutants from road traffic reduces with distance from the point of release, and beyond 200m these are likely to have reduced to a concentration equivalent to background levels. Therefore, the Highways Agency does not anticipate that this location would be affected by changes in air quality due to the Scheme. By comparison, the property set furthest back (but still within the study area) from the M4 in this area on Old Marsh Lane, which has been modelled in detail, is predicted to experience annual mean concentrations of NO2 and particulate matter (PM10) that are well below the health based objectives with the Scheme in place (19.8 µg/m3 and 20.0 µg/m3 respectively). Imperceptible (10% of the objective or less) increases in concentrations of these pollutants are predicted compared to the without Scheme scenario (0.4 µg/m3 and <0.1 µg/m3 respectively). This property is set approximately 110m back from the M4, therefore pollutant concentrations at Amerden House are likely to be lower than those predicted here. The pollutants assessed for this Scheme are those of primary concern for emissions from road traffic. Concentrations of other pollutants that could have been considered a concern in 1995 (e.g. benzene, SO2, etc) are not modelled and assessed in detail in current DMRB air quality assessments. This is because concentrations of these pollutants are generally below health based limit values and changes to fuel and vehicle technology mean these pollutants are not emitted from roads vehicles in quantities that could affect achieving these objectives.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	Particular areas of concern for LBH refer to the preliminary environmental information report: sheets 53 - 61 (of 61), Ch 17300 - 10100. Details of the concerns are listed below with reference to the relevant sheet no.: Sheet 54/61, Ch 16400 -15500 Visual impact of proposed gantry G2 -12 from Little Benty (residential area) to north. Sheet 55/61, Ch 15500 -14600 Visual impact of proposed gantry G2-11 from Little Benty (residential area) to north. Visual impact of vegetation removal to enable installation of ERA ref. E2-B1 from The Brambles (residential area) to north. Visual impact of proposed gantry G2-07 from the Brambles (residential area) to north. Visual impact of proposed vegetation loss, widening, new gantry from Wordsworth Way (residential area) to north. Sheet 56/61 Ch 14600 - 13700 Visual impact of proposed vegetation loss / acoustic fence loss to enable widening from Wordsworth Way, Keats Way, Cherry Lane School and Vine Close (residential areas) to north. Sheet 58/61 Ch 13700 -12800 Visual impact of proposed gantries G1-12, G1-13 and road widening from Premier Travel Inn guests to north. NB Roadside vegetation along the northern boundary has recently been removed, leaving exposed views. Sheet 59/61 Ch 12800 - 1900 Visual impact of gantry G1-05 from Savoy Avenue and Cleave Avenue (residential area) to north. Sheet 60 and 61/61Ch 11900 - 10100 Visual / acoustic impact of vegetation removal and road widening to west bound slip road to north of Cranford Park, west of A312 / J3. Cranford Park is a Conservation Area situated within the Green Belt. Selected trees are protected by TPO No. 460. Buildings close to the motorway are listed Grade II and the whole site is the subject of a HLF bid for environmental enhancement.	The effects of the Scheme on the receptors identified are addressed in Chapter 8, Landscape of the ES.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	268	In our opinion the ZVI (Zone of Visual Influence) line, indicated on M4-PEIR_Drawing_08-2_Visual- Effects_Key_Sheet-01-16.pdf Sheet 5, has been incorrectly drawn in the vicinity of our properties. The drawing shows the line coming back in line with the motorway boundary as it passes our properties. Although there are some trees on the motorway embankment, which provide some limited cover, they are deciduous and therefore provide next to cover when not in full leaf. Even taking into account their spread in the future the view of our properties from the motorway will still be significant. We have an unobstructed view of the motorway from the rear (also including from the side of one property) of our properties/bedroom windows/back door/gardens and the current hard shoulder lies approximately 2m (in elevation) above our rear bedroom windows. This means that any traffic using the hard shoulder (including trucks and vans in current lane 1) can easily see into our rear bedrooms etc., this issue has been highlighted recently due to the current roadwork scheme, which has been using the hard shoulder as a running lane. Within the context of this proposed project we would be directly affected by;- Loss of privacy - as explained above Intrusion of noise - due to closer proximity of motorway traffic Pollution from gaseous exhaust emissions - due to closer proximity of motorway traffic Pollution from air born debris - particulates, tyre debris, dust & dirt thrown up by passing vehicles.	It is accepted that these properties were overlooked in the PEI Report but were picked up during subsequent winter surveys. These properties are included in the final VES/VED. The assessment of visual, noise and air quality effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. The original intention was to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Planting proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise and visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme's contractor, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. No additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area, except for two short lengths of barrier where the motorway crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decrease in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation. Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at six sensitive receptors (residential properties) located near Winnersh is predicted to be medium increase, and receptors are predicted to be above the annual average objective value (A65, A65a, A65b, X47 and X612) on King Street Lane (B3030) and Reading Road (A329) or just below the annual average objective value (A77) on Reading Road (A329) with the Scheme in place. Following IAN 174/13 the predictions at A65, A65a, A65b and X612 (as shown on Drawing 6.5a) and X47 (as shown on Drawing 6.5b) have been considered as part of the overall evaluation of significance for operational air quality. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at three further sensitive receptors is predicted to be medium increases at concentrations that are just below the annual average objective value with the Scheme in place (A65_1, A65a_1 and A65c) on King Street Lane (B3030). The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at five sensitive receptors, located near those which exceed the annual average objective value, is predicted to be a small increase, and receptors are just below the annual average objective value (A65b_1, A69, A78 to A79) or below the annual average objective value (A65c_1) with the Scheme in place on King Street Lane (B3030) and Reading Road (A329). The increase in annual average pollutant concentrations at these receptors is driven by the increase in traffic flows on the M4 in this link (approximately 11,500 AADT) and their proximity to the Scheme. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at all other sensitive receptors (residential properties and Sefton Primary School) on this link is predicted to be an imperceptible or small increase. However, all receptors are predicted to be below the annual average objective value with the Scheme in place, therefore experiencing a negligible change in air quality. It is anticipated that exceedances of the 1-hour average objective are unlikely on this link as annual average concentrations at all sensitive receptors are less than 60 µg/m3.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
07/12/2014	292	Environment: It is sincerely hoped that - if proceeded with - the major structural changes to local roads, bridges, earth embankments that are implicit in The Myrke scheme, will be done sympathetically and not lead to the uglification of our area. We hope that as far as possible minimal displacement of established trees, shrubs and local wildlife will be one of HA's important objectives. We also hope HA will appreciate that people of The Myrke are trying to carry out their lives and look after their families here whilst having to face up to the "Blight" of many years of this very intrusive (and for the most part unwanted) scheme which they found suddenly thrust upon them. NB We were first advised of this major proposal for The Myrke area in land April 2014 - with no prior consultation, and we are still struggling to "firm up" information to allow us to assess the effects of the scheme on our properties and everyday lives.	The proposed Datchet Road Overbridge at The Myrke would be constructed east of the current location. The mitigation proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which accompanies the DCO application. These are at a preliminary stage and will be developed further with the detailed design of the Scheme. The design illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the scheme and planting matures. The ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise impacts on wildlife and local communities. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme's contractor, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. The impacts of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES that accompanies the DCO application. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, but it cannot be removed completely. The Highways Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. A site liaison officer will be appointed for the construction period to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders.	No
21/12/2014	307	Agree the proposal is important to the area and national infrastructure and support it fully. Need to monitor a potential increase in noise/air/visual pollution. Essential that parish and local authority can continually respond to any public concerns.	Assessments of noise, air quality, and visual impacts has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and are reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. The Highways Agency has maintained close liaison with local authorities throughout the pre-application process, which has proved useful in providing support on various technical, planning and consultation matters. The Highways Agency is keen to maintain this ongoing dialogue, not only through the examination period, but on the basis that consent for the scheme is forthcoming from the Secretary of State for Transport, and therefore during the subsequent stages of work to ensure a properly coordinated and responsive approach with all key stakeholders in the effective delivery of the Scheme.	No
08/12/2014	316	2) No proper noise survey has been undertaken 3) No proper environmental survey has been done 4) No proper pollution survey has been done 5) There is no factual reports published This project will have a real impact on our quality of life, not just for the 5 years during construction but for the long term. There will inevitably be a permanent increase in noise, vehicle pollution, and light pollution. This project has been worked on for approximately 10 years, and to this date it seems that no real data has been put together, it's all assumptions.	Environmental surveys (including noise monitoring, air quality monitoring, landscape surveys and ecological surveys) have been carried out for this Scheme. The findings of the surveys have been assessed as part of the EIA process and are provided within the ES which accompanies the application for a DCO. In summary: Additional noise barriers will be provided at discrete locations where there is an increase in noise and all lanes of the motorway will be resurfaced with low-noise surfacing, such that most properties will experience negligible change / minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. The assessments show that there is no significant decrease in air quality. The existing lighting will be replaced with LED luminaires and no additional lighting will be provided so there will be no adverse effect. A PEI Report, outlining the results of the environmental surveys at that time, was prepared for the public consultation in November/December 2014, and this was made available at public exhibitions and deposit points along the length of the Scheme.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	353	1. At present on The Myrke the M4 can be heard at the front of the property. The back gardens are surprisingly quiet due to a large bank of earth where the path leading up the the Datchet road buffers the sound. This should be kept and further sound proofing measures added. 2. They Myrke had surface water on it in the flood times of 2014. All efforts must be made to not worsen the risk of flooding - more drains- pumps and trees may be needed as the scheme and construction sites will cause more run off by road surfacing a larger area. 3. Clearer and more detailed plans and timescales need to be made available. I visited the stand at the Queensmere where the advisers knowledge was very limited and the consultation plans were unclear. 4. At the end of the Myrke is a turning circle vital for an area where other turning opportunities are restricted due to cars parking on both sides of a narrow road.	Impacts of the proposed scheme on the environment have been assessed through the EIA process and mitigation has been proposed where appropriate.. The impacts of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES that accompanies the DCO application. In line with this, a new overbridge, with approach embankments, will be constructed on The Myrke. In addition, the existing noise shielding to the rear gardens of properties on The Myrke will be maintained. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways for Scheme opening. A noise barrier will also be located to the motorway at the northern end of The Myrke. Accordingly, It is predicted that properties on The Myrke will experience negligible change / minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. Flood risk impacts on river flooding and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the DCO application. The assessments have shown that the Scheme would not increase flood risk. Scheme plans were made available online as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. These plans have been updated for the DCO application and will be available on the Planning Inspectorate's website if the application is accepted. An outline construction programme is included in Annex B of the Engineering and Design Report submitted with the DCO application – again this will be available online. The Agency can confirm that the turning circle will be unaffected by the Scheme.	No
21/12/2014	401/562	I am totally opposed to this sad joke of an environment-trashing, antiquated scheme. It is not in the least bit "smart".	Impacts of the Scheme on the environment have been assessed through the EIA process and mitigation has been proposed where appropriate. Mitigation proposals are designed to address the impacts of the Scheme where possible. Mitigation proposals are set out in the Environmental Masterplan which aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways for Scheme opening. Additionally, noise barriers will be provided to further address the impacts of the Scheme. The ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. The impacts of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES that accompanies the DCO application.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	402/563	The full span gantry sited between Harlington High Street over bridge and Junction 3 is likely to have an adverse visual impact on the western part of Cranford Park and the residential area on the opposite north side of the motorway.	The assessment of visual effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. Mitigation proposals will be provided in the Environmental Masterplan which sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening of the Scheme as the planting matures. In addition, the ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities. There is extensive vegetation along the west edge of Cranford Park with limited views out to the M4. It is anticipated that gantry G1-05 will be screened from Cranford Park by this intervening vegetation during the summer months. It potentially may be visible through the leafless canopies during the winter months at some localised locations, but this potential impact is considered to be minor. With regard to the residential properties on Cleave Avenue and Savoy Avenue some presently experience views to the existing gantry located slightly to the east of the proposed gantry G1-05 in gaps in the intervening conifer trees which run parallel with the M4. This existing gantry will be removed as part of the Scheme.	No
18/12/2014	493	The site for the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is positioned between the M4 and the A4 Colnbrook Bypass and between M4 J4B and 5. The Strategic Rail Freight Interchange proposal is known as the Slough International Freight Exchange (SIFE) and a Public Inquiry regarding the planning appeal in respect of the proposal has been scheduled. It should also be noted that the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is referenced in the Development Plan for the areas, as follows: "The council has also recently become aware of proposals for Slough Intermodal Freight Exchange (SIFE) on land north of the Colnbrook bypass [...] Any further rail freight facilities at Colnbrook would have to demonstrate that there was a national or regional need for such a development" (Slough Core Strategy Paragraphs 2.29-30). Response to Consultation The Preliminary Environmental Report that has been prepared in connection with your proposal does not appear to make reference to the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, including within Chapter 16 in respect of potential Cumulative Effects. Prior to the finalisation of your Environmental Impact Assessment, you should review the application documentation for the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, including the following matters: 1. The operational development associated with the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange would include a new railway infrastructure link between Old Slade Lake and the M4 2. The Landscape and Green Infrastructure Strategy for the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange also seeks to enhance the network of right of way in the area, including the use of the Old Slade Lane overbridge by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Your proposals do not appear to compromise the above objectives; however care should be taken to ensure that your final submission documentation does not prejudice the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.	The Slough International Freight Exchange was included in Appendix 16.1 of the PEI Report and has been taken into account in the cumulative assessment for the Scheme in the ES. The information has been reviewed and updated where necessary prior to the completion on the ES, and the cumulative effects as a result of this development with the Scheme have been considered.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
05/12/2014	631	The only allocations within 1 km of the M4 are sites SA2a and SA2b in the Sites and Detailed Policies Document. Most of SA2b has been developed (for a Tesco distribution warehouse). There are basic maps in the document, and they are also shown on our Proposals Map.	Both allocated sites SA2a and SA2b have been included in the Cumulative Assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.	No
General Scheme responses				
10/11/2014		Where is the money coming from for this project?	The Scheme is being delivered in accordance the Government's current transport programme which includes as a key aim, the creation of a national road network fit for the 21st century (National Infrastructure Plan, December 2014). This identifies the Government's Top 40 priority infrastructure investments, including the M4 J3-J12 smart motorway Scheme. In financial terms, the Scheme is part of the Government's investment into England's motorways and major A- roads, which will see up to £3 billion a year invested in improving roads by 2021, underpinning economic growth and high quality jobs across the region. The estimated cost of Scheme is in the range of £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times. The strategic case for providing additional capacity on the M4 within the Thames Valley was first examined in 'The Thames Valley Multi-Modal Study' (2003), which put forward a range of interventions, as part of a preferred transport strategy. The publication of the Advanced Motorway Signalling and Traffic Management Feasibility Study (Department of Transport 2008) highlighted the causes of congestion in the Scheme's area and identified the M4 J3 to J12 as a priority for the provision of additional capacity. Since that time, the proposed Scheme was announced by the Roads Minister in 2012 as one of six road improvement schemes for development by the Highways Agency, with funding for the Scheme confirmed by the Government in the June 2013 Spending Review, subject to value for money and deliverability	No
02/12/2014		Need to refine the timing and cost of this proposal, although the idea (to use largely existing infrastructure to improve journey times) is sound.	The timing of the proposed Scheme (subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Transport) is set for 2021/2. This allows for the necessary consenting process to be completed, pre-construction works and an estimated construction period of 5 years. The estimated cost of the Scheme, as proposed, is between £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times.	No
11/12/2014	047	I wanted to know if there had been a decision yet on the contractor that would be completing the construction of this project or if there was a shortlist of bidders? If there is not when is there expected to be an announcement of this?	The construction of the Scheme will be procured through the Highways Agency's Collaborative Delivery Framework. On this basis the Highways Agency anticipates that a contractor will be appointed around August 2015 to work with the designers as they prepare the detailed design.	No
08/12/2014	080	Can you confirm if this project will be coming out to tender as an HA ECI model contract and if the tender will be limited to HA Framework contractors or whether it will come to market as an open competition.	The construction of the Scheme will be procured through the Highways Agency's Collaborative Delivery Framework.	No
03/12/2014	125	We have seen your scheme details on NSIP's pre-application notices. We feel we could be of service to you or your stakeholders.	The Highways Agency acknowledges the interest in the Scheme indicated.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/11/2014	158	The money it would cost could much better be used for welfare, health and social care which would benefit a far greater number of people.	The M4 smart motorway Scheme has been identified within the Government's National Infrastructure Plan (December 2014) as a key infrastructure project. The intention is to create a national road network fit for the 21st century, to meet a number of identified needs in terms of improving economic productivity, supporting jobs and growth across the country, whilst seeking to support development and ensure a road network of the best possible quality. Government decisions concerning the alternative use of public funds is a matter outside the scope of this Scheme.	No
19/11/2014	162	I believe this is a poor use of public money as it gets very little extra road space for the amount spent. I don't want to see my taxes spent in this way.	Smart motorways provide an effective way of providing increased capacity in a cost effective and deliverable way, maximising the use of the existing asset. Smart motorways can be delivered more quickly than traditional solutions such as widening and are better value for money. The concept of smart motorways is based on utilising the existing carriageway through the use of the hard shoulder as a running lane at all times. The absence of a hard shoulder provides the necessary capacity for road users without the need for motorway widening, except for localised widening at junctions to accommodate slip roads and in areas where there is no existing hard shoulder.	No
28/11/2014	190	The cost range looks very wide, several hundreds of millions of pounds from the lowest to the highest estimate.	The estimated cost of the Scheme is in the range of £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times.	No
21/12/2014	297	Money better spent on other motorway junctions such as M25/M1, M40/M25, M40 High Wycome (where only two lanes are used).	The Scheme is being delivered in accordance the Government's current transport programme which includes as a key aim, the creation of a national road network fit for the 21st century (National Infrastructure Plan, December 2014). This identifies the Government's Top 40 priority infrastructure investments, including the Scheme. In financial terms, the Scheme is part of the Government's investment into England's motorways and major A- roads, which will see up to £3 billion a year invested in improving roads by 2021, underpinning economic growth and high quality jobs across the region. The estimated cost of the proposed Scheme is in the range of £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times. The strategic case for providing additional capacity on the M4 within the Thames Valley was first examined in 'The Thames Valley Multi-Modal Study' (2003), which put forward a range of interventions, as part of a preferred transport strategy. The publication of the Advanced Motorway Signalling and Traffic Management Feasibility Study (Department of Transport 2008) highlighted the causes of congestion in the Scheme's area and identified the M4 J3 to J12 as a priority for the provision of additional capacity. Since that time, the Scheme was announced by the Roads Minister in 2012 as one of six road improvement schemes for development by the Highways Agency, with funding for the Scheme confirmed by the Government in the June 2013 Spending Review, subject to value for money and deliverability.	No
16/12/2014	390	Too Expensive	The estimated cost of the Scheme is in the range of £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
14/12/2014	436	Too much disruption, cost and delays for little gain.	Future forecasts of traffic growth are anticipated to increase from the current level of 130,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of the M4 if nothing is done. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required, as a key objective. Smart motorways provide an effective way of providing increased capacity in a cost effective and deliverable way, maximising the use of the existing asset. Smart motorways can be delivered more quickly than traditional solutions such as widening and are better value for money. The anticipated construction period is approximately 5 years, although the detailed phasing of the construction works has not yet been determined, as these will need to be developed in conjunction with the appointed contractors. This would include minimising as far as possible inconvenience to local residents and businesses.	No
Construction Programme				
11/12/2014	036	In relation to the proposed works on the M4 Junction, please can you advise if and how the works are lightly affect travel, and of proposed commencement date for works.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads and drivers is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals during the construction period will be set out in the CTMP, which will be finalised in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of the construction phase. While arrangements are yet to be confirmed, it is anticipated that construction traffic will access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads. Three lanes of traffic will be maintained on the motorway during peak hours. Subject to obtaining consent, the construction for the Scheme is due to commence in September 2016 and be completed by the end of 2021. A contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed. The Highways Agency anticipate that a contractor to be appointed around August 2015. The Highways Agency is proposing to appoint site liaison officers for the duration of the construction period to keep local people informed of progress and to advise on matters such as planned local diversions or disruption to traffic.	No
19/12/2014	038	In summary, the main concern South Bucks has for the alterations proposed for the M4 is the method of construction. There are very little details about how the scheme will be carried out to date but is an aspect that needs to be consulted on prior to commencement. Once up and running the concern is how much the increased capacity will add to traffic pollution and whether the experienced change is in relation to that which is predicted in the South Bucks Region.	A Contractor has not been appointed to the Scheme yet so some construction information is not available but detail on construction of the Scheme is provided in the Engineering and Design Report ("EDR") (Document Reference 7.3). The Contractor will liaise with local authorities when planning the works as part of detailed design. Air quality has been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. These assessments show that there will be no significant decrease in air quality. The results are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a DCO.	No
11/12/2014	074	Is there not a quicker way to complete this project as 5 years seems a long way of yet.	The timescales for construction have been determined based on previous smart motorway schemes. The entire length of the Scheme will not be affected by traffic management for five years. The current construction plan shows the roadworks between J12 and J8/9 from January 2017 to May 2018; the bridgeworks (J8/9 to J5) from January 2018 to July 2020; and the roadworks between J8/9 and J3 from July 2019 to June 2021.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	077	Surprising that the work will start in the west.	As a contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed, precise construction details are not yet known. At present, the Highways Agency anticipates that the construction works will commence at J12 and work eastwards to J3. The western section of the Scheme (J12 to J8/9) is likely to be quicker to build than the eastern section. This is due to the presence of a number of hardshoulder discontinuities at a number of structures that require replacement (e.g. the 11 overbridges and 8 underbridges) in the eastern section. However precise details on the construction phasing will be developed once a contractor is appointed to the Scheme.	No
11/12/2014	078	When are the roadworks likely to start and for what duration?	A contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed so some construction details are not known yet but timescales have been determined based on previous schemes. Subject to obtaining consent, construction of the Scheme is due to commence in September 2016 and be completed by the end of 2021. The entire length of the Scheme will not be affected by traffic management for five years. The current construction plans show the roadworks between J102and J8/9 from January 2017 to May 2018; the bridgeworks (J8/9 to J5) from January 2018 to July 2020; and, the roadworks between J8/9 and J3 from July 2019 to June 2021.	No
14/11/2014	149	Please complete the work as quickly as possible...	The anticipated timetable for completion of works (by 2021) is set initially by the timescales required for obtaining consent for the Scheme, which is subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Transport, to be followed by a period of pre-construction works and an estimated construction period of 5 years.	No
26/11/2014	185	This scheme is urgently needed now; the proposed timescale presented, for completion in 2021, is far too long	The timescales for construction have been determined based on previous smart motorway schemes. The anticipated timetable for completion of works (by 2021) is set initially by the timescales required for obtaining consent for the Scheme, which is subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Transport, to be followed by a period of pre-construction works and an estimated construction period of 5 years.	No
11/11/2014	212	The construction indicative timelines seem long, however, there does need to be a balance of progress with minimising day to day distruption. Overnight closures would be preferable. It would be hugely beneficial if the works are future proof. For example, the current road works between jun 11 to past jun 10 created significant disruption in surrounding town centres, and has caused additional challenges during peak travel times. Ideally, it would be beneficial for work to take place throughout the day and night (noise levels to residents permitting) to reduce construction time. Something needs to be implemented quickly and efficiently to meet demand and increase capacity.	Traffic management proposals during the construction period will be set out in a Traffic Management Plan to be finalised in consultation with local authorities, including West Berkshire Council, along with other stakeholders, prior to the start of construction. The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, by way of methods to be adopted via the CEMP, but it cannot be removed completely. As with most construction projects, impacts resulting from the construction phase will be largely dependent on the location, phasing and timing of the construction works. The main environmental impacts of this phase are associated with localised increases in noise, dust, temporary disruption to drainage, construction traffic, visual impact of construction plant and disruption to normal movement of road users and disposal of surplus site waste material. The Highways Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. At this stage it is anticipated that construction traffic will access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	223	I am very concerned over the projects being carried out very close to me. How long will all three projects last.	The anticipated timetable for completion of works (by 2021) is set initially by the timescales required for obtaining consent for the Scheme, which is subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Transport, to be followed by a period of pre-construction works and an estimated construction period of 5 years. Although the overall construction period is five years, activities in individual areas will not be continuous for this period. Whilst a contractor for the Scheme has not been appointed, construction phasing, methods and practices will consider the impact on adjacent residents and how works outside of normal hours can be minimised where practicable, as set out in the CEMP provided with the Application. Although some operations will require work outside of normal working hours (e.g. where lane closures of the motorway are required) liaison with local authorities will take place to confirm the details of any noisy activities where required (e.g. gaining consent under s61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 ("CPA 1974")).	No
08/12/2014	316	7) The impact of night time working 8) The impact on residence lives 10) 5 years of disruption during works	As a contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed, some construction details are not known yet. Traffic management proposals during the construction period will be set out in a Traffic Management Plan to be finalised in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Construction traffic is likely to access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads. Three lanes of traffic will be maintained on the motorway during peak hours. Some night-time carriageway closures of the motorway will be required to lift in new bridge beams but these will be agreed in advance with local authorities and any affected residents. The entire length of the Scheme will not be affected by traffic management for five years. The current construction plans show the roadworks between J12 and J8/9 from January 2017 to May 2018; the bridgeworks (J8/9 to J5) from January 2018 to July 2020; and the roadworks between J8/9 and J3 from July 2019 to June 2021. The Highways Agency is proposing to appoint site liaison officers for the duration of the construction period to keep local people informed of progress and to advise on matters such as planned local diversions or disruption to traffic.	No
21/12/2014	320	It would have been useful to have more information on the banner "Smart Motorway" what it means?How will it be useful for vehicle drivers. Hopefully the scheme will get approved and would be completed within: 1. Initially proposed budget. 2. Initially proposed timelines. 3. Within less disruption to traffic and environment. All the best! P.S. Simulator experience was simply great.	The Highways Agency has developed national campaign material to help deliver the smart motorways message which is located on their website: http://www.highways.gov.uk/publications/smart-motorways-campaign-material/ Subject to the Scheme gaining consent the Highways Agency will look to provide more information on the specific effects of the Scheme to motorists in the construction exhibitions.	No
21/12/2014	332	General/ What calculation has been done to assess the overall delay/disruption from major construction against the remedy effected? How long will this take to achieve/balance out?	No specific works have been undertaken for the Scheme to calculate the exact point that the benefits and disbenefits balance out. However a calculation has been undertaken to determine its Business Case Ratio ("BCR") which compares the benefits offered by the Scheme over its life, to its costs. The BCR considers both the journey time savings during operation and the delays during construction in addition to a number of other factors (e.g. noise, air quality, carbon, taxation, etc.) and follows an agreed national set of rules.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
17/12/2014	358	As a company with headquarters in the M4 corridor (Thames Valley Park, Reading), Vail Williams is in support of the M4 smart motorway between junctions 3 to 12. It is felt that these improvements are now a necessity along this section of the M4 in order to provide traffic flow and adapt to the increased pressure on this major road. Being based at Thames Valley Park, both our employees and clients use this section of the M4 on a regular basis for both commuting and business use and it is often felt the motorway can no longer cope with the volume of traffic which uses the motorway at all times of the day, but particularly at rush hour. In addition, as Vail Williams is a property consultancy, it is felt that these improvements would have a positive impact on economic growth, by encouraging commercial business to grow westwards from London. Increasing the capacity of the motorway would help facilitate this growth by providing a road network which could cope with any increases in commercial development. Concerns have been raised however on how traffic will be managed during the construction of the smart motorway and further clarification on whether this construction will be phased or not would be useful as congestion has greatly increased during the period of construction between junctions 8/9 and 10 alone. Although there are some concerns regarding the work we are overall in support of the smart motorway as it is felt that it is necessary given the motorway at present appears to be at capacity and further expansion would help encourage and facilitate further economic growth along the M4 corridor. Thank you for considering this response and for the opportunity to participate.	Smart motorways are about supporting the economy by providing much-needed capacity on England's busiest motorways, whilst maintaining safety for road users and those who work on those roads. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan ("CTMP") (Document Reference 4.5, Annex F), which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. Construction traffic is likely to access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads. During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing on the M4. The Highways Agency will use established traffic management techniques. Whilst precise details on the traffic management will be developed once a delivery partner is appointed for the Scheme, it could involve narrow lanes and contraflow, which have been used on other smart motorways schemes. The Highways Agency is also proposing to appoint site liaison officers for the duration of the construction period to keep local people informed of progress and to advise on matters such as planned local diversions or disruption to traffic. Subject to obtaining consent, construction for the Scheme is due to take place between 2016 and 2021.	No
12/12/2014	423	The information I have viewed so far does not contain any information about project plan and timing and how you plan to remove bridges. I can only assume it will be sequential, this type of details needs to be understood prior to approving this scheme. Villages such as Dorney and Eton Wick can be cut off with limited to no access so a clear plan with detailed timeline needs to be made available to the public prior to approval. Local businesses, Dorney school and residents will have a major impact for a prolonged period of time which is not easy to understand from information available	Details on the construction of the Scheme, and, in particular, the timing and phasing of work on structures is provided in the Engineering and Design Report ("EDR"), which is included with the Application. The demolition of the bridges is discussed in chapter 8 of the EDR and the outline construction programme is included as Annex B to the EDR. The effects of these works on local communities, and the local road network is assessed in the ES, in particular in Chapters 13 and 14.	No
12/12/2014	426	West Berkshire Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation for the M4 J3-J12 Smart Motorway scheme. The Council as part of the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership is supportive of the Smart Motorway proposals. We recognise that the scheme is likely to bring significant benefits to users through the provision of additional capacity and more reliable journey times on a section of the M4 where peak time congestion regularly results in delays to users. Therefore we consider that the scheme will help maintain the District's connectivity with other economic centres in the Thames Valley, Heathrow Airport, London, and the wider national Strategic Road Network. However, the Council is also keen to ensure that the scheme will not negatively impact residential areas and businesses in West Berkshire both during the construction phase and once the scheme becomes operational, and will seek for the appropriate level of mitigation to be provided where this may be the case. The Council's interest in the Smart Motorway project primarily relates to the western end of the proposed scheme around Junction 12 (Theale); including the A4 which feeds the local highway network into Junction 12. Improvements are expected to take place at Junction 12 in the near future as part of a third party funded scheme associated with the construction of an IKEA store at Pincents Lane adjacent to Junction 12 (which the HA has previously agreed as part of the planning application process). The HA will need to ensure that there is timely liaison with the Council to discuss the coordination of these works around Junction 12 and on the A4 in Calcot in relation to the Smart Motorway project. The IKEA highway improvements are associated with consented planning application ref: 11/00218/COMIND and discussions have taken place between the relevant HA and Council Highways Development Control officers regarding these. Please also be aware that IKEA have submitted a new revised application for the site (14/03032/COMIND) which is currently being determined.	The Agency notes the Council's support for the Scheme. The effects of the Scheme on residential receptors and businesses, and the mitigation measures proposed are reported in the ES, in particular Chapter 14, Community and Private Assets. Once operational the Scheme will provide much needed capacity along the M4 corridor. The traffic modelling carried out has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4. The Scheme also results in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities including West Berkshire Council, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Discussions regarding the CTMP will include coordination of the works on the M4 J3-12 scheme and the IKEA store at Pincents Lane, which has also been taken into account in the cumulative effects chapter of the ES. The Highways Agency has maintained close liaison with the Council throughout the pre-application process, which has proved extremely useful in providing support on various technical, planning and consultation matters. The Highways Agency is keen to maintain this ongoing dialogue, not only through the Examination stages, but on the basis that approval of the Scheme is forthcoming from the Secretary of State, during the subsequent stages of work to ensure a properly co-ordinated and responsive approach with all key stakeholders in the effective delivery of the Scheme.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	440	2. Timing of construction and liaison with Network Rail. The parallel main Great Western railway line is currently being electrified and resignalled. While work on the railway is scheduled to be finished by 2016, I am reliably informed that it is way behind schedule - possibly by as much as 2 years! For work on the M4 to start while there is still disruption on the railway would cause chaos as some rail passengers will want to avoid the disruption by switching to road and, when the M4 works start, some road users will want to switch to rail. I understand also that trying to procure local construction staff could be difficult if both road and rail projects are undertaken simultaneously. I suggest therefore that the commencement of works should be deferred until the electrified railway is up and running.	The concerns you have raised regarding parallel works on the Great Western Railway are noted. The Agency has met with Network Rail several times during the preparation of the preliminary design and will continue to do so through detailed design and construction planning.	No
30/11/2014	477	Timetable to start of construction needs to be shortened so that construction and therefore the finish should be as soon as possible Except where close to residential areas working hours should be as long as possible and incentive payments on a shared saving scheme should be implemented to shorten the construction and therefore the disruption time. Three lanes must be kept open at all times between 6.00 a.m. and 11.00 p.m.	The timescales set prior to the start of construction works are dictated by the completion of the necessary consenting process, as prescribed in the Planning Act 2008. During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing on the M4.	No
Existing Allotments				
05/12/2014	009	I am writing to state concerns regarding the proposed Smart Motorway development of the M4 J3-12 with regard to how it will impact Slough Borough Council allotment tenants. Whilst I agree that the Motorway improvement is very important, I hope that we can reduce the impact these works will have on allotment tenants in the Slough area. At The Myrke between Junctions 5 and 6 (opposite Upton Park) where the works will have a significant impact. At The Myrke we have over 170 plots with tenants ranging from those that have tenanted their plot for many years to those that have just started growing and need a little help. We also have a significant number of tenants who do not have English as first language. 1. Access to the site and use of the central concrete road is essential and I would like to be assured that access will be available at all times 2. All tenants will find cultivation during the works very difficult - it will be very noisy and dusty (some organic growers will have a real problem with contamination levels) and dependent on the time of year may decide not to cultivate that year. Works during winter months when there is less cultivation would be preferable but minimising noise and dust at any time is important. 4. You also have on your plan an area identified as 'water main subway lengthening' which suggests that you want to take over up to 20 plots. Most of these plots are extremely well cultivated and have been tenanted by the same person for many years. Some tenants are low income Asian families and their plot is a major food source for their family. Given the attention growers give to the care of topsoil, the work they put-in to the construction of their fences and sheds, any takeover of their plot (for even a limited time) would be devastating. Growing medium could not be restored.	The Highways Agency is aware that the Slough Allotment Federation has identified that many of the tenants not only derive great enjoyment from their allotments but also rely on the food produced to feed their families and that considerable time and effort has been spent improving the soil. No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. Should this not be possible, a number of allotment plots will be required temporarily to provide working space while the Highways Agency alters Thames Water's access to its water main subway that passes under the M4. This is required as the current access points are within the hard shoulder which will become a live lane. These works will take place over a shorter period within the five year timescale, although the precise timeframe for delivery is subject to the detailed construction programme which is yet to be finalized. Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community. The Recreation Road Bridge to the north of the allotments only spans the existing M4 live traffic lanes and the hard shoulder is narrowed in this location. To enable the hard shoulder to be used as a live traffic lane it is proposed to demolish the existing bridge and replace it with a longer one built on the same alignment. The new bridge will be slightly higher and the approach road embankments will be longer to suit the new alignment. Accordingly, no allotment land is required permanently for the new Recreation Road Bridge. Access to the allotment site is gained from the approach road to the Recreation Road Bridge. During the works to rebuild this bridge the Highways Agency will require the appointed contractor to liaise with allotment tenants in order to maintain access to the allotments. The area required for the works does not include the central allotment access road.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	024	I have received notification that the Smart Motorway scheme from J3 to J12 on the M4 will severely effect the allotments at The Myrke, Datchet. This site has over 100 allotments and many people who hold these plots have had them for 20 years plus. We were fortunate to been given two plots in 2007 and have worked them both ever since. Not only have we invested money but an enormous amount of time in developing these plots to the good condition they are in now and we are lucky to have had several good years of growing an abundance of vegetables and fruits. The Myrke is a small community of allotment holders and many of us share our produce, seeds and help and assistance to one another each year. Both of us see our allotments as a life line and brings great joy to what is a very mundane and difficult life as we are disabled and use the time at the allotment as very needed exercise. We are both totally opposed to this development, not only about the allotments but the environment and wild life it will destroy, and for what? To improve the congestion on the M4. I don't think so, we live in a society where more and more families have more than 1 car, our neighbours have 3 and that seems to be a trend. So unless the quantity of vehicles coming on to the roads is stopped or reduced the congestion on all our roads will worsen and this proposed development will be a total waste of time and money. We are totally opposed to this and will fight the proposals. I am sure that when all the plot holders find out what is going on that they will all protest vehemently.	The Highways Agency is aware that the Slough Allotment Federation has identified that many of the tenants not only derive great enjoyment from their allotments but also rely on the food produced to feed their families and that considerable time and effort has been spent improving the soil. No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. Should this not be possible, a number of allotment plots will be required temporarily to provide working space while the Highways Agency alters Thames Water's access to its water main subway that passes under the M4. This is required as the current access points are within the hard shoulder which will become a live lane. These works will take place over a shorter period within the five year timescale, although the precise timeframe for delivery is subject to the detailed construction programme which is yet to be finalized. Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community. The Recreation Road Bridge to the north of the allotments only spans the existing M4 live traffic lanes and the hard shoulder is narrowed in this location. To enable the hard shoulder to be used as a live traffic lane it is proposed to demolish the existing bridge and replace it with a longer one built on the same alignment. The new bridge will be slightly higher and the approach road embankments will be longer to suit the new alignment. Accordingly, no allotment land is required permanently for the new Recreation Road Bridge. Construction of the Scheme, and particularly works within the motorway verge, will require removal of existing vegetation in some locations. The Highways Agency's proposals have been drawn up to reduce this as far as possible and the scheme includes replacement planting using native species. The final Scheme drawings will clearly identify areas of existing vegetation not to be removed and the appointed contractor will be required to protect these from damage. The Scheme is being designed in consultation with environmental bodies including Natural England and the Environment Agency to reduce the impact on flora and fauna, including relocating some species.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	227	Regarding The Myrke allotment site belonging to Slough Borough Council, I wish to raise concerns over the proposed Smart Motorway works on the M4 between Junctions 5/6. I understand that during the proposed construction works access to the allotment site and use of the central road on the site will still be possible. Please could this be confirmed. My plot is also adjacent to an area marked within the red line bordering the construction works suggesting that you may need to take over some of my plot for 'water main subway lengthening'. Even temporary use of my plot would destroy years of my work improving the quality of my soil, would remove my shed where I store my tools and would take down my fence. My plot is an essential part of my life and what I grow is an important food source for my family. Taking over my plot will be devastating, can you please confirm if part or all of my plot will be taken over and how you will compensate me if it is.	No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. Should this not be possible, a number of allotment plots will be required temporarily to provide working space while the Highways Agency alters Thames Water's access to its water main subway that passes under the M4. This is required as the current access points are within the hard shoulder which will become a live lane. These works will take place over a shorter period within the five year timescale, although the precise timeframe for delivery is subject to the detailed construction programme which is yet to be finalized. Access to the allotment site is gained from the approach road to the Recreation Road Bridge. During the works to rebuild this bridge the Highways Agency will require the appointed contractor to liaise with allotment tenants in order to maintain their access to the allotments. The area required for the works does not include the central allotment access road. The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The Vehicle Restraint System has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design will take place in the next stage of the Scheme's development, and will be based on the Highway Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required. Noise barriers are currently in place between the M4 and the southern half of the allotment site (the end furthest away from the Recreation Road Bridge). Where these are affected by the works the Highways Agency can confirm that they will be replaced; although additional noise barriers will not be installed along the remainder of the allotment boundary. All lanes on this stretch of the M4 will be re-surfaced with low-noise surfacing. The Highways Agency appreciates that dust and vehicle emissions are an undesirable side-effect of construction works. Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. Before works commence the contractor will be required to agree working methods and mitigation measures to reduce this impact as far as practicable. Measures routinely used on construction sites include: turning off engines when not in use; damping down dusty access tracks with a water bowser; boundary screening; and the use of low emissions equipment.	No
05/12/2014	009	I am writing to state concerns regarding the proposed Smart Motorway development of the M4 J3-12 with regard to how it will impact Slough Borough Council allotment tenants. Whilst I agree that the Motorway improvement is very important, I hope that we can reduce the impact these works will have on allotment tenants in the Slough area. We have 2 sites where the proposed works will have an impact on tenants, Westpoint near Junction 7 where I understand from Slough Borough Council that the impact will be minimal	No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. Should this not be possible, a number of allotment plots will be required temporarily to provide working space while the Highways Agency alters Thames Water's access to its water main subway that passes under the M4. This is required as the current access points are within the hard shoulder which will become a running lane. These works will take place over a shorter period within the five year timescale, although the precise timeframe for delivery is subject to the detailed construction programme which is yet to be finalised	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
Site Compounds				
07/12/2014		The idea of using the Bardons site for a construction depot would be disastrous for our area a it is serviced by narrow rural roads which are already saturated with HGV traffic. This was not mentioned at the exhibition.	Following further public consideration of the suitability of the Brandons site, and account taken of a number of consultation responses, it is no longer proposed to take this forward as a potential construction compound for the Scheme.	Yes
19/12/2014	038	2) The impact of the proposed Construction Sites The additional construction sites are of concern. Any site chosen should account for local traffic conditions. For instance Iver is currently experiencing high levels of HGV traffic. Should a construction yard be located in the vicinity, it could have a major impact on the local roads. Therefore before any decision is made on the location of the construction yards, discussions should be had with the Local Authority.	Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. The majority of construction traffic will be routed along the M4 when transporting material directly to site or removing materials. Whilst a contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed, and the detailed design is still to be finalised, the Highways Agency will aim to minimise waste and use of imported materials where practicable. This will minimise the amount of construction traffic on local roads. The Highways Agency will seek to liaise with all relevant local authorities to ensure local knowledge of the specific issues and sensitive areas is utilised in the selection of the construction compounds and any proposed mitigations. Following public consultation, the Highways Agency no longer propose to take forward compounds 1, 10, 12 and 13 (compound 10 being relatively close to Iver).	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
28/11/2014	233	Proposal for a Contractor's Compound at West Theale Industrial Estate, Wigmore Lane, Theale, Berkshire, RG7 5HH I refer to the proposal to locate a contractor's compound to support the major works upgrading the M4 motorway as indicated on the information provided to the public and the residents of Wigmore Lane house numbers 19 to 37a. I must first point out that my home also has direct line of sight to the proposed compound and we have not being included within any correspondence, engaged within the visits or the survey's carried out on behalf of the project team. Over the past 34 years the planning authorities within West Berkshire have been positive with respect to ensuring that the environmental impact and safety of the Wigmore Lane residents have been mitigated through the formal process of planning permission. A key aspect of those permissions is to ensure that the impact of noise, traffic and the protection of rare species is maintained at an agreed, well defined, acceptable and reasonable level. From my point of view and concern is what might be called lip service is currently being made of the issues presented by a Contractor Compound in close proximity to an already maximised and stable environment. Please would you include within your assessment process the following aspects: 1. The planning constraints and limits already in place as seen as well establish maximum by the residents which are monitored and discussed between the residents and our neighbouring companies on a regular basis. 2. The Bats which live in the loft of [another property on] Wigmore Lane and who are seen every evening flying across my property into the route through the proposed siting of the compound and the adjacent rear gardens. 3. The Wigmore Lane and A4 roundabout becomes traffic locked during the morning and evening rush 2 hours. With the current exit times of up to 20 minutes on a regular basis. 4. New Drivers and HGV lorries making deliveries to the industrial estate miss the entrance and need to turn and cause damage at the Wigmore Lane T Junction on a very regular basis. In 2014	Following further consideration of the suitability of Wigmore Lane (compound 1) and account taken of a number of consultation responses it is no longer proposed to take this forward as a potential construction compound for the Scheme.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	I am providing an Officer response responding on behalf of the London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH) to your letter dated 10th November 2014 and following our holding response and meeting regarding the above, held on 27 January 2015. This letter has been issued for formal Cabinet Member approval which is expected in March 2015. Should any further matters arise, Officers will contact you in due course. Firstly thank you for allowing LBH to issue a holding response and coming to see officers on the 27th January. Having regard to section 42 of the 2008 Planning Act, LBH wish to issue the following comments on the current proposals submitted, based on the information submitted. Please note that these comments are in addition to feedback provided in response to the Section 47 consultation held in 2014. Highways Officers have been advised that a construction compound is now proposed in the London Borough of Hounslow to the north east of Junction 3 of the M4. Given the proximity of this site, full details of the traffic and location of this compound should be provided for review. No further comments are issued on this point as the documentation does not detail this particular compound. Traffic movements to be associated with the proposed compound no. 11 could cause significant impacts on Stockley Road and nearby junctions, where there are significant existing congestion issues. The Highways Agency (HA) is therefore requested to consider alternatives sites to locate this compound. Alternatively, further information should be provided in relation to the compound's access layout and vehicle traffic impacts. Officers would request a better understanding of the Stockley Road construction compound in light of the high levels of congestion in this area at peak times. The construction traffic modelling results are still to be delivered (using QUADRO software) and expected to show if the impact of the compound will indeed justify an objection. Should the modelling not justify an outright objection, it is expected that HGV traffic would only be permissible to operate off-peak mitigating the impact on routes predominantly congested during the peak hours. When considering the construction traffic, it is understood that all vehicles will travel to/from M4 with no access from land outside the HA boundary. It is not clear if the access arrangements for the construction compounds is satisfactory, further details of this need to be provided in order for officers to advise on the acceptability of the arrangements.	The use of a potential compound to the north east of Junction 3 of the M4 was suggested during the consultation process. However, following examination of the transport links in the area and a number of potential ecological issues the Agency does not propose to include this area in the Application for development consent. The Agency notes the comments regarding compound 11 and the existing congestion in the area. A Contractor has not yet been appointed but further details regarding the compounds will follow once they are in place for discussion with the local authorities. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP.	No
21/12/2014	306	Key impact on local residents will be the location of of the site construction compound during the 5yr+ construction period. Proposal for compound between Ascot Road to A308(M) will cause issues at Windsor Road/Braywick Rd/ A308(M) roundabout. Suggest dedicated access to A308(M)	Site assessments carried out during the EIA process have identified an ancient monument adjacent to the A308(M), in the vicinity of the proposed location for construction compound 5. Accordingly, the proposed site was curtailed to miss this area. However, the Highways Agency will be discussing access locations and routes with the local authorities and will aim to use A roads and motorways to minimise disruption to local residents where practicable.	No
21/12/2014	400/561	I am extremely concerned to hear that there is a possibility that a field opposite the Myrke (adjacent to Upton Court Park) may be used for heavy plant and/or works activities. My key concerns are : 1. Prolonged periods of noise 2. Increased traffic levels on an already fast and busy road 3. Damage to roads and to houses in the Myrke from vibrations caused by regular heavy plant movements I feel very strongly that a more acceptable location must be found for these activities	The use of construction compound 8 has been proposed on the basis of its position between the bridge replacement sites at Datchet Road and Recreation Road both of which require working space in this area. Although a contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed, the Highways Agency when planning the compound will take account of the potential effects on residents including: provision of a compound layout as sympathetically as practicable to houses on The Myrke, mitigation of noise by selection of suitable lower noise equipment, minimising night work in the vicinity of The Myrke and provision of main access compound access / egress via the M4 to limit additional traffic movements along Datchet Road.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	404/565	There is great concern on the noise levels, the night works and the air pollution on the residents of the Myrke during and after the works as we understand the road is the only one along the route that is metres from the M4. We understand the horses field is an option to use during the entire scheme as a compound site, this is only metres from some of the houses including mine and as this could be used day and night, the noise levels, the air pollution and constant disruption to our lives for years is unacceptable.	The Scheme is at preliminary design stage and a contractor has not yet been appointed by the Agency. The contractor appointed by the Highways Agency will work to minimise unacceptable noise and dust during the works and in particular for night works (e.g. demolition works, bridge beam installation and resurfacing). During construction, working methods will follow the latest accepted practices and will be designed to have as little impact on local residents, the environment and local infrastructure as possible, as set out in the CEMP. These will include using silenced and low emission plant, minimising transport, screening temporary working lights to minimise light pollution to the surrounding areas, road cleaning and providing noise screening where appropriate and feasible. Noise created by work on site will be carefully monitored and controlled to ensure that the impact on members of the public is reduced as far as possible. The Highways Agency will make every effort to minimise noise and will monitor noise levels to comply with guidelines. It will also consult with local environmental health officers before undertaking any out-of-hours work that may be required. The use of construction compound 8 has been proposed on the basis of its position between the bridge replacement sites at Datchet Road and Recreation Road, both of which require working space in this area. When planning the compound layout the effects on local residents will be considered and the compound layout and access arrangements provided will be as sympathetic as practicable. Noise levels will also be mitigated where possible through measures, including selection of suitable lower noise equipment and minimising night work in the vicinity of The Myrke.	No
12/12/2014	426	Site Compounds According to the consultation document, two possible compound sites are located in West Berkshire at the Bardon Facility at Wigmore Lane, Theale and a field accessed off Dorking Way in Calcot. It is assumed that both of these sites will be accessed from the local highway network. For both sites, the Council would wish to see the predicted number of daily HGV movements that will occur during construction and how the impact on nearby residential areas will be mitigated. The Council's Environmental Health Team has provided separate comments as part of this consultation in relation to the impact that these compounds and their associated activities may have on residents. There are some properties that are very close to the proposed compounds (nearest being only 10 metres) and there is likely to be an effect on local residents in terms of noise, dust and light from the compound activities. Please see the separate comments via your online response form for more details. The highway works associated with the IKEA development outlined above will also include major remodeling of the A4/Calcot Retail Park/Dorking Way junction, which could have implications in terms of the possible compound site off Dorking Way. We note that there is also a third compound site on the Old Basingstoke Road in Wokingham District that is close to our boundary. We would like to see that all construction movements to/from this site will be taken via the A33, in particular we would not wish to see construction vehicles using unsuitable roads in West Berkshire, such as the route through Beech Hill to access this site.	Following further public consideration of the suitability of compound 1(Wigmore Lane), and account taken of a number of consultation responses, it use is no longer proposed to take this forward as a potential construction compound. With regards to construction compounds 2 (Calcot) and 3 (Old Basingstoke Road) as the Scheme is at the preliminary design stage, and a contractor has not yet been appointed, the details of the compound layouts, traffic movements and mitigations have not yet been finalised. The Highways Agency will seek detailed liaison with relevant local authorities regarding the development of the compounds and routing of vehicles to avoid unsuitable roads and maximise the use of the M4. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. The Highways Agency acknowledges the response made regarding the remodelling of the A4/Calcot Retail Park / Dorking Way Junction. The Agency will take this into account during the detailed design of the works around the junction and the signage.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
29/11/2014	478	I am opposed to the use of the horses' field, adjacent to The Myrke allotments, used as a construction compound in view of the increased difficulty in drivingt out of The Myrke, which is already problematic at busy times plus the potential for increased littering - already a considerable nuisance. We have be threatened with motorway improvements in the past, including what turned out to be unnecessary compulsory purchase of several houses at the north end of The Myrke, plus the noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Jubilee River so we have already endured considerable disruption over the years and I think we have suffered enough! So although I am in favour of the proposal in principle I am worried about the environmental effects.	The use of construction compound 8 has been proposed on the basis of its position between the bridge replacement sites at Datchet Road and Recreation Road both of which require working space in this area. Although a contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed, the Highways Agency, when planning the compound will take account of the potential effects of residents including: provision of a compound layout as sympathetically as practicable to houses on The Myrke, mitigation of noise by selection of suitable lower noise equipment and minimising night work in the vicinity of The Myrke, provision of main access compound access / egress via the M4 to limit additional traffic movements along Datchet Road. Further, the effects of this construction compound have been considered as part of the EIA process. The results of this assessment, and mitigation measures proposed, are reported in the ES which accompanies the DCO application. The ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to minimise impacts on local communities. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme's contractors, and will be prepared in consultation with local authorities.	No
19/12/2014	595	There are a lot of other issues that need to be addressed, but you must consider the compound construction, if this proposal goes ahead that it will be placed away from housing.	Given the built up area of the M4 and the need for access to minimise journey distances and traffic on local roads, it was not possible to avoid locating proposed construction compounds near housing completely (bearing in mind that the majority of the proposed locations have previously been used as compounds). Although a contractor has not yet been appointed by the Highways Agency, when planning the compound layout effects on local residents will be considered and compound layout and access arrangements considered as sympathetically as practicable.	No
17/12/2014	610	Please try to ensure that construction vehicles and traffic are kept away from Richings Park, Iver Village and Iver Heath as we are already saturated by HGV and construction traffic.	The majority of construction traffic will be routed along the M4 when transporting material directly to site or removing materials. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. Once appointed, the contractor will be required to consider the location of sensitive routes along the Scheme which will include Iver.	No
Traffic Management				
14/11/2014	045	2) I am worried by the disruption and delays that may be caused by needing to widen existing bridges on one of the UK's busiest sections of road.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing on the M4. Some night-time carriageway closures of the motorway will be required to lift in new bridge beams but these will be determined in advance in consultation with local authorities.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	074	Love the proposals. This stretch of the M4 has been neglected for a long time and is quite ugly when it should be a warm welcome for people arriving at Heathrow. I just want to make sure that existing lanes are kept open and managed without causing disruption.	During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing on the M4, in conjunction with established traffic management techniques. Some night-time carriageway closures of the motorway will be required to lift in new bridge beams, but these will be determined in consultation with local authorities and any affected residents. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
21/11/2014	169	Any roadworks on the M4 creates major holdups and disruptions as well as noise and pollution form queues. There is major work going on now and the thought of more to come over a number of years is very stressful. Please just leave it alone, the traffic hold ups are manageable if the lanes are left open and not coned off as now. I consider this very simple, the end result may sound good, but we will have years of disruption and holdups before that which are unacceptable.	The modelling for the Scheme has shown that without the Scheme the level of congestion will continue to increase, and it is therefore needed to help relieve this and provide additional capacity in the corridor. Whilst some impact on the normal operation of the M4 is inevitable in order to provide improvement works, activities in individual areas will not be continuous for the whole 5 year period. Further, 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing, in conjunction with established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. The effects on the Scheme, including in relation to noise and air pollution have been assessed and are reported in the ES. Additional noise barriers will be constructed at discrete locations where there is an increase in noise and low noise surfacing will be provided across all lanes, such that most properties will experience negligible change / minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. The assessments show that there is no significant decrease in air quality. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, by means of mitigation to be provided by the CEMP, but it cannot be removed completely. In addition, construction traffic is likely to access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads.	No
24/11/2014	175	With the current plans, road users will endure years of disruption only to have a less safe road at the end of it.	Whilst some impact on the normal operation of the M4 is inevitable in order to provide improvement works, activities in individual areas will not be continuous for the whole 5 year period. Further, 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing, in conjunction with established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. The Highways Agency is aware that the loss of the hard shoulder is of concern to some road users, who believe that it will increase the number of live lane breakdowns. However, the provision of refuges every 2.5km and the controlled environment supported by Variable Mandatory Speed Limits is expected to result in a reduction in accident rate.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
26/11/2014	184	(I have also sent the below comments to my local council.) I currently have a daily commute of 60 miles, upon which I am reliant on the M4 being functional. Since the current road works begun around junction 10 , my daily overall commute has gone from 90 minutes to repeatedly being close to 4 hours. These works have involved bridge refurbishment; a feature that will be repeated within the new proposal. This type of refurbishment is therefore already proven to cause significant delays. What lessons have been taken from these roadworks to avoid a similar situation in the future scheme? On the 20th November a lorry broke down in the roadworks around junction 10. This resulted in it taking me over an hour to drive the 10 miles between junctions 8/9 and 10. The new scheme proposes the removal of the hard shoulder, meaning a breakdown on the road (when drivers are unable to reach the designated pull over points) will cause this sort of chaos on a frequent basis. What is the resolution for situations when drivers are unable to reach these points and are forced to stop within the lane? These huge delays are frustrating and severely impact my work/life balance but are made better by the knowledge that they will not run for longer than a few months. However a 5 year development scheme is a far more depressing thought. The alternative routes available for many local drivers, is only reachable through the A4. However as local drivers know, if the M4 is congested, the same will apply to the A4. It is also worth remembering that during the summer (when people are less likely to drive badly!) travel chaos that hit Reading when an accident on the M4 caused the whole town to become so congested it reached a standstill. I can only imagine that during a five year period this would become a frequent problem if already congested roads are squeezed even tighter. What measures are being put in place to prevent this sort of travel chaos as a consequence of any M4 problems within the Reading/Wokingham area? I understand that the motorway needs expansion to cope with the growing volumes of traffic however I feel that the Highway Agency grossly underestimate the impact that these works will have upon local residents.	A reduction in delays to journeys is one of the key benefits offered by the smart motorways model used by the Highways Agency. The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. Whilst some impacts on the normal operation of the M4 are inevitable in order to provide improvement works, activities in individual areas will not be continuous for the whole 5 year period. During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing, in conjunction with established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. It should be noted that whilst the current works on the M4 have many of the above features in place, during the construction of the Scheme the additional capacity that is being provided via the M3 Smart motorway should be available and will provide a good alternate route for strategic M4 traffic (or traffic with origins and destinations between the M3 and M4).	No
30/11/2014	193	Another main concern is whilst construction is going on, how are delays going to be alleviated? I drive Junction 12 to 11 every weekday and on Mondays and Tuesdays it is already tailed back all the way, exacerbated at the moment by the roadworks between 10 and 8/9. The Theale bypass A4 is queuing right to the other end of the village. 3 times this week I have been unable to get onto the M4 go westbound because of people trying to join the eastbound M4 to get through the roadworks blocking my entrance onto the J11/A33 roundabout. What plans do you have in place to stop this happening during the duration of the smart motorways upgrade. I have had to travel through Reading on A roads, and I am sure I am not the only one, this is surely a situation that cannot go on for the whole duration of the works?	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
01/12/2014	195	During development, good access in and around the area. Disruption minimised during construction period.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
10/11/2014	200	3) What will happen to the road during future roadworks? At present, all lanes are kept open through use of the hard shoulder, this will no longer be possible. With future growth forecasts in the Thames Valley, it is undeniable that smaller works will be needed in 20 or 30 years time (re surfacing, adding hard shoulders, reinforcing bridges etc),	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
10/11/2014	202	My biggest concern is how the traffic will be affected while the works are happening.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
11/11/2014	212	Would consideration be required to join up this proposal changes to jun 12 with any proposed changes brought about from Ikea being built next to the junction, rather than a continual cycle of road works causing added frustration.	Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities including West Berkshire Council, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction. Discussions regarding the CTMP will include coordination of the works on the M4 J3-12 scheme and the IKEA store at Pincents Lane, which has also been taken into account in the cumulative effects chapter of the ES.	No
11/12/2014	223	What happens to the traffic while the works are taking place?	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
19/12/2014	273	-Our concerns for the inconvenience upon works commencing, such as Traffic congestion and of course, on the motorway itself for 6-7 years.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
16/12/2014	328	My main concern is the impact to journey times over the five year construction period. This is presently unknown.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads and journey times is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	408/569	Please also ensure the works do not restrict traffic flows in the meantime.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. We will use established traffic management techniques. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
20/12/2014	416/579	The London Fire Brigade are particularly interested in how emergency access arrangements will be provided and maintained during construction and for the finished system.	During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. The Agency will use established traffic management techniques. Details on the traffic management will be developed once a Contractor has been appointed for the Scheme, but it is anticipated to involve narrow lanes and contraflow, which have been used on other Schemes, whilst maintaining emergency access. During the operation of the Scheme technology will be used to create an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway) and managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services. This can be provided on any lane.	No
11/12/2014	440	3. Phasing of the work. Presumably, while work is undertaken, a 50mph speed limit will apply. While accepting that one long section of work is better than several short ones with gaps at the national speed limit, it is quite unnerving driving for any distance at 50mph with an HGV only inches behind. Can I ask, therefore, that sections under construction should be no longer than about 10 miles at a time?	Typically speed limits of 50mph would apply during the works (minimising disruption to road user whilst providing an acceptably safe working area for Highways Agency's contractors). The appointed contractor will develop detailed traffic management proposals which do require a compromise between the use of continuous lengths in excess of 10 miles, the need for multiple areas of traffic management to be in place simultaneously and the overall length of the construction duration. Subject to obtaining consent for the Scheme, the Highways Agency will provide further details of the proposed construction phasing during preconstruction exhibitions.	No
10/12/2014	445	Disruption due to closures will majorly effect the continued operation of Tesco Reading Distribution Centre due to regular routes along the M4. Any information with regards to road closures and disruption to journey times along this section of road should be made clear with substantial notice in order to provide alternative planning and routes in advance of works.	The effects of the Scheme, including during construction, on local roads is assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. During construction we will maintain 3 lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the outline traffic management plan which is provided with the Application. The Contractor will develop the traffic management plan further during detailed design and this will include liaison with local highways authorities, residents and businesses prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The Highways agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community.	No
08/12/2014	452	THIRDLY, what about temporary and permanent inconvenience to residents living closeby?	Although the overall construction prior is 5 years, activities in individual areas will not be continuous for this period. A contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed but their construction phasing, methods and practices will need to consider the impact on adjacent residents and how works outside of normal hours can be minimised where practicable. Although some operations will require work outside of normal working hours (e.g. where lane closures are required) liaison with relevant local authorities will take place to confirm the details of any noisy activities where required (e.g. gaining a consent under s61 of the CPA 1974).	No
Structures				
17/11/2014		If I was designing it, I would make the bridges wider ready for some time in the future when hard shoulders are considered worthwhile! i.e. 10 lanes wide.	The design is in accordance with current Highways Agency policy. The re-built structures are not designed to accommodate future adding of hard shoulders. The additional land take and construction costs are not economically justifiable, at present, and building large structures would cause unnecessary impact on the local road network and land owners, while impacting the travelling public by taking longer to build.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	1) The impact of bridge closures on the local area The main concerns for SBDC relate to the construction phase. In particular: There is a large concentration of bridge works around the Dorney area with 7 sites being identified as requiring alterations between the Monkey Island Lane and Datchet Road Overbridges. The time- frame and schedule of this work could have serious ongoing ramifications for local communities should it not be carried out efficiently. Careful consideration on how traffic will be managed in this area would be vital with the A4 already experiencing high levels of congestion and therefore the Local Authorities need to be consulted on the schedule. Marsh Lane and Lake End road are the only two roads servicing Dorney Village. The development of the bridges leaves the village vulnerable to being cut off from the A4 and forcing residents to take a large detour. This should therefore be a factor that is considered when identifying when to develop the bridges. This is also the case with the closure of Old Slade Lane would require residents to also have to undertake a large detour to access their properties.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction. The diversion route for drivers during the closure of Old Slade Lane will be via Colnbrook Bypass, Sutton Lane and North Park, a distance of approximately 5km. However, this route will be agreed with South Bucks prior to commencement of construction, via the CTMP. A detailed construction programme has been provided at Annex B to the EDR (Document Reference 7.4) However, details on the construction phasing and associated traffic management will be developed further once a Contractor has been appointed to the Scheme.	Yes
08/12/2014	050	Customer has been on our road projects page and cannot find information she is looking for. She is looking for what will happen to bridges during M4 J6-8/9 road widening/smart motorways work.	A copy of the consultation brochure was sent to this Respondent on 2 December 2014.	No
11/12/2014	077	Widening of bridges an essential part of the scheme.	The design has been carried out in accordance with the current Highways Agency's standards. Widening of underbridges and works to overbridges forms an essential part of the Scheme. However, this work will only be undertaken where absolutely necessary, which is principally where the existing structures do not provide sufficient width either above or below to accommodate the Scheme's carriageways.	No
10/11/2014	200	1) Are the re built structures designed to accommodate future adding of hard shoulders?	The design is in accordance with current Highways Agency policy. The re-built structures are not designed to accommodate future adding of hard shoulders. The additional land take and construction costs are not economically justifiable, at present, and building large structures would cause unnecessary impact on the local road network and land owners, while impacting the travelling public by taking longer to build.	No
11/11/2014	205	In the short term I think it is short-sighted to expensively rebuild bridges as pinchpoints for the future. They should have capacity for five lanes in each direction, not only four. I appreciate this adds to the project costs but believe it is worthwhile.	The design is in accordance with current Highways Agency policy. The additional land take and construction costs are not economically justifiable, at present, and building large structures would cause unnecessary impact on the local road network and land owners, while impacting the travelling public by taking longer to build.	No
12/12/2014	222	Cranford Countryside Park is cut in two by the motorway (the northern and southern sections are joined for pedestrian, bicycle and horse traffic by the St Dunstan's subway). The poor standard and unwelcoming look of this subway (and indeed the Fuller Way subway to the west) is another issue that we feel needs to be addressed, whether or not the subways are lengthened under the new arrangements.	There is no need to alter these subway structures as part of the Scheme, as they do not constrain the proposals for the smart motorway works on the carriageway above. All concerns relating to the condition and suitability of these structures for providing access to Cranford Countryside Park should be directed to Highways Agency Maintaining Agent, Connect Plus: Managing Director, Connect Plus Services, South Mimms Office St Albans Road South Mimms Potters Bar, EN6 3NP	No
15/12/2014	264	Caller is enquiring whether Sutton Lane Bridge is being demolished as its too narrow for Smart improvements - apparently he's heard its been decided not too demolish it.	In accordance with the proposed construction design and works under the DCO, no major structural works are required to the Sutton Lane overbridge to accommodate the Scheme.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	272	Regarding all the bridge renewal proposals our main concern is that the new bridges are constructed to support the weight of modern HGVs, including future developments that are on the horizon such as longer, heavier vehicles and platooning.	All replacement structures will be designed to current Highways Agency and European standards, with allowances for General Order, Special Order and other traffic in accordance with current guidance as given in IAN 124, which is subject to the road classifications and the requirements of the relevant local authorities.	No
21/12/2014	342	1) Check up, 2) Inspection, 3) Use the special study about The Law of the Road, 4) Decide about any change or walk should be doing. For improvement with using Health and Safety, 4) Any change should match with the type of the place or the area. Plus the desire look for the people to give a relax and happiness	The effects of the Scheme, including on the environment and local communities are assessed and reported in the ES. The Planning Statement which accompanies the Application also assess the Scheme against national and local planning policy.	No
21/12/2014	346	Please consider suicide risks fully when planning new bridges.	The Highways Agency has taken into account health and safety/suicide risks during design of the bridge structures in line with the National Suicide Strategy for England produced by the Department for Health. In line with this assessment, all of the parapets on replacement overbridges will be tied into the highway boundary fencing and meet current standards and guidance, incorporating either anti-clamber mesh over the full parapet height, or solid-infill with mesh above where there is a known equestrian route.	No
21/12/2014	402/563	Some detailed criticisms include: the proposed Order limits which extend beyond the existing highway boundaries to include that part of Cranford Park running alongside the northern side of the motorway. This connects the subway from the southern extent of the park together with the Roseville Road footpath link with the northern extension of the Park and is part of the Hillingdon Trail. Interruption of this connection would be injurious to the enjoyment and operation of this highly regarded park.	The proposed Order limits adjacent to Cranford Park, leading from the north entrance to St Dunstans Subway to J3 follow the extent of motorway land. As provided for in the DCO application, no additional land will be required outside of the motorway embankments. There are no plans for works that affect the subway. Nor are there are no proposals to interrupt the Hillingdon Trail.	No
12/12/2014	424	Basically I cant find a detailed timeline of how the bridges around J7-8/9 will be affected and to what degree (car and walking).	Detail on construction of the Scheme is provided in the Engineering Design Report ("EDR") (Document Reference 7.3), with a detailed construction programme at Annex B to the EDR. The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges, including the additional journey times that will result from the construction of overbridge, is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers.	No
11/12/2014	441	I attended the Dorney parish council consultation - I have great concerns re the impact on the school and pupils teaching and learning -	Following public consultation, concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, as well as the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road, have each been taken into account by the Highways Agency. The Scheme's proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes
Datchet Road Overbridge				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/11/2014	028	I have received a letter from Highways directing me to documents on your website. I have printed a copy of the plan/map relating to the Datchet Road Bridge.At the exhibition I attended earlier in the year, the plan appeared to suggest that a section of the Slough road south of the bridge would be moved slightly, apparently involving the loss of trees on the north side of the Slough Road between the Datchet Road bridge and(approximately) the entrance to the next bridge east. I should be grateful for clarification or a more detailed map	The replacement of the existing Datchet Road overbridge while maintaining a traffic route over the M4 requires a minor realignment of the existing route. This is achieved through realignment of the route immediately to the east of the existing structure, and merging back into the existing alignment to the north and south of the structure over a distance of approximately 250m. This may require the removal of existing vegetation along the line of the route, particularly to the north as described. Where vegetation clearance is required to allow access and working room for construction activities, replacement planting as shown on the Environmental Masterplan will be provided as part of the Scheme. The Environmental Masterplan and vegetation clearance drawings have been submitted as part of the Engineering and Design Report with the application for a DCO.	No
21/12/2014	404/565	Then there's the concern the works to the 2 bridges by the Myrke and the M4 works could cause vibrations which in turn could damage the houses / garages as they are so close to the sites. Will there be surveys carried out to each house before and after the works and the Highways Agency responsible for any damage the works may cause to our properties?	The proposals for the replacement of the structures at these locations are straightforward in structural terms, and utilise proven, well-understood designs with extensively used construction methodologies. There are no proposals which are likely to cause significant issues during construction. Vibration has been assessed as part of the noise and vibration assessment undertaken for the Environmental Impact Assessment. The results of these are reported in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the DCO application. A range of good site practices will be adopted in order to mitigate construction phase noise and vibration. These will be secured in the Construction Environmental Management Plan, an 'Outline' version of which accompanies the DCO application. The Contractor will agree the contents of the CEMP with the local highways authorities prior to commencement of construction.	No
Huntercombe Spur Overbridge				
Lake End Road Overbridge				
07/12/2014	132	I have looked at your proposals for works designed to turn the M4 into a smart motorway, with respect to the section between J7 and J8/9, which is close to where I live. I have one major concern, which relates to the closure of Lake End Road during bridge widening and the proposed consequent diversion of traffic onto Marsh Lane. The section of Marsh Lane between Dorney Reach and the entrance to Dorney Lake is quite narrow and ends in a sharp bend – OK for cars, but unsuitable for wide or long vehicles, such as lorries, which often have to drive across both carriageways to gain enough clearance. At the bend itself (known as Climos Corner), pedestrians cross the road to gain access from the pavement coming from Dorney village into the Dorney Lake site. There are often cars parked on or very close to the roadway near this bend, and the road itself is frequently used by cyclists and horseriders. Given the heavy volume of traffic which uses Lake End road, if this was diverted along Marsh Lane I think accidents would be inevitable. It is also impossible for long vehicles (such as the trailers carrying boats for rowing events) to turn from Marsh Lane into Dorney Lake, and vice versa – which is why traffic for the Olympics and other rowing events was all sent via Lake End Road. Unless Marsh Lane is to be widened (which I hope very much would not be the case, as it would be to the detriment of its rural character), I urge you not to divert traffic along this route; or, if you must do so, do not allow access for larger vehicles.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/12/2014	243	Dorney Lakes's Activities Dorney Lake was the venue for 2012 Olympic Rowing and Canoe/Kayak and the Paralympic Rowing. The site operates all year round, has a total of circa 250,000 visitors annually. These range from casual recreational visits, to significant events where there will be up to 4,000 people accessing and the leaving the site on any one day all using cars or coaches. In 2015, there are 80 days of high activity booked and this will grow bu 10% each year i the following 5 years through til 2020. Your project team said these bridge works are planned to take place in 2018. Any significant disruption to access and egress from our site will cause significant disruption and will inevitably affect our ability to host events with the consequential financial loss. This will also potentially stop our ability to host two International regattas that are planned to be held between 2017 and 2020. Out understanding of current plans We attended one of your Public Exhibitions and spoke with members of your project team who explained the current scheme proposals as follows. We understand that at present it is planned that each of the bridges would be closed at different times during the works, so that one bridge would remain open for the diverted traffic whilst the other is being demolished and then rebuilt. The closure of the Marsh Lane bridge is not such a problem since lake End Road is well able to handle the diverted traffic. However, when the Lake End Road is bridge is shut, Marsh Lane does not have the traffic carrying capacity to be able to deal with the diverted traffic. There are a number of operational issues with traffic accessing Marsh Lane including that of access from the A4. There is also a 200 metre stretch of this road approaching the access to our site, where there is only enough room for cars to pass slowly due to the width of the road. There is also an added problem where there is an extreme right angle bend in the road opposite the entrance to the Lake. This restriction in road width and the acute bend will make access and egress from the Lake entrance unsafe as it is almost impossible for any heavy vehicle, boat trailer and towing vehicle, plus coaches many used by the visiting schools. This will inevitably channel all such traffic through Eton, also an area of restricted road width. Recommendation Lake End Road must remain in use throughout the planned works period. Without this Dorney Lake's activities would be seriously curtailed and could potentially therefore lead to a compensation claim for loss of income.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
17/12/2014	247	2) Work on Marsh Lane bridge and Lake End bridge The proposals presume that these two bridges can be closed in turn with traffic diverted whilst each bridge is rebuilt. This assumption fails to take into consideration the nature of the roads. Marsh Lane is unclassified, narrow and rather hazardous so totally unsuited to absorbing the heavier traffic diverted from the better Lake End Road. However, Marsh Lane could be closed and traffic diverted to Lake End Road without serious inconvenience. I urge the HA to seriously consider providing a new bridge alongside Lake End Road Bridge in order to keep this route open during replacement of the existing bridge (similar to Wood Lane).	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes
16/12/2014	254	Unfortunately I was not able to attend the meeting in Dorney last Tuesday however I would like to express my concerns for the eight month rebuild project of Lake End Road overbridge. There are many reasons why I am against this including the effect that this will have on our day to day lives and we feel that we will be significantly affected by the proposed scheme. For one, it will hugely inconvenience our school run. As we are one of the few properties directly affected, I am therefore against the reconstruction of this bridge and vote to form a new bridge as drafted in the plans. We believe that a new bridge would be more suitable and less disruptive. I would appreciate a response to this letter as I have spoken to my property lawyer who feels there could be a claim for damages to my grade II listed property should there by any damages.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	284	3. Bridge Replacement Marsh Lane and Lake End Road: • Assumptions had been made by the HA that these bridges could be closed in turn • Some of the issues with regards to the closure of Lake End Road and the unsuitability of Marsh Lane to handle the resultant traffic have already been raised at the local Parish Council meeting and I believe a process of familiarisation with the local area, schools and businesses has already begun by the HA representatives. • This liaison with the local community is essential and a strategy must be developed for a relatively smooth transition and implementation process. If we accept that this scheme is likely to go ahead then perhaps the HA can work with the relevant local parties to ensure a workable solution is reached for the bridge demolition and rebuilding for Marsh Lane and Lake End Road.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes
19/12/2014	494	We are a Riding school employing 12 people, which provide riding lessons and stabling for clients from London and the surrounding area. We have about 300 clients having lessons a week and 10 livery horses. Problems with your suggested scheme is if you close Lake End Road: 1: All our customer who travel to us from the North, East and West will be inconvenienced as they will have to come via Eton, which is not a direct route and will increase their travel time by 30 minutes. Alternatively if they come via Marsh Lane which is an unclassified Road which is unsuitable for heavy traffic with the corner Court Lane/Marsh Lane and the road between Marsh Lane Harcourt Road being very narrow. This will most definitely affect our client base and the number of Jobs we can support. 2: With horse riding being a sport it can result in the occasional accident, resulting in the need for an Ambulance. Marsh Lane route would be not suitable for this. The Eton route is unsuitable, as Eton wick having speed humps every 100 yards needs to be looked at. If there was a serious accident your proposed scheme may be putting the health and wellbeing of our riders at unnecessary risk. 3: The feed for our horses is delivered in an arctic Lorry. As we have 46 horses the deliveries are quite frequent, the only route for this is Lake End Road. 4: Our Livery clients and any livestock that we need to transport will also have serious problems with the proposed diverted route if Lake End Road is closed. This includes veterinary call-outs and emergencies. With the proposed diversion route and the increased traffic when the Dorney Lake (Eton Lake) has an event will totally gridlock the area and so we will NOT be able to function. 5. The properties of Dorney will be at a severe risk in the event of a fire as no large Tenders will be able to reach Dorney village. Other problems with your proposed scheme include the fact the Bath Road does not have the ability to handle the traffic that will be created between Lake End Road and Marsh Lane. The road is totally overloaded already with the newly opened Tesco Superstore and shopping outlets; therefore your traffic studies must take this into account. The Taplow Car Boot, which is held 28 times a year on Sundays and Bank Holidays, which possibly has never been accounted for. Conclusion Your scheme if it goes ahead as planned will result in a business which has been in my ownership for 35 years and has survived many disruptive schemes in the past (Jubilee River and Dorney Lake) properly going to the wall with the loss of 12 direct employees and a number indirect. I urge you please to reconsider your scheme, this time taking into account the effects on the local businesses, and the effects on the emergency services the businesses and residents of Dorney require.	The proposed diversion routes for the Scheme are set out in the ES and the impact of closures due to works on overbridges is addressed in Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers. Traffic management proposals, including diversion routes, during the construction period are set out in the CTMP which is provided with the Application. The development of the CTMP will be in consultation with local authorities and other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. The concerns regarding access to Dorney Rowing Lake, and similar concerns regarding local access to Dorney County Combined School, and the issue surrounding the suitability of Marsh Lane as a diversion for Lake End Road have been taken into account following information received at the recent public consultation. The proposals have been amended as a result, with the current preferred proposal being that Lake End Road overbridge will now be constructed offline to the west of the existing structure, which will allow the existing bridge to remain open for the duration of the construction works. At Marsh Lane, the proximity of private residences to the side road embankment limit the options for reconstruction, hence this replacement structure will remain online. However, options are being investigated with regard to provision of alternate access for the duration of the reconstruction.	Yes
Riding Court Road Overbridge				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
13/01/2015	267	On behalf the landowners we have been reviewing the drawings that have now been sent out for the consultation .It seems that you are proposing an offline construction, with a new wider span bridge built offline on our site side of the existing bridge. The bridge will be 1.4 higher although the tie in point still appears to be north of the existing access. It would need to be demonstrated that the proposed bridge approach works don't prejudice the formation of an access to our site. They indicate that the access track to the mast will be kept open at all times. Although the red line encroaches into our site we think you have shown a retaining wall at the foot of embankment which appears to leave the existing track where it currently is, nonetheless, it still enquires land from our site although the extent is not evident from the attached plans. In the absence of more detailed information about the impact of the design and the land take we wish to register a holding objection.	The current Scheme design includes replacing Riding Court Road overbridge with a new bridge to the west of the existing bridge, including widening and raising of earthworks, and demolition of the existing bridge. It is anticipated that some land will be required temporarily during construction for access and working space to construct the realigned Riding Court Road and new Riding Court Road overbridge, but will not be affected by permanent land take. The proposed works will provide suitable tie-ins, within the parameters of current Highways Agency design standards, to all connecting accesses. Any land required for the Scheme will be secured through the DCO process and the Planning Inspectorate will assess whether any land required by the Scheme is justifiable.	No
Old Slade Lane Overbridge				
18/12/2014	493	Your proposals do not appear to compromise our project's objectives; however care should be taken to ensure that your final submission documentation does not prejudice the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. In particular, the design and methodology for the Old Slade Lane overbridge should make clear that it has made allowance for a potential future extension to accommodate the intended railway infrastructure link. We would welcome a more detailed discussion with you on this point.	The Agency understands that the proposed rail freight interchange will include a substantial screening embankment running parallel to the M4 at the point where Old Slade Lane (and hence the replacement overbridge) crosses the M4 corridor. The Agency considers that there will be sufficient space for the respondent's proposed structure crossing the new rail lines to be constructed independently of the (by then, extant) Old Slade Lane overbridge. The Agency would be happy to discuss its and the respondent's proposals in more detail.	No
Sipson Road Subway				
11/12/2014	067	I cycle through a pedestrian/cycle underpass at the end of Sipson Road which goes under the M4. Your planning notices about the J3 to J12 smart motorway works is up at either end of the underpass. Are there going to be works to the underpass too? Will the underpass be closed to cyclists and pedestrians? I don't know how I will get to work if you do close it. When will the woks begin? You haven't told me what I need to know! Is the pedestrian underpass under the M4 being closed during this proposed work? This underpass is on my cycle route to work so it would be helpful to know if you intend to close it!	The conversion of the M4 to a smart motorway, with the conversion of the hard shoulder to a running lane as an integral part of this, will require Sipson Road Subway to be lengthened. Access through the subway will be maintained wherever it is safe to do so, but some closures will inevitably be necessary. Diversion routes will be established during these closures, including via Holloway Lane and Cherry Lane to the east of Sipson Road, as set out and assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES. The Scheme is scheduled to begin on site in 2016 and continue until 2022, but at this stage it is not possible to provide more detailed information about when works will begin at a specific site until a contractor is appointed. An indicative construction programme has been provided at Annex B to the EDR (Document Reference 7.4).	No
09/02/2015	241	Opportunities need to be used to make M4 subways which are undergoing works, such as Sipson Road, to be upgraded. The Sipson Road subway is also likely to become part of a Quietway in the future, further justifying the need for it to be upgraded. Initial site visits to discuss the upgrading of this subway have been held between LBH and the HA, however further details of the measures proposed should be provided as part of the submission. The proposals for the Smart motorway offer an opportunity to improve public accessibility to Cranford Park. This park is underused at present and accessibility could be substantially improved to provide the general public with the opportunity to use this public open space.	The Sipson Road Subway is being lengthened by 5m on the south side. The span of the lengthening structure will be greater than the existing structure to mitigate the tunnelling effect of lengthening and also to reduce the need for costly diversions of existing buried services which run adjacent to the subway. Other than these works, no further upgrading is proposed as part of the Scheme. We will continue to liaise with the London Borough of Hillingdon during the detailed design stage. The existing subway structures at Cranford Park are unaffected by the Smart Motorway Scheme. Access through the subway will be maintained wherever it is safe to do so, but some closures will inevitably be necessary. The available diversion route during these closures would be via Holloway Lane and Cherry Lane to the east of Sipson Road.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	265	I have read the S140566_M4_junction3_to_12_consultation_brochure and would like to make the following comments; 1. J3-4 - No impact on bridges or underpasses and LCN+ 88/88a unaffected 2. J4 to 4b widened to 5 lanes; pp29 of consultation document, Diagram 22 - Sipson Road Subway on LCN+89/93 - this would be closed for widening and a diversion proposed; If this is via say Harmondsworth Road/Holloway Lane providing interests of School cyclists are taken into account [eg by providing shared use of footpaths as appropriate] , it ought to be acceptable. I do not think this is a major route, the area to the south being underpopulated on account of the airport. 3. J4b to 9, pp22-28 of consultation document, diagrams regarding 11 bridges 9-21; demolitions/rebuilding of bridges to cope with discontinuities in the current hard shoulder ; As this is beyond the M25 junction this is out of scope for comment by London office, other offices will no doubt be feeding back anyway, however in general the proposal where closures do take place the plan is to consult local communities on diversions at the time of closure, and it would be difficult for us to comment.	The comments are noted.	No
Wood Lane Overbridge				
08/12/2014	316	I am a shift worker and I will be greatly inconvenienced during the Wood Lane bridge replacement, as this bridge is the only way in and out of our property. No factual method statement for this bridge replacement can be found. It is for all the above reasons that we oppose this project.	Details on construction of the Scheme are provided in the EDR. The proposals at Wood Lane are for the new structure to be constructed offline to the east of the existing structure. This allows the existing structure to remain open for the entire duration of the construction of the new structure, hence there will be only very limited restrictions on access to both the residential area and the nearby water treatment works. These restrictions will be short-term (likely a weekend closure) and associated with the provision of a safety zone during demolition of the existing structure.	No
Traffic and Economics				
Impact on local roads				
11/12/2014		I'm unable to comment on points 8-19 due to shortage of local knowledge. However, my main concern is the impact of increasing the volume of traffic, particularly in an easterly direction. The situation will be compounded by a build up of traffic in the Brentford/Chiswick areas. This may also affect local traffic around junction 3, affecting The Parkway, A4 and Great West Road which are already heavy with traffic during peak periods.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
12/11/2014	137	You have not proposed how to handle the extra volumes of traffic reaching M4 junction 10 that this scheme will generate. Thanks to Bracknell council using the land which should have carried the A329(M) towards the M3 and beyond for housing, there is regular congestion which backs up onto the M4 westbound around the exit. There is a similar deficiency caused by the same motorway not having been properly completed at the Reading end (the much-needed 3rd river crossing) and increased traffic flows will likely make this worse too.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/11/2014	216	I also wonder if any thought has been spared for the transport infrastructure of all towns/villages along the proposed route? It's all very well improving the infrastructure of the M4 to accommodate the ever-increasing volume of traffic/cutting journey times along the M4, but where towns along the route do not have the similar level of traffic flow measures in place, will this not simply cause a bottleneck for traffic exiting the M4? For example, traffic exiting the M4 at Junction 11 at Reading at AM peak times is very slow. Traffic already queues every morning in lane 1 approaching both the east and westbound exit slip roads. Road users simply join the back of a long queue which goes along the A33 into Reading. Using a 4th lane would surely only increase the number of vehicles which would be able to reach Junction 11 at the same time would it not? (Based on the premise that most vehicles are aiming to arrive at work for 9am).	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
08/12/2014	224	Our clients have an interest in land at Matthews Green Farm, which is adjacent to the A329(M) Motorway in Berkshire. The land has been allocated for residential development in the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy of the North Wokingham Strategic Development Location. Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Matthews Green Farm could result in increased traffic congestion on local roads. We therefore request a copy of your transport assessments and information regarding the likely changes to traffic flows at the following locations: 1) the M4 motorway, between junctions 10 and 11; 2) the A329(M) motorway between Junction 10 and the Coppid Beach junction.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. The information requested was sent to the Respondent on 5 February 2015, with a 28-day extended consultation period allowed for a response.	No
17/12/2014	247	5) Impact of the scheme on local trunk road traffic Traffic congestion east to west on the A4 and on the parallel A308 Windsor to Maidenhead road is at times considerable. Any problems on the M4 has immediate implications as traffic diverts onto trunk roads. I have not seen any discussion of anticipated impact of the Scheme on traffic flows in the local area and measures to avoid gridlock.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
21/12/2014	324	The scheme will increase traffic use of the access roads which are severely congested now and there no proposals to improve them.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
21/12/2014	408/569	The extra capacity this will bring is welcomed however we need to ensure the junctions and connecting major roads are upgraded to cope with the traffic	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
Traffic Modelling/Forecasting				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	019	On a road engineering level - traffic flows etc - this looks set fair to be as big a disaster as could be engineered for £700m. There is nowhere for the additional traffic to go, so what you are proposing to provide is more space for motorway pay-and-display mode. Now if you look at the DfT website and peruse the traffic figures, you will see that road traffic levels are rather stable at the moment, and have been for some time. So why bother? General election due? Promises about "greenest government ever" need burying? Marginal constituencies to be bought? On a transport planning level - supposedly one order above mere highways engineering - you must have read sufficiently about the subject to understand that engineering work to improve traffic flows only works if you are dealing with a pinch point; that is there is somewhere for the extra traffic to go, if only it could be passed through that pinch point. Quite clearly this is not the case, and eastbound absolutely not the case, since there is no mention of rebuilding the elevated section where the motorway ends. That would probably be political dynamite - too hot to handle even for ministers used to transport hot potatoes. The rather vague "London" leaves that open, I notice.	The M4 between J3 and J12 presently carries over 130,000 vehicles per day, and more in some places. At peak times, traffic flows in many links are close to or exceed the total flow that the link is capable of handling (i.e. its capacity). Therefore, the motorway suffers from heavy congestion, which leads to unpredictable journey times. Although traffic volumes reduced in 2008, at the start of the global financial crisis, long-term traffic trends still show significant growth. Traffic flows are forecast to increase further, and which, without road improvements, will result in more severe congestion. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD") has highlighted previously that the current road transport infrastructure network in England is one of three key barriers to UK growth requiring action from government (OECD Global Competitiveness Report 2011/12). The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. The Scheme provides additional capacity to deal with congestion along its length. As a strategic route it links to the M25 and Heathrow and there is an increase in flow forecast. Between J3 and J2 the increases in traffic flows are significantly reduced – generally less than 2% and less than 1% in the peak periods. This is probably a fair reflection of the fact that there is no spare capacity in London. TfL and GLA have made their own assessment of the impact on London's roads are are content with the Agency's proposals.	No
02/03/2015	033	Campaign for Better Transport is concerned about the all-lane running aspects of the Smart Motorway scheme. While previously we recognised the potential benefits of the Managed Motorway schemes, which included the option of using the hard shoulder as a running lane only at times of congestion, we believe that permanently increasing capacity will lead to more traffic and more congestion in the long term, through the well-known mechanisms for inducing traffic.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	058	1. I fully understanding the need for the work having been a victim of the congestion on the M4 and in theory approve any work to improve the driving experience. 2. I have also suffered similar congestion on feeder/ exit routes, but there is no mention of these.	The key drivers of the Scheme are founded on future forecasts of traffic growth which are anticipated to increase from the current level of 140,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of motorway if nothing is done. The concept of smart motorways introduces active traffic management techniques to increase capacity by the use of variable speed limits and hard shoulder running. Key benefits of the Scheme include smoother traffic flows, more reliable journey times, fewer road traffic collisions, and reduced noise and harmful vehicle emissions. The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
20/11/2014	114	I would be particularly interested to know what the original design capacity was for this stretch of motorway, what the current usage is and what the department thinks the future capacity should be.	The stretch of M4 between junctions 9 and 15 was opened in 1971. However, the Agency has no information on the original expected capacity and usage for this part of the motorway. The prime information sources from the periods identified below have been deposited in the national archive. The Agency believes that the former HMSO publication “Roads in Rural Areas” is the document which contains the information regarding historical capacity. Regarding the current usage, the stability of traffic flow, hence the level of service provided by the road, reduces as flow increases. Guidance in TA 46/97 (TRAFFIC FLOW RANGES FOR USE IN THE ASSESSMENT OF NEW RURAL ROADS) suggests that dual three lane motorway is suitable for opening year traffic flows in the range of 25,000 to 67,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) (average 24 hour flow). One of the main constraints on the capacity of a motorway are junctions. The existing merges and diverges at the ends of this link of M4 are all two-lane slip roads. TD 22/06 (LAYOUT OF GRADE SEPARATED JUNCTIONS) shows this to be compatible with one-way peak hour flows between J10 and J11 of up to 5,400 vehicles per hour. The Agency would expect a typical weekday flow on opening of the Scheme in 2022 to be in the region of 150,000 vehicles per day. TA46/97 lists D4M as suitable for AADT in the range 52,000 to 90,000 at the Scheme opening year and TD22/06 as 7,200vph (one way). References to smart motorway peak flows have been established in the region of 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane.	No
12/11/2014	137	nor have you proposed widening the 2-lane elevated section through Chiswick resulting in 4 lanes of traffic having to fit into half the space at that point. The whole scheme feels like having to do "something" to work on the M4's problems without the slightest thought having been given as to what will happen to the traffic when it leaves that motorway.	The Scheme is designed to address congestion between J3 to J12. It is not the intention of the Scheme to attract a significant volume of additional traffic into central London. The issue has been considered by Transport for London ("TfL"), as the responsible highway authority for London’s roads, and the Agency is of the understanding that TfL is content with the Scheme in this respect.	No
12/11/2014	138	There needs to plans to deal with the traffic between 3 and 1.	The Scheme is designed to address congestion between J3 to J12. It is not the intention of the Scheme to attract a significant volume of additional traffic into central London. The issue has been considered by TfL, as the responsible highway authority for London’s roads, and the Agency is of the understanding that TfL is content with the Scheme in this respect.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
28/01/2015	167	You will be aware that the Department for Transport has recently forecast an average traffic increase across the country of over 40% by the 2040's.Given the level of live development schemes in central Berkshire I would expect these estimates to be surpassed along the M4. In turn such major growth must surely negate any marginal noise reduction that your present scheme may provide. Your comments on the ability of the M4 to deal effectively with such growth of traffic and noise would be welcomed please. When I asked about design years and flows at your exhibition I was quoted some peak period traffic figures but nobody could tell me the level of increase over existing. Again I did expect to be shown base and design year 18 hour flows when talking about noise but these were unforthcoming. Could you please provide base and design year flow comparisons at peak and 18 hour levels for the sections between J10 and J12? It is also something of a moot point as to whether it is reasonable for the flows and conditions measured today on the M4 to be the starting point for analysis. The motorway was not designed for current traffic levels and it follows that the noise already produced exceeds calculations made when consent was granted for adjacent housing.	The key drivers of the Scheme are founded on future forecasts of traffic growth which are anticipated to increase from the current level of 140,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of the M4 if nothing is done. The proposed Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required. The concept of smart motorways introduces ATM techniques to increase this capacity by the use of variable speed limits and hard shoulder running. Key benefits of the proposed Scheme include smoother traffic flows, more reliable journey times, fewer road traffic collisions, and reduced noise and harmful vehicle emissions. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Accordingly, it is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation	No
10/11/2014	201	Not sure if we are addressing very well know congestion areas like from Junction 5 to 4B.	A key driver of the Scheme is the future forecast of traffic which is anticipated to increase from the current level of 140,000 per day to an average of 160,000 vehicles per day over the next 20 years. This will result in even more congestion on this stretch of the M4 if nothing is done. The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required. The concept of smart motorways introduces active traffic management ("ATM") techniques to increase this capacity by the use of variable speed limits and hard shoulder running. Benefits of the Scheme include smoother traffic flows, more reliable journey times, fewer road traffic collisions, and reduced noise and harmful vehicle emissions	No
08/12/2014	225	Our clients have an interest in land that has the benefit of planning consent for up to 433 new dwellings, a Primary School and associated infrastructure. Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Hatch Farm Dairies could result in increased traffic congestion on local roads. We therefore request a copy of your transport assessments and information regarding the likely changes to traffic flows at the following locations: 1) the M4 motorway, between junctions 10 and 11; 2) the A329 Reading Road, between the Showcase roundabout junction and the junction with King Street Lane; 3) Lower Early Way between the Showcase roundabout and the junction with Rushey Way.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. A copy of the information requested was sent to the Respondent on 5 February 2015, with a 28-day extended consultation period allowed for a response.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	Supporting documentation should consider the impact of the proposals onto LBH roads, the proposals at junctions 3 and 4 and the impacts of existing and future vehicular traffic between junction 4 and Horton Road/Stockley Road interchange and between junction 3 and Bulls Bridge roundabout. Modelling results within the accompanying documentation for this submission must include the development proposals in Hayes, Stockley Park and elsewhere in the south of the Borough. This modelling should also be used when assessing the compound sites. It is not clear if the impact of traffic growth from planned developments is considered within the Transport Assessment, which may not be covered within the general forecasted traffic growth in the NTM. There are a number of the major developments planned in the local area north of junctions 3 and 4. The key ones are listed as below, which should be considered within the future traffic modelling scenarios. Full details of all of these applications (planning reference details etc) have been submitted as part of the cumulative assessment. 1) Stockley Park - Phase 3 2) Southall Gas Works 3) Western International Market 4) The Old Vinyl Factory 5) Gatefold Building 6) 20 Blyth Road 7) Hyde Park Hayes 8) Unit 3 Millington Road 9) Lake Farm School 10) Slough Intermodal freight exchange The proposed physical improvements to junctions 3 and 4 are limited to realignment of slip roads and some widening works are also proposed between these junctions. Any physical alterations would be subject to road safety audits, as required by the HA.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
19/11/2014	285/625	The proposed scheme will only serve to transport traffic faster into London whereby causing more traffic jams for traffic travelling EASTWARDS. Unless the "exits" at J4b/J4/J3 and Chiswick Flyover can be improved to allow the traffic to leave te motorway quicker, then we will have more traffic jams.	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. The Agency is working to improve the junctions at J4b, J4 and J3 to make traffic flows more reliable.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	302	My main concern was one of safety with the discontinuation of the hard shoulder. I think the refuse areas should be no more than 1 mile apart. My other concern was about delays created by the motorway works but this was satisfactorily answered in discussion.	Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes that are to start main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer large structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed. The design changes are based on experience of designing and operating smart motorways for more than five years. This experience and detailed assessment has demonstrated that increasing the spacing between refuge areas will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user. Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to a refuge area in an emergency, even when the distance is increased. Refuge areas are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways – at a maximum spacing of 2,500m. These can include purpose built ERAs as well as hard shoulders on slip roads, motorway service areas and exiting the network completely. This is equivalent to the spacing of lay-bys on the trunk road network; at a speed of 60 mph drivers will still pass an area of refuge roughly every 90 seconds. Roadside signing is used to give drivers advance notice of the distance to the next emergency roadside telephone (orange phone) in an ERA. Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through the smart motorway's features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway), managing traffic with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers	No
21/12/2014	311	It adds capacity but not resilience. It would be better to upgrade parallel roads so they can cope even better in the event of a closure. The opportunity should be taken to separate J8 and J9 and and alleviate J7 westbound. The variable speed limits should be extended to the London end of the M4 otherwise you could be delivering traffic 50mph or less and then allowing it to speed up to 60 thereby loosing the benefits of regulation. The 60 limit is unnecessary at some times of the week and the 40 could be varied to 50 at those times except at the A406/205 exit at Chiswick.	The Scheme will increase the capacity of the M4 and is also expected to result in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. The Highways Agency will continue to work with the local traffic authorities through the Scheme so that during road closures the traffic is managed in the most efficient way. The traffic flows at J8/9 have been taken into account through the design of the scheme and it is expected that the scheme will continue to provide performance benefits through the section. The purpose of the Scheme is to provide the additional capacity within the existing Highways Agency estate boundary. However, major junction works at specific junctions will continue to be considered by the Highways Agency regional teams. The speed of traffic through the Scheme between J12 and J3 will vary depending on the road traffic conditions and the signals will display speed limits in accordance with the traffic conditions. This could potentially result in the speed limit, for example, being 50mph through the Scheme during congested periods and then after the Scheme ends at J3 the speed limit will be the fixed 60mph. This however would not be a concern. The speed limits on display through the Scheme will vary depending on the road traffic conditions so if the Scheme is displaying 50mph then due to the congestion it is unlikely that traffic would be able to travel at 60mph. The Agency will continue to work with the local highways authorities so that traffic into London is managed in the most optimum way to improve traffic flows through the Scheme and the surrounding sections of motorway and local roads. The effects of the Scheme on local roads are also assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	316	1) How can widening the motorway reduce traffic	Smart motorways use the latest technology to improve journeys by managing traffic flow and setting speed limits accordingly to keep traffic moving smoothly instead of continually stopping and starting. Variable speed limits will adapt to traffic conditions including the national speed limit.	No
21/12/2014	330	I disagree with increasing the capacity of our motorways without taking into account other means of transport. The motorway will soon be "full" again and then what? Also, Crossrail may have quite an impact on traffic levels on the M4, Heathrow might be downgraded etc.	The key element of smart motorways is making the hard shoulder available as a running lane at all times. The absence of a hard shoulder provides the necessary capacity for road users thereby reducing congestion and improving journey time reliability by smoothing the flow of traffic. Smart motorways provide an effective way of providing increased capacity in a cost effective and deliverable way, maximising the use of the existing asset. Smart motorways can be delivered more quickly than traditional solutions such as widening and are better value for money. The TVMM published in 2003, looked at the contribution that all modes of transport and traffic management might make-including road, rail, bus and light rail. The TVMM sought to identify the most effective means of addressing current and future transport-related problems in the Thames Valley. The TVMM recommended demand management measures on the M4 motorway either in isolation, or in combination with increased levels of public transport provision. Some of these public transport projects have either been completed or are currently underway.	No
21/12/2014	332	What is the projected time saving for a journey J12 to J3 at peak times? Will improved traffic flow simply generate more road traffic given the extreme cost of rail-per-mile travel on this route?	The key element of smart motorways is making the hard shoulder available as a running lane at all times. The absence of a hard shoulder provides the necessary capacity for road users thereby reducing congestion and improving journey time reliability by smoothing the flow of traffic. Smart motorways provide an effective way of providing increased capacity in a cost effective and deliverable way, maximising the use of the existing asset. Smart motorways can be delivered more quickly than traditional solutions such as widening and are better value for money. The TVMM published in 2003, looked at the contribution that all modes of transport and traffic management might make-including road, rail, bus and light rail. The TVMM sought to identify the most effective means of addressing current and future transport-related problems in the Thames Valley. The TVMM recommended demand management measures on the M4 motorway either in isolation, or in combination with increased levels of public transport provision. Some of these public transport projects have either been completed or are currently underway. The Agency uses a variable demand model that is able to forecast the effects of changes in transport provision on both highway and public transport modes. Comparing the number of trips using highways in each modelled time period, the difference between the with-Scheme and without-Scheme scenarios is no more than 0.5% in all time periods and purposes and is generally less. The total is approximately 0.15%. What this means is that the Scheme does not generate significant volumes of traffic, nor does it switch significant volumes from rail. Furthermore, it could be argued that the increases in traffic flow on the M4 (which are generally well above 0.5%) are due to re-assignment from other roads, not “additional”.	No
19/11/2014	347	Associated works: BEFORE work relating to this scheme commences in the vicinity of Junction 4B, it is ESSENTIAL that the capacity of the M25 is increased. AT LEAST one additional lane is required between junctions 15 and 16 clockwise. Also junctions 12 and 11 anti-clockwise and probably between junctions 11 and 10 anticlockwise. Any improvements should also take account of the increase in traffic flow as a result of this scheme and that on the M_.	Improvements to M25 junctions 10 to 16 are planned and form part of the Highways Agency Road Investment Strategy. During development of the Scheme, the Agency has liaised with the M25 team and amended the design for the junction 4b eastbound merge to the M25 in response to their feedback. The Agency will continue to liaise with the M25 during detailed design and construction.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	350	I support this proposal strongly. I have used this stretch of M4 regularly since it was opened. Congestion gets worst every year. Have you considered the knock-on effects? One knock-on effect will almost certainly be increasing traffic on A404(M) at Jct 8/9. This will make congestion at roundabout on A404(M) even worse [where Maidenhead-Marlow Road closures]. Bisham. A flyover is needed to coincide with opening of M4 smart motorway - not council's idiotic proposal involving traffic lights	The effects of the Scheme on local roads are also assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
12/12/2014	426	The Council wishes to see any modelling work that the HA have undertaken in relation to scheme especially for the area of West Berkshire. The Council is interested in any forecasts for the future growth and whether or not the scheme is expected to draw in greater traffic (over and above the predicted growth that would happen anyway without the scheme) as the capacity of the M4 increases. The interface between any models the HA have been using and local models held by the Council.	TThe Agency uses a computer forecasting model to undertake its traffic modelling. This model is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model is able to assess changes in overall demand arising from proposed schemes and takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads, as reported in Chapter 13 of the ES. In the case of the Scheme, there is forecast to be an increase of less than 1% in traffic across the modelled highway network. The Smart Motorway, All Lane Running scheme will smooth traffic flows on the M4 and although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads.	No
15/01/2015	482	I am not convinced this is the answer as the congestion will just back up from the Chiswick flyover. You can put as many lanes as you wish back to Junc 12 but as I say I just think the M4 will back up as before.	The Scheme is designed to address congestion between J3 to J12. It is not the intention of the Scheme to attract a significant volume of additional traffic into central London. The issue has been considered by TfL, as the responsible highway authority for London's roads, and the Agency is of the understanding that TfL is content with the Scheme in this respect.	No
18/12/2014	493	It should also be noted that the traffic generation associated with the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (including the effect on M4 J5 and extent of S278 works in its vicinity) has been previously agreed with the Highways Agency, which has not objected to the planning application in respect pf the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.	The Agency has noted this response. The Agency can confirm that the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange has been taken into account in the cumulative assessment for the Scheme, as reported in the ES Chapter 16: Combined and cumulative impacts.	No
19/12/2014	588	It is noted that the M4 Motorway is located outside the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Council areas. As such it should not have a significant direct environmental impact arising from the construction of new carriageway and associated infrastructure, such as gantries, cameras etc. Due to the nature of the Smart Motorway proposals increasing capacity of the M4 as it passes to the south of South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse, the Councils are generally supportive of the scheme, given that it should encourage use of the strategic road network, rather than alternative less appropriate and more local routes. However, it is not clear from the proposals if any wider traffic modelling of the impacts on surrounding roads has been undertaken, and it would be useful to be provided with any evidence on these impacts	The Agency uses a computer forecasting model to undertake its traffic modelling. This model is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model is able to assess changes in overall demand arising from proposed schemes and takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads, as reported in Chapter 13 of the ES. In the case of the Scheme, there is forecast to be an increase of less than 1% in traffic across the modelled highway network. The Smart Motorway, All Lane Running scheme will smooth traffic flows on the M4 and although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads	No