

**APPENDIX 29: SECTION 42 CONSULTATIONS –
RESPONSES FROM LOCAL
AUTHORITIES AND PRESCRIBED
CONSULTEES**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX 29 VOLUME 5.2 SECTION 42 CONSULTATIONS – RESPONSES FROM PRESCRIBED CONSULTEES

Section 42 Consultees: Responses to consultation Prescribed Consultees/Local Authorities/Land Interests

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| Additional information request | | | | | |
| 11/12/2014 | 043 | Iver Parish Council | Request for PEI Report, NTS and the relevant plans | The requested information was provided to Iver Parish Council on 10 December 2014. | No |
| 26/11/2014 | 057 | Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution Limited | Please provide as much information as possible | The Agency identified SSE plant as part of the Scheme's research, and continues to engage with SSE teams as part of its stakeholder engagement processes. The Agency engaged with SSE to obtain information on the company's apparatus. Commencing in February 2014 it made requests to SSE for C3 estimates of costs to deal with SSE apparatus affected by the Scheme. The engagement by SSE in response to the C3 requests was welcome and helpful and the information provided has been very useful in the Scheme's development. Any of SSE's assets affected by the Scheme will be covered by protective provisions for the benefit of Electricity undertakers, which have been provided in the DCO. | No |
| Air Quality | | | | | |
| Increased Air Pollution | | | | | |
| 16/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | Section 6 of Preliminary Environmental Information Report states that consultation was carried out with EHOs however this was not the case. Section 6.6.2 identifies monitoring locations within our borough but does not include 10 monitoring locations at sensitive receptors along the M4 which should have been considered. The air quality assessment indicates that there are a number of receptors within WBC area where concentrations of NO2 will increase as a result of the scheme which is located within an existing AQMA. No further consideration has been made of this worsening of air quality. This will have a direct impact on our LAQM duties and the requirement to DEFRA in improving air quality in this area. The proposed location of the compounds are extremely close to residential areas and therefore the receptors are likely to be affected by dust, plant/vehicle emissions and noise. The mitigation measures proposed are insufficient. | EHOs and air quality officers were contacted by the Alliance on behalf of the Agency to establish general baseline air quality data. All Wokingham Borough Council sites that are located in representative locations have been used in the assessment. The data presented in section 6.6 of the ES only displays those measurement locations that exceed the objective value. All measurement locations considered in the assessment are presented in Appendix 6.4 to the ES. There are 391 individually modelled receptors within WBCs area. Five medium (2.1 - 2.6 µg/m3) increases in annual mean NO2 concentrations are predicted at sensitive receptors that exceed the objective value within WBCs area. The remaining 386 receptors are not predicted to exceed the objective value. Changes in NO2 concentrations at these remaining receptors are predicted to range from a decrease of 0.7 µg/m3 to an increase of up to 2.1 µg/m3. The results of the air quality assessment are reported fully in the ES which accompanies the application for development consent. It is not anticipated that the LAQM duties of WBC will be affected by the Scheme. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. However, proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP"), which is provided with the Application. | No |
| 16/12/2014 | 006 | West Berkshire District Council | The Preliminary Environmental Information Report details the location of the construction compounds. There is the likelihood that existing sensitive receptors will be affected by noise and air quality from the compounds due to their very close proximity. It is recommended that application under Prior Consent of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 is made to West Berkshire Council to protect the residents from noise and also prepare a construction management plan to include air pollution (including dust and vehicle and plant emissions). | An Outline CEMP is provided with the Application, which includes measures to control dust, vehicle and plant emissions. The Agency will review whether an application under COPA 1974 is necessary or appropriate in the circumstances. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 038 | South Bucks District Council | Infrastructure enhancement to support economic success and decrease congestion along major arteries linking Heathrow and London to the rest of the UK is a key issue for the South East. We therefore understand the need for an improved M4 corridor to meet the anticipated needs of the region over the next 40 years. The proposal put forward has the potential to ease congestion in the South Bucks region as the motorway becomes more efficient at servicing larger volumes of traffic. The concern over this expansion is the impact on local housing (for example along Old Slade Lane) and SSSIs. The nearby Burnham Beeches SAC and SSSI is of particular concern with it being vulnerable to changes in air quality. Discussions should take place with Natural England to ascertain whether air quality changes will have an adverse effect on these locations. Although the initial report indicates minimal impact on the local area in terms of noise and pollution, it would be prudent to guarantee alleviation measures should this not be the case in practice. | The air quality assessment for the Scheme was undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The impact of changes in air quality on Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation ("SAC") and the Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI") has been assessed, and reported in Chapters 6 and 9 of the ES, which accompanies the Application. The SAC and the SSSI are located approximately 4.4km from the M4 and 2km from the M40 near to the A355. The predicted increase in annual average daily traffic ("AADT") flow along the A355 closest to Burnham Beeches ranges between 12 and 49 vehicles per day. An increase in vehicles of this size would not produce a significant change in air quality effect on the SSSI/SAC. The Agency has consulted Natural England as part of the preparation of the ES. Properties on Old Slade Lane are predicted to experience an imperceptible increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, with a maximum predicted increase of 0.3 µg/m3 at the property closest to the M4. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council, Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>5.0 It should be noted that the entire section of the M4 within the jurisdiction of Slough Borough Council (SBC) to a buffer area of around 50m from the highway falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA1).</p> <p>6.0 SBC latest Air Quality Progress Report 20141 clearly illustrates there are breaches of the NO2 EU limits along the boundary of the M4. There are several hundred Slough Borough properties that fall within the M4 AQMA1.</p> <p>7.0 To date, we have received no air quality action plan or low emission strategy from the Highway Agency in relation to the M4 and would welcome assistance in tackling the poor air quality that afflicts our residents from the M4 motorway traffic in a progressive way.</p> <p>8.0 The Highway Agency has a duty to ensure the impact of the strategic road network does not give rise to harm to public health. The European Union have initiated infraction proceedings against the UK Government for non-compliance with (NO2) EU Limits2.</p> <p>9.0 Outdoor Air quality is one of the most significant public health issues affecting the modern world, and there is growing body of medical evidence that the prolonged exposure to NO2 pollution may have longer term impacts on health in particular lung function and respiratory symptoms, and there is more data coming through epidemiological studies3.</p> <p>10.0 NO2 pollution is also a precursor for a number of harmful secondary air pollutants, including nitric acid, and photo oxidants (including ozone) and also secondary particulates via ammonia and the chemistry is very complicated. Additionally, NO2 concentrations closely follow vehicle emissions in many situations so that NO2 levels are generally a reasonable marker of exposure to traffic related emissions.</p> <p>11.0 There is also a need to drive more harmful fine particulate emissions from road traffic which are known to cause chronic health impacts (relation to heart and lung function) and affects mortality. Whilst the existing particulate levels from the M4 are below EU limits, there is still a need to reduce the impact further in particular the smaller PM2.5 fraction.</p> <p>12.0 Particulate matter (PM) PM aggravates respiratory and cardiovascular conditions. The smaller the particle, the deeper it will deposit within the respiratory tract. The health impacts of PM2.5 are especially significant. The Mayor of London commissioned a study in 2010, which suggested that around 4,300 deaths per year in London are partly caused by long-term exposure to PM2.5 (which is widely acknowledged as being the pollutant which has the greatest effect on human health). Road traffic is a significant source of PM2.5 and the M4 will be a significant source of local PM2.5 in Slough.</p> <p>13.0 The impact of high levels of NO2 on health is mostly acute, and there are some studies to suggest that it cause inflammation of the airways, and can also increase asthma symptoms. Air quality is therefore a significant consideration and a public health issue and the Highway Agency have an obligation to take all practical measures to minimise the exposure of air pollution from the motorway and trunk road system.</p> | <p>The numbered points below reflect those in the representation from SBC:</p> <p>5.0 The AQMA is identified in the ES Air Quality Chapter, sections 6.9 and 6.10, and has been considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") for the Scheme, as reported in the ES.</p> <p>6.0 The air quality assessment undertaken as part of the EIA, has modelled 303 individual properties within this AQMA. Of these, 11 are predicted to be above the air quality objective for annual mean NO2 with the Scheme in place, and are predicted to experience a small (0.4-2 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations.</p> <p>7.0 The assessment undertaken for air quality is focussed upon the effect of the Scheme upon local air quality. This includes the evaluation of changes in air quality at sensitive receptors with particular reference to locations anticipated to be subject to poor air quality in the opening year of the Scheme. Mitigation measures to improve air quality are recommended to avoid potentially significant air quality effects on this basis rather than on existing baseline air quality. Those mitigation measures are detailed in Chapter 6 of the ES, and are secured by the Outline CEMP, which is submitted as part of the Application.</p> <p>8.0 The assessments undertaken for the Scheme were focussed on the effects of the Scheme on local air quality, rather than the effects of the strategic road network as a whole. This is as is required by the methodology set out in the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges ("DMRB").</p> <p>9.0 The air quality assessment considers the effects of the Scheme compared to the health based objective values set out in legislation, such as the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010.</p> <p>10.0 The effect of the Scheme on concentrations of NO2 is a key focus of the assessment of air quality for Highways Agency Schemes, and is reported in the ES. The secondary pollutants listed do not form part of the DMRB methodology.</p> <p>11.0 & 12.0 The assessment of PM2.5 does not currently form a part of the Highways Agency's DMRB methodology. Therefore a PM 2.5 assessment has not been undertaken for this Scheme.</p> <p>13.0 The effect of the Scheme on concentrations of NO2 is a key focus of the assessment of air quality for Highways Schemes. Mitigation measures are linked to the prediction of significant Scheme effects, which are not anticipated for this Scheme.</p> <p>14.0 Traffic changes due to the Scheme on the wider road network are considered as part of the assessment of effects on air quality for the Scheme, as reported in the ES.</p> <p>21.0 Mitigation measures are linked to the prediction of significant Scheme effects. As the effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant, operational mitigation is not proposed. However, construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Proposals to control these potential</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>14.0 Slough Borough Council has recently secured funding from DEFRA to develop a low emission strategy by the end of 2015. The strategy is aimed at reducing the NOx emissions from road transport within the Borough. The objective is to comply with all the NO2 Limits by 2020 (10 years after we should be complying with the EU limits). Slough has 3 other AQMAs located on the strategic A4 network, the impact of increasing capacity on the M4 needs to be assessed in relation to junction and local network capacity.</p> <p>21.0 Therefore the M4 road traffic noise and air pollution are material impacts to be fully considered by the Planning Inspector. Exposure to elevated levels of road traffic noise and air pollution directly links to public health outcomes. The Highway Agency needs to ensure that if the proposed smart M4 leads to an increase in noise levels and air pollution above EU limits, mitigation is required to prevent unacceptable exposure to residents.</p> <p>31.0 With reference to the EPI we note and comment specifically as follows on chapter 6 Air Quality and chapter 12 Noise and Vibration affecting Slough.</p> <p>32.0 Air Quality – We note that just over 3000 receptors have been modelled using ADMS roads and the modelling subdivides sections of the motorway and also takes account of local road network impacts on air quality. The latest emission factors EFTV6.0.1 have been used. Some of the RMSE are quite high above 10% of the air quality objective levels. It should also be noted the modelling accuracy is around ±15%. The RMSE is below this threshold in the Slough Area of modelling. There is acknowledgement to the gap analysis based on the rate of improvement of air quality from cleaner vehicles (actual against predicted). A compliance risk assessment has also been undertaken.</p> <p>33.0 It is accepted that a 'do nothing' (leaving the motorway) as exists will also see a reduction in air pollution over time, despite increased traffic and heavy congestion. This is because improvement in vehicle technology and higher emission standards being applied to tailpipe emissions, switch off engine technology when cars are stationary, and also because of the uptake in low emission vehicles (electric, hybrid, clean gas, and potentially hydrogen) will start to phase into fleets over the next decade.</p> <p>34.0 The main concern from Slough perspective when using the hard shoulder running, is increasing the capacity of the motorway and hence concentration of emissions, and closer proximity of the source (vehicles) of emissions closer to residents. As well as secondary localised congestion impacts on junctions.</p> <p>35.0 We note as follows Junction 7 to 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 residential receptors will still breach the national air quality objective and EU Limit in the 2022 Do Minimum Scenario; • Potential for construction dust to affect air quality and for compound 6 near junction 6 to affect air quality and site mitigation measures are likely; • With the scheme in place only 1 residential receptor is predicted to be in breach of the EU Limit and 13 just below; <p>36.0 We note as follows Junction 6 to junction 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 residential receptors will still breach the national air quality objective and EU Limit in the 2022 Do Minimum Scenario; • Potential for construction dust and for compound 8 near The Myrke to affect air quality and site mitigation measures are likely; • With the scheme in place 10 residential receptor are predicted to be in breach of the EU Limit and 8 just below the EU Limit; • We note further model predictions of for residential receptors (A247 – A254) and A322 will be undertaken in the final ES <p>37.0 We note as follows Junction 7 to 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 residential receptors will still breach the national air quality objective and EU Limit in the | <p>impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application.</p> <p>31.0 No response required.</p> <p>32.0 No response required.</p> <p>33.0 No response required.</p> <p>34.0 The effects of emissions from traffic using the motorway and junctions are modelled in ADMS-Roads using traffic data which includes the potential effects of junctions and the use of the hard shoulder.</p> <p>35.0 This is correct in regards to the text in the PEI Report, however the sentence for Do-Minimum reads: "Concentrations of NO2 are predicted to be just above the annual average objective value in the 2022 Do Minimum scenario at seven receptors in this link (north-west of junction 6)". This should more correctly read "Concentrations of NO2 are predicted to be just below the annual average objective value in the 2022 Do Minimum scenario at seven receptors in this link (north-west of junction 6)".</p> <p>36.0 Confirmed.</p> <p>37.0 The single residential receptor identified will be just below the objective in the 2022 Do Minimum Scenario.</p> <p>38.0 The opinion of significance against the Highway Agency assessment criteria has been developed by the Scheme designers in close liaison with the Highways Agency's air quality specialists and is a consistent approach applied to all Highways Agency schemes. Mitigation measures are linked to the prediction of significant Scheme effects, which are not anticipated for this Scheme.</p> <p>39.0 As the effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant, operational mitigation is not proposed. However, construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application.</p> | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>2022 Do Minimum Scenario;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for adverse impact from construction compound 9 near Brands Hill, site mitigation measures are likely; • With the scheme in place 9 residential receptor are predicted to be just below the EU Limit; <p>38.0 Slough deviates in its opinion of significance against the Highway Agency assessment criteria. In our view any resident within our boundary, experiencing a breach of the national air quality objective in 2022, opening year of the smart motorway, is considered a significant impact, no matter how small or large the magnitude of change. The limit is an absolute limit and there is a duty on all public bodies (including the Highway Agency) to develop strategies and plans to ensure compliance with the EU limits for air pollution. We would expect the Highway Agency to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the exposure of air pollution from the M4 to below the EU limits.</p> <p>39.0 We would like the Highway Agency to consider using its smart technology to continue to improve local air quality in Slough and to model and consider the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the use of maximum mandatory speed limits along the M4 stretch Junction 4b to 7 and 7 to 4b to reduce air pollution until the EU limits are met at all residential receptors; or • Use of variable speed limits along the same stretch M4 stretch Junction 4b to 7 and 7 to 4b to reduce air pollution until the EU limits are met at all residential receptors; or. • The potential to introduce a low emission lane (preferably hard shoulder lane) between Junctions 4b and 7 and 7 and 4b to ensure EU limits are met at all residential receptors; and • The promotion (via signage) of ensuring traffic remains on the M4 to connect to M40, via M25 and not use the Slough strategic network as a cut-through. | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 086 | The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead - Highways Department | <p>Air Quality Bray/M4 AQMA</p> <p>This area was declared in 2009 due to the exceedance of the annual mean objective for NO2. Road traffic in the area is the dominant source of pollution. The M4 contribution has been apportioned and it accounts for about half of NO2 emissions from local sources. The proposed scheme, when operational is predicted to have a negative impact on air quality within Bray/M4 AQMA. The Highways Agency is responsible for managing motorway emissions and would need to better consider this impact and the potential control measures within the forthcoming ES. One of the scheme's objectives is to implement environmental improvements and mitigation where appropriate and required. This should be the case in reducing the air quality impact of the M4 within Bray/M4 AQMA.</p> <p>Monitored NO2 concentrations near the M4, site WM29 at 60µg/m3 are the highest in the Borough and, as the PEI report shows one of the highest within the area of the proposed scheme. The report states that the area around Windsor Road (A308) Overbridge is not affected by the scheme. However the proposed scheme will increase motorway capacity by permanently converting the hard shoulder to a running lane creating a fourth lane. Emissions are predicted to increase and the distance between the traffic lane and sensitive receptors will be reduced. Predicted NO2 concentration at locations representing worst-case exposure under LTT 2022-do something compared with 'do minimum' show and increase from 36µg/m3 to 38µg/m3.</p> | <p>Effects on air quality, including on the AQMA, have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, as reported in the ES. The results of that assessment demonstrate that there is no significant effect on air quality as a result of the Scheme. The concentrations discussed in the comments (WM29 measuring 60µg/m3) are current measured concentrations. Predicted concentrations in the opening year of the Scheme (2022) are lower than those currently measured due to projected improvements in background concentrations and vehicle pollutant emission rates. The air quality objectives considered in the assessment include both the short term and long term (annual mean) objectives. Properties located within the AQMA at the A308 underbridge are predicted to experience a small (0.7-1.9 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, with predicted annual mean concentrations ranging from just below to well below, the objective value (24.5-38.2 µg/m3). On the basis of the above, additional operational mitigation is not proposed. Additionally, the use of barriers is not currently an approved technique for mitigating air quality effects on the Agency's schemes. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. However, proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which is provided with the Application, and secured by a requirement in the DCO.</p> | No |
| | | | <p>This is based on projections of long term trend. Historically the rates of improvement in air quality and future year projections of declining concentrations have always been overestimated. Given the degree of uncertainty about the rate of improvement in air quality it is reasonable to adopt a precautionary approach and consider potential control measure. The PEI report fails to consider that even in the event the predicted LTT2022 are correct, a</p> | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>concentration of 38µg/m3 would still be within the MoU of 10% of the air quality objective and above 36µg/m3. A concentration of 38µg/m3 will not be sufficiently below the air quality objective for RBWM to revoke Bray/M4 AQMA after 2022. We would not support the proposed scheme in its current form, with no control measures to reduce the air quality impact. In particular we recommend that the Highways Agency considers noise barriers as a mean to improve air quality. It would be possible to improve the atmospheric dispersion of emissions from the M4 by increasing the height of the existing noise barriers in the area. An assessment, using ADMS Urban on the effect of the elevation of Windsor Road - M4 Overbridge on ground level concentrations show that when the elevation is increased by 2 metres ground level concentrations at receptor points decrease by up to 28%. This demonstrates that the use of taller noise barriers would reduce the air quality impact of the M4 on the AQMA. The new noise barriers will also better contain the traffic noise from the new traffic lanes. The noise barriers would need to extend 350 metres to the west and 250 metres to the east of Windsor Road Overbridge. The proposed scheme is an opportunity to mitigate the motorway air quality and noise impact in the area.</p> | | |
| 12/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London ("TfL") | <p>The HA also states that there will be no impact on air quality – again TfL needs to understand how this conclusion was reached in terms of data used for assessment.</p> | <p>Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, as reported in the ES. The assessment methodology and basis for the conclusions reached on the effects on air quality as a result of the Scheme are detailed in Chapter 6 of the ES, and its accompanying appendices.</p> <p>The Agency met with TfL on 9 December 2014 to discuss its concerns. As explained in that meeting, and in the ES, there are no significant changes in traffic (as defined in DMRB HA207/07) predicted on the TfL network due to the Scheme and no significant effects on air quality are predicted.</p> | No |
| 18/12/2014 | 135 | Dorney Parish Council | <p>AIR POLLUTION</p> <p>Dorney Parish Council is very concerned about increase in air pollution with a junior school 150m away and old people and normal residents living adjacent to the Motorway . No consultant was present at the meetings who specialised in this matter but it was agreed that one would be present at the next Council meeting but unfortunately this will be too late for this reply.</p> <p>Although we recognise that Dorney is only a small parish, we do hope that the concerns we have raised will be taken in to consideration as the proposed work on the Smart Motorway will have significant adverse effect on the community and we hope that our local knowledge we can provide will minimise this.</p> | <p>Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, the results of which demonstrate that there is no significant impact to air quality as a result of the Scheme. The property on Meadow Way closest to the M4 within Dorney Parish is predicted to experience a medium (2.0 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place above the objective (40.4 µg/m3). All other properties to the south of the M4 in this area are predicted to experience a small (0.7 - 1.4 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place below, or well below, the objective the objective value (23.2 - 30.9 µg/m3). Dorney County Combined School is set further back from the M4 and is predicted to experience an increase of 0.4 µg/m3 with annual mean concentrations well below the objective with the Scheme in place (19.9 µg/m3). The results of the air quality assessment are reported fully in the ES, which accompanies the Application.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | <p>The Environmental Study compares "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" options. The study assumes an increase in M4 traffic volume but does not consider that this is an issue to be addressed. We note, however, that the Agency is taking the opportunity to address the unsatisfactory drainage of the Motorway. We would like the Agency to adopt a similar approach to the environmental issues arising from the increasing motorway traffic and to ameliorate the effects of noise and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>1) Atmospheric pollution - In Table 6.1 of the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI), objectives are given for atmospheric concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and NO_x and in Table 6.8 the receptors which exceeded those objectives are listed. The PEI continues in Paragraph 6.8.6 to say that no mitigation is recommended. Also paragraph 6.8.9 says "All other receptors in Bray Wick are predicted to be below the annual objective value with the Scheme in place, therefore experience a negligible change in air quality". Yet in the case of the Bray/M4 Air Quality management Area (AQMA), the annual mean concentration of NO₂, as recorded by sensor WM29, is about 60ug/m³, which is an exceedance of the order of 50%. It seems that the PEI only considers the peak hour objective and ignores the annual mean objective. The A308 underbridge is central to this AQMA, as acknowledged by PEI Reference 6-19. (The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (2013). '2013 Air Quality Progress report for The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead' July 2013). Appendix B of this reference ascribes roughly 46% of the No₂ to sources on the M4 and continues by estimating the amelioration which could be achieved by raising the barriers at the side of the road; see Table B.9, page 65, for the modelled results from raising the elevation of the barriers.</p> <p>Recommendation - The BPC suggests raising barriers on both sides of the motorway within the Bray/M4 AQMA. A height of six or seven metres above ground level is suggested. This would ameliorate both the noise and atmospheric pollution experienced by residents. We also suggest the extension of these barriers from, on the south side, the end of the western end of the Westbound on-slip of J8/9 and on the north side from 380metres to the west of the A330 overbridge to a point 350 metres to the east of the A308 underbridge on both sides. The extended barriers could be reduced in height to four or five metres and their length is open to negotiation. Barriers are effective against all noise sources, not just tyre noise, and atmospheric pollution so the BPC would prefer those specified in addition to the low-noise surface currently suggested. The Agency has undertaken to address adverse environmental impacts by minimising them during the detailed design process and the adoption of appropriate working practices. bray Parish Council wishes to work with the Agency and the Borough Council to meet these objectives and mitigate the risks, ensuring that the impact on the Parish residents is minimised.</p> | <p>Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, the results of which demonstrate that there is no significant impact to air quality as a result of the Scheme. The concentrations discussed in the comments (WM29 measuring 60µg/m³) are current measured concentrations. Predicted concentrations in the opening year of the Scheme (2022) are lower than those currently measured due to projected improvements in background concentrations and vehicle pollutant emission rates. The air quality objectives considered in the assessment include the both short term and long term (annual mean) objectives. With the Scheme in place, properties located within the AQMA at the A308 underbridge are predicted to experience a small (0.7-1.9 µg/m³) increase in annual mean NO₂ concentrations, with predicted annual mean concentrations just below to well below the objective value (24.5-38.2 µg/m³).</p> <p>On the basis of the above, additional operational mitigation is not proposed. Additionally, the use of barriers is not currently an approved technique for mitigating air quality effects on the Agency's schemes. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. However, proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application.</p> <p>The Agency welcomes the opportunity to continue liaison with Bray Parish Council through the detailed design stage.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council, Highways Department | <p>The Highways agency are aware of the Air Quality Management Area that currently exists along the length of the M4 in Wokingham Borough. As Wokingham Borough Council has no direct influence in making positive changes to the environment in the vicinity of the motorway, Wokingham Borough Council strongly request the Highways Agency not only to mitigate any adverse impacts of the scheme but works to improve the environment further.</p> | <p>The assessment undertaken for air quality, as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, is focussed upon the effect of the Scheme upon local air quality. This includes the evaluation of changes in air quality at sensitive receptors with particular reference to locations anticipated to be subject to poor air quality in the opening year of the Scheme. As the effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant, operational mitigation is not proposed. However, construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 15/12/2014 | 266 | London Borough of Hounslow | <p>I would like to reserve the position of the London Borough of Hounslow in relation to the air quality assessment related to the M4 J3 to 12 Smart Motorway Scheme for the following reason:</p> <p>In the Environmental Statement you report: Assessment of potential effects Construction effects</p> <p>6.14.21 There are no construction works which will be undertaken as part of the Scheme in this part of the study area.</p> <p>Local operational effects (Opening Year, 2022)</p> <p>6.14.22 The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at sensitive receptors at junctions 3 to 1 of the M4 is predicted to be small at one receptor (X617) which is predicted to be above the annual mean objective value with the Scheme in place. However, this location is unlikely to have openable windows, as an apartment block and may therefore already be mitigated against poor air quality. This increase is due to the proximity of this receptor to the A4 and M4 at junction 2 and an anticipated increase of approximately 4,900 vehicles on the M4. The predictions at X617 have been considered as part of the overall evaluation of significance for operational air quality. However, further work will be undertaken to consider how this location is assessed and whether this location is included in the evaluation of significance for the final ES. The magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at all other receptors is predicted to be imperceptible resulting in a negligible change in air quality. 203 receptors are predicted to be above (160) or just below (43) the annual mean objective value with the Scheme in place. It is also anticipated that exceedances of the 1-hour mean objective are unlikely in this part of the study area as annual mean concentrations at all receptors are less than 60 µg/m3.</p> <p>I would like to have more time to consider this aspect of the assessment in relation to receptor X617 and talk again to the HA team who undertook this work. I am seeking reassurance regarding the nature of the increase in nitrogen dioxide concentration and possible mitigating steps if necessary,</p> | <p>Following the air quality modelling undertaken for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report ("PEI Report"), the property identified, Wallis House, (X617) was anticipated to experience a small worsening in air quality and to have annual mean concentrations of NO2 that were above the objective value in the opening year. Further air quality modelling of this location, utilising up-to-date plans of the building, has been undertaken since the publication of the PEI Report. For the residential areas closest to the M4, the largest increase in NO2 predicted is at an imperceptible level (<0.4 µg/m3). The results of the air quality assessment are reported fully in the ES which accompanies the Application.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 278 | Greater London Authority ("GLA") | <p>The preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) includes some assessment of air quality impacts beyond the scheme, including east of junction 4 (junctions 3 to 1) of the M4. The PEIR notes that junctions 3 to 1 are entirely within air quality management areas, with eight monitoring locations, of which one is just below and seven are above the annual mean objective value for NO2 the proposed works. The assessment of potential effects concludes that the magnitude of change in NO2 concentrations at all sensitive receptors except one will be imperceptible resulting in a negligible change in air quality. One sensitive receptor will experience a small change and further work is suggested.</p> <p>However, given the concerns set above regarding traffic modelling the GLA needs to better understand how the proposal will affect air quality and noise levels within its boundary. It is essential to understand what impacts, if any, on air quality and noise levels can be expected in west and central London including on the A4, A30, A40 and the A312 as a result of changes in traffic flows.</p> <p>The GLA and TfL would welcome further discussion to fully understand the assessment of traffic and therefore air quality and noise.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>At this stage the principle of the M4 Smart Motorway project cannot be supported; however the GLA and TfL wish to have further discussions regarding traffic, air quality and noise implications, particularly for the M4 east of the proposed works.</p> | <p>Effects on air quality, including on the AQMA, have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, as reported in the ES. The results of that assessment demonstrate that there is no significant effect on air quality as a result of the Scheme. There are no significant changes in traffic (as defined in DMRB HA207/07) predicted on the wider road network within the GLA area due to the Scheme. Consequently, no significant effects on air quality are predicted.</p> <p>The property identified, which is Wallis House (X617), was anticipated to experience a small worsening in air quality and to have annual mean concentrations of NO2 that were above the objective value in the opening year. Further air quality modelling of this location utilising up-to-date plans of the building have been undertaken since the publication of the PEI Report. For the residential areas closest to the M4, the largest increase in NO2 predicted is at an imperceptible level (<0.4 µg/m3).</p> <p>The Agency met with the GLA on 11 November 2014 and with TfL on 9 December 2014 to discuss their concerns.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 279 | Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Limited | <p>6. At page 17, in the section NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR CONNECTIVITY... the document goes into more detail, and qualifies the LEP's support as being conditional on appropriate mitigating measures.</p> <p>"We welcome the planned M4 Smart Motorway Scheme from Junction 3 out to Junction 12, due to start construction in 2016. This should include screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>9. Finally at page 19 which describes Package 6 – Enhancing the Strategic Transport Network, the detail of the scheme is again spelt out: "With regard to the strategic road network, we welcome plans for the early implementation of the M4 Smart Motorway scheme but will lobby for it to include appropriate screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>10. The officers have considered the detail of the works proposed by visiting your exhibition and by reading the consultation booklet.</p> <p>13. We also note that your assessment work has found no significant impacts on air quality as a result of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>14. It is therefore apparent that you have already considered the issues raised by the LEP. We hope that your commitment to successful mitigation of these impacts will include a contingency sum for post implementation works where it can be shown that there are unanticipated adverse impacts, or that the mitigation deployed has been unsuccessful.</p> <p>15. We have no comment to make on the fine detail of the proposed new structures and alignments; this is best left to residents and local authorities with detailed knowledge of each location.</p> <p>16. Please contact us again if you have any further questions.</p> | Effects on air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, including the need for appropriate air quality mitigation measures, as reported in the ES. As the effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant, operational mitigation is not proposed. However, construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application. The Outline CEMP includes inspection and monitoring procedures to assess the effectiveness of measures to prevent dust and air pollutant emissions, and provides for corrective action to be taken if required. | No |
| 21/12/2014 | 355 | Dorney Parish Council, | The M4 in South Bucks is a designated AQMA by SBDC. I believe NOx measurements have been made by diffusion tubes which are notoriously inaccurate. Has there been any continuous monitoring by analysers? There are several receptors very close within 20m of new road and there is a school within 200m at Dorney Reach. I believe speed restriction lowers the effect of exhaust pollution as on the M3 so they should be applied here. | <p>Effects on air quality, including on the AQMA, have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, as reported in the ES. The results of that assessment demonstrate that there is no significant effect on air quality as a result of the Scheme. The assessment of air quality effects has included the use of diffusion tube data, which is considered suitable for use when bias corrected against a chemiluminescent monitoring technique.</p> <p>The property identified is on Meadow Way closest to the M4 and is predicted to experience a medium (2.0 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place above the objective the objective value (40.4 µg/m3). All other properties to the south of the M4 in this area are predicted to experience a small (0.7 - 1.4 µg/m3) increase in annual mean NO2 concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place below, or well below, the objective the objective value (23.2 - 30.9 µg/m3). Dorney County Combined School is set further back from the M4 and is predicted to experience an increase of 0.4 µg/m3 with annual mean concentrations well below the objective with the Scheme in place (19.9 µg/m3). As the effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant, operational mitigation, including the imposition of speed restrictions, is not proposed.</p> | No |
| DCO Process | | | | | |
| Consultation Documents | | | | | |
| 11/12/2014 | 035 | Cycling England | Your request for pre-application consultation to Cycling England has been re-directed to the Department for Transport. Please note that Cycling England no longer exists. | No action required. | No |
| 11/12/2014 | 041 | Civil Aviation Authority | No comment. It is not necessary to consult the CAA other than the consultation required by section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. | No action required. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 11/12/2014 | 043 | Iver Parish Council | For some reason the Parish Council is not listed as an inspection point! We note that Denham (miles away) is! | The choice and location of Public Information Exhibition venues and deposit point locations has been determined in consultation with local authorities in line with the legislative requirements under the Planning Act 2008, through the publication of a Statement of Community Consultation ("SoCC"). The approach taken has sought to achieve a geographic spread of publicly accessible venues across the length of the proposed Scheme. A public consultation exhibition was held in Iver Village Hall on Saturday 6th December 2014. The closest deposit points were West Drayton Library and Slough Library, both within five miles of Iver. No public consultation exhibitions were held in Denham, nor was it used as a deposit point location for the public to inspect the consultation documents. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | 22.0 The principle objectives of the scheme to reduce congestion smooth the flow of traffic, making journey times more reliable, supporting economic growth, delivering high level of safety and minimising environmental impacts is recognised and generally supported but not at significant detriment to our residents or local highway infrastructure. 23.0 The scheme is at pre-application stage and a section 42 consultation notice under the Planning Act 2008 has been served on the authority on 10th November with comments required before the 21st December deadline, this is a very tight timescale for what is a significant national infrastructure project. The information, in particular the preliminary environmental information (PEI) is incredibly comprehensive, and we argue that more time should have been granted for the authority to review and respond, particularly as previous correspondence and informal consultations lacked significant details contained within the (PEI). The application to the SoS for a Development Consent Order (DCO) is expected in early 2015. It is clear the timescales are very tight as the works are due to start in September 2016. | Liaison was conducted with the Council prior to publication of the PEI Report, primarily information gathering to allow the Agency to develop the technical detail provided in the PEI Report. The Agency held meetings in early 2014 to discuss Scheme proposals/options and two meetings were held with the Council to discuss options for overbridge replacements in May 2014. The Agency also met to discuss planning/consultation matters as part of the Berkshire Planning Officers in September 2014. The PEI Report was the first opportunity for the Agency to share the required level of detail that would enable stakeholders to submit comprehensive comments to enable further development of the Scheme design. The time limit set for responses to the statutory consultation under s.42 was six weeks. This is longer than the minimum time limit for responses of 28 days, provided under s.45(2) of the Planning Act 2008. The early, non-statutory, consultation undertaken was on the basis of the details available at that preliminary stage of the Scheme, to enable early stakeholder engagement. Stakeholders will have a further opportunity to provide comments on the Scheme proposals to the Planning Inspectorate if the Application is accepted. | No |
| 15/12/2014 | 128 | The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage) - South East Office | On the basis of our understanding of the present scope of the work we do not feel that it is essential for us to participate in pre-application discussions. English Heritage therefore has no comment to make on these proposals. I recommend that you include a copy of this letter with any application made for these works. It is important that the local planning authority is invited to give pre-application advice. Relevant amenity societies may also be able to assist and we recommend that you approach them. If, as the scheme develops, there are material changes to the proposals and their impact on the historic environment, please consult us again. Meanwhile, please contact me if you would like to discuss any matter further. | All local planning authorities along the length of the Scheme have been consulted at various stages of the proposals. The Agency will continue to liaise with statutory environmental bodies and other relevant stakeholders as the Scheme progresses. | No |
| 15/12/2014 | 231 | Arborfield and Newland Parish Council | We note that the proposals will be exhibited at Winnersh Community Centre at the end of March 2015, and it would be helpful if a Highways Agency representative could lead us through the proposals as they affect the Parish in more detail, at that time. | The proposals were exhibited at Winnersh Community Centre on Friday 28th November 2014. No further exhibitions are planned, although if the application for Development Consent Order is accepted by the Planning Inspectorate then Scheme information will be made available for the public to view at various locations along the length of the Scheme. When the Application is finalised, the Highways Agency, as the Applicant would be happy to meet with the Parish Council to discuss in detail how the work may affect the Parish and to continue that engagement throughout the Development Consent Order process. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 09/12/2014 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>I am difficulty understanding the consultation.</p> <p>The maps are not cross referenced adequately with the text which refer to 'sheets' that are not clearly labelled as such. The main report has a page numbering system that is not aligned with the PDF version making it difficult to navigate to the relevant pages.</p> <p>However, of more concern is the difficulty in locating the relevant maps relating to non-roadside works. For example, the main report refers to a possible construction compound at Stockley Park (as well as other Hillingdon locations) but they do not appear to be mapped, or the referenced maps not available.</p> <p>To that end, its difficult to understand the implications for Hillingdon. Is it possible that a representative of the applicant can explain the works in more detail to relevant officers, or at least to talk me through the scheme so that I can a better understanding.</p> | A meeting was held with London Borough of Hillingdon on 27 January 2015, and comments were discussed. A further consultation response has been received following that meeting (reference number 636) which supersedes this. | No |
| 20/12/2014 | 416/579 | London Fire Brigade Enterprises Limited | The London Fire Brigade wish to be included in all stages of consultation, planning, development and construction with regard the M4 smart motorway development which may impact on our legal duties and responsibilities. | The Highways Agency will continue to liaise with key agencies such as the London Fire Brigade throughout the development of the Scheme, in ensuring that the statutory requirements are fully recognised and adhered to. | No |
| National Grid | | | | | |
| 09/12/2014 | 088 | National Grid Gas plc - Land and Development Team, National Grid Electricity Transmission plc - Land and Development Team ("National Grid") | National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) has two high voltage electricity transmission lines and one underground transmission cable which lies within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits. National Grid's response raises requirements relating to maintenance of statutory clearances, retention of existing ground levels, working safely near apparatus, landscaping (request to use slow/low growing under overhead cables, and no plants within 3m of underground cables), effect of excavation works on "pillars of support" of towers, concern over any relocations/diversions of cables, effect of vibration. We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application. | <p>National Grid apparatus has been identified within the limits of the Scheme. The Agency has engaged with National Grid to obtain information on the company's apparatus. Consultation with National Grid commenced in April 2014 when requests were made for C3 estimates of costs to deal with apparatus affected by the Scheme. Engagement by National Grid in response to the C3 requests is still on-going and information provided has been used in the Scheme's development to inform whether National Grid's apparatus is required to be diverted to enable the construction work.</p> <p>Potential effects on National Grid's assets as a result of the Scheme have been addressed by the incorporation of protective provisions for the benefit of electricity and gas undertakers in the DCO submitted with the Application.</p> | No |
| Ecology | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | <p>Ecology:</p> <p>The specific areas that relate to Buckinghamshire are represented by Sheets 14, 18 and 19 (EIA Scoping Report Figure 1), relating to Junctions 7-8 and 4-5: Landscaping Opportunities should be sought to improve the linear connectivity of sites along the motorway as a potential corridor for wildlife. This may be achieved by sympathetic management of the roadside verges as well as the planting of native species of local provenance that represent the local species mix.</p> <p>Where vegetation is removed, this should not have an impact upon protected species that may frequent them. If mature trees are to be removed these will require an assessment of their potential to support bat roosts. Where vegetation is to be cleared preliminary assessments and/or checks by and Ecological Clerk of Works (ECOW) should be undertaken to ensure that harm is not caused to breeding birds, reptiles and other protected species deemed potentially present by ecological survey.</p> <p>Bridge works</p> <p>Bats are known to roost in a number of locations within bridges. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Widening joints · Expansion joints · Gaps at the corners of buttresses · Widening gaps (where the width of the bridge has been increased) · Cracks and crevices that are approximately greater than 100mm deep e.g. · Drainage pipes and ducts · Internal voids <p>All species of bat and their roosts are protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 which make it an offence to undertake activities that may kill, injure or disturb an individual or damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of that individual. Consequently, each bridge should be subject to a preliminary bat assessment. Opportunities to integrate biodiversity features into the design of new bridges may also be realised.</p> <p>The works present a fantastic opportunity to improve ecological connectivity across the M4. Opportunities should be sought to include overbridges for the purposes of wildlife i.e. green bridges. Both the Natural Environment White Paper (2011) and the United Kingdom's Biodiversity Strategy (Biodiversity 2020) recognise the findings of the Lawton Report and the need to create 'more, bigger and better joined' habitats. The inclusion of a green overbridge would conform to these national objectives. Appropriate locations may be within the Colne Valley Park in close proximity to the Colne Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA). For more information about BOAs see: http://www.buckinghamshirepartnership.co.uk/partnership/bmkbp/biodiversity_opportunity_areas.page</p> | <p>The landscape scheme is set out on the Environmental Masterplan ("EM") (Document Reference 7.4, Annex A) sets out the mitigation proposals in response to the intervention of the new Gantries, localised carriageway widening, retaining solutions, side roads and associated vegetation clearance as a result of the Scheme. The EM demonstrates how the vegetation clearance required for the Scheme and any replacement planting and mitigation measures identified as part of the EIA for the Scheme. Where the Scheme has resulted in severance of continuous planting the mitigation proposals have sought to reconnect these areas subject to Highways Agency standards and guidance, recognised industry standards and Health and Safety Requirements. The majority of the plant stock proposed would be native of species, preferably of local or regional provenance or as a minimum, UK provenance with species selection and specification appropriate to location and purpose.</p> <p>The potential for vegetation clearance to impact on protected species has been considered in the EIA. Mitigation measures are secured in the Outline CEMP, which provides that all existing vegetation within the Order limits shall be retained where possible. Prior to any vegetation clearance all areas of existing vegetation are to be assessed by a suitable qualified Landscape Architect. The CEMP provides for pre-construction surveys to determine the current status and distribution of protected and notable species and their current status and distribution along the Scheme.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Scheme on bats has been undertaken as part of the EIA. The Environmental Masterplan incorporates the provision of approximately 60 bat boxes at suitable locations. A variety of boxes will be used to support a variety of species.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 18/12/2014 | 490 | Environment Agency | <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>We would need to see detailed designs and method statements accompanying any crossings over or culverting of a watercourse.</p> <p>1) Any crossing over a watercourse or proposed culverting should be accompanied by a detailed plan showing the direct relationship between the existing/proposed crossing and the watercourse. Also, a method statement should be included showing how the watercourse will be protected during works to the crossing e.g. PPG5.</p> <p>2) More detail will be required where the proposed alterations to any crossing are likely to directly impact the watercourse, i.e. culvert widening, bridge abutment encroachment, temporary structures situated within 8 metres of the watercourse, etc. In this instance, an assessment should be made to determine the risk to local ecological receptors and the quality of the watercourse as a result of those works.</p> <p>3) The information provided to date has been dismissive of the importance of the habitats identified and concluded that the overall impacts are neutral in most cases. We currently do not have the detail to be able to agree with this or not.</p> <p>4) We are concerned that you are only proposing to leave a 3m buffer to watercourses where water voles are found. This is not sufficient as burrows can extend back by up to about 5m and depending on the level of disturbance an even wider buffer may be required.</p> <p>In any case specific mitigation or avoidance measures may be required if the works are likely to cause deterioration of the ecology of the watercourse. This can only be determined when more detailed crossing designs have been produced. Equal consideration should be given to the detrimental impacts during the construction phase (noise, lighting, timing etc) as much as the eventual outcome and need to be compensated for. This includes the position and use of the construction compounds/service yards. We are pleased to see that all planting will be of native species and that otter ledges will be incorporated into culverts where they are not presently</p> | <p>Work on detailed designs will commence after the DCO Application has been submitted, and the Environment Agency will be consulted during this process. The provision of Method statements in relation to works in watercourses is secured in the Outline CEMP, which is submitted with the Application. Where in-stream works are required the Contractor will develop and agreed specific method statements for the works, in consultation with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The EIA of the Scheme has considered the habitats that may be affected by the Scheme and the valuation of receptors has been revisited within the ES, where further detail is provided.</p> <p>No works to occupied water vole habitats (or within 5m of watercourses occupied by water voles) are proposed and, therefore, neither a licence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) nor any targeted mitigation will be required.</p> | Yes |
| Flooding | | | | | |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>Floodwater Management and Drainage</p> <p>Further information is requested (this request was made to the HA however the details had not been received prior to the drafting of this consultation response). The additional information requested includes original drainage drawings, to review where and when drainage will be changing, clarification on the potential implication on the Frogsditch by the ERA and other construction works along the path of the Frogsditch.</p> <p>As part of the proposals, there should be diversion of any watercourse rather than culverting. Drainage should not just maintain the status quo but improve it by controlling more on site, as well as improve the water quality as the receiving watercourses often cause flooding in that area. This is a requirement under the Water Framework Directive, SuDS National Standards, London Plan etc.</p> <p>Concern is raised about any implication to the Blue Ribbon Policy, which seeks to improve strategic waterways. Users of the strategic waterways such as the Yeading Brook and in Cranford Park will be detrimentally impacted on through the removal of vegetation and no screening will also affect their enjoyment.</p> | <p>In line with the Agency's design standards, existing maximum discharge rates from the highway drainage system to the receiving watercourses will not be increased, and therefore there will be no impact on flood risk. Spillage control devices and other pollution interceptors will be provided at all Emergency Refuge Area ("ERA") sites, prior to the outfalls. Flood risk impacts on river flooding and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 5.3) and Drainage Strategy Report (Document Reference 7.5) for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The assessments have shown that the Scheme would not increase flood risk. This is also reported within the ES which accompanies the DCO Application.</p> <p>The drainage design will be finalised during Detailed Design (to commence in April 2015) and this will be informed by a comprehensive survey of the existing drainage system.</p> <p>Planting proposals are 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 Environmental Statement includes an Outline Environmental Management Plan 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 Construction Environmental Management Plan by the Scheme contractor(s), and will be agreed with Local Authorities</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|----------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | <p>Flood control</p> <p>It is noted that the central reserve drainage system will be replaced. Should this form part of a new sustainable drainage system biodiversity opportunities should be realised through appropriate SuDS design, noting that the SuDS triangle comprises of water quality, water quantity and amenity/biodiversity. Consequently, SuDS installations should be provided with features and planting for biodiversity.</p> <p>Please find below the contact details for Buckinghamshire County Council's Ecology Advisor</p> | <p>In line with the Agency's design standards, existing maximum discharge rates from the highway drainage system to the receiving watercourses will not be increased, and therefore there will be no impact on flood risk. Spillage control devices and other pollution interceptors will be provided at all Emergency Refuge Area ("ERA") sites, prior to the outfalls. Flood risk impacts on river flooding and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 5.3) and Drainage Strategy Report (Document Reference 7.5) for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The assessments have shown that the Scheme would not increase flood risk. This is also reported within the ES which accompanies the DCO Application.</p> <p>The central reserve drainage to be replaced is the collection system (linear slot drains) and not the carrier system. Some specific central reserve manholes may need to be replaced if impacted by the new central reserve rigid concrete barrier. Given the replacement is only the collection system, its location within the central reserve and the reason for the change from filter drains to slot drains to provide additional roadway for the additional running lane, SUDS is not a viable option within the central reserve.</p> | No |
| 18/12/2014 | 490 | Environment Agency | <p>Flood Risk</p> <p>At this stage the details of the proposed works which will affect main rivers or the floodplain are fairly limited and it is hard to give specific advice. However, in general the documents seem to summarise the main risks and considerations associated with surface water and fluvial flood risk.</p> <p>Fluvial Flood Risk: If significant alterations to the route of main rivers are proposed, then we would be likely to recommend that flood modelling is undertaken to properly assess any impact. Increases in Built Footprint - You will need to demonstrate that any increase in built footprint (e.g. larger bridges/abutments) within the 1 in 100 chance in any year including an allowance for climate change flood extent can be directly compensated for, on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage. This is necessary to prevent the new development reducing floodplain storage and displacing flood waters, thereby increasing flood risk elsewhere. Please be aware that if there are no available areas for compensation above the design flood level, then compensation will not be possible and no increases in built footprint will be allowed.</p> <p>Flood Defence Consent</p> <p>Under the terms of the Water Resources Act (1991) and the Thames Region Land Drainage Byelaws (1981), our prior written consent is required for any works in, over, under or within eight metres of a main river. This is irrespective of any planning permission granted. Details on how to apply can be found on the following link: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-defence-consent-england-and-wales</p> <p>For Environment Agency guidance on bridges, culverts, service crossings, outfalls, we recommend reference is made to our Fluvial Design Guide, which can be found at http://evidence.environment-agency.gov.uk/FCERM/en/FluvialDesignGuide.aspx</p> | <p>In line with the Agency's design standards, existing maximum discharge rates from the highway drainage system to the receiving watercourses will not be increased, and therefore there will be no impact on flood risk. Spillage control devices and other pollution interceptors will be provided at all Emergency Refuge Area ("ERA") sites, prior to the outfalls. Flood risk impacts on river flooding and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 5.3) and Drainage Strategy Report (Document Reference 7.5) for the Scheme which accompany the Application Mitigation to compensate for any loss of floodplain as a result of the proposed side roads alignment will be provided. There is sufficient land available within the Agency land to provide flood compensation. This assessment is set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and is also reflected in the ES for the Scheme.</p> <p>There are no major main river route alterations proposed. Therefore, flood modelling is not required.</p> <p>Consents and licenses for the Scheme will be applied for in a timely manner as the Scheme progresses through detailed design.</p> | No |
| Footpaths/PROW | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Proposed order limits includes Public open space - general amenity space with east west PROW. Recently enhanced planting/pollution screen. Red line incorporates PROW and SBC land. Desirable to retain east west access along PROW or a diverted route.</p> | <p>Details of the effects of Scheme are shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) and detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES. Where PROW are to be temporarily stopped up, a diversion route will be identified and agreed with the Local Authority. Where an alternative route is not available then access will be maintained where possible.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | Rights of Way: The bridge works are likely to affect two existing Rights of Ways in Buckinghamshire; Marsh Lane and Old Slade Lane (please refer to the attached plans). The County Council needs to be consulted on the impacts of the bridge works and any requirements for Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders if the footpaths/bridleways need to be closed. Please find below the contact details for the Strategic Access Advisor | Details of the effects of Scheme are shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) and detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES. Where PRoW are to be temporarily stopped up, a diversion route will be identified and agreed with the Local Authority. Where an alternative route is not available then access will be maintained where possible. | No |
| Highways and Diversions | | | | | |
| 08/12/2014 | 136 | Earley Town Council | Whilst the upgrade of the motorway was welcomed, there was concern that there could be a significant increase in traffic movements in the Earley area whilst the works were being carried out and Councillors requested that the Highways' Agency should liaise very closely with Local Authorities on the road works proposed to try to minimise the disruption to local residents. | 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. Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible. As with most construction projects, effects resulting from the construction phase will be largely dependent on the location, phasing and timing of the construction works. The environmental effects of the construction phase will be mitigated through implementation of CEMP, an Outline of which is provided with the Application. The Contractor will liaise with local authorities during preparation of the final CEMP to minimise the disruption to local residents and the local community. | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 426 | West Berkshire District Council | We are also aware that some overnight closures of the M4 will be required as part of the construction phase. Where this is to be the case, the usual diversionary routes should be used and with prior agreement with the Council. | During construction 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained on the M4 during peak times in order to keep traffic flowing. However, some overnight closures of the M4 will be required. Traffic Management Measures will be implemented in accordance with the 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 including West Berkshire Council, along with other stakeholders prior to the start of construction, as provided for in a requirement in the DCO. | No |
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | The demolition and construction of overbridges are due to take place at night/over the weekend. Buckinghamshire County Council would also wish to comment on the tactical diversion routes during motorway closures between junctions 8/9 and junction 7 and the strategic diversion for anything between junctions 4B (M25) and junction 8/9. In addition concerns have been raised regarding possible displaced traffic during the construction period, particularly on the A355 through Farnham Royal/Farnham Common and the A4. Increases in congestion on the A4 will result in locals using less appropriate parallel routes in Taplow, Burnham, Farnham Royal, Iver and Wexham. Please find below the contact details for the County Council's Intelligent Transport Systems Specialist | 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. | No |
| Junction 12 | | | | | |
| 12/12/2014 | 129 | North Wessex Downs AONB | Relating to North Wessex AONB: Consideration should be given on leaving Junction 12 travelling westward to an entrance sign for the "North Wessex Downs AONB" marking the end of the Smart Motorway Scheme, end of the lit part of the motorway and entrance into this nationally protected landscape. | The signage strategy has been discussed with the Highways Agency's specialists and the Highways Agency's maintenance service provider during Preliminary Design. This suggestion will be considered when the signage strategy goes through Detailed Design. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 12/12/2014 | 426 | West Berkshire District Council | It is also unclear from the consultation documents as to whether the existing ramp metering on the eastbound on-slip will be removed as part of the proposals, or whether the slip-road will simply become the nearside lane after the junction. | With a lane gain at this location it is unlikely that Ramp Metering ("RM") will be required at this location. However, this RM site will require further review before a decision is made whether to remove it. The decision to retain or decommission the sites will need to be agreed to by Specialist Technical Support Services ("STSS") / Netserv during the Detailed Design phase of the Scheme. | No |
| Junction 5 | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | Potential for shared working Slough Borough Council is also proposing an extension of the Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) scheme from Junction 5 towards Heathrow. Therefore, there is a potential for Slough Borough Council and the Highways Agency to work together to explore the potential for provision of bus priority measures at the A4/Junction 5 roundabout. | The Agency welcomes the opportunity to continue to liaise with Slough Borough Council, and discuss the Slough Mass Rapid Transit scheme. However, it falls outside the scope of this Scheme, and therefore the Agency does not propose to incorporate the potential provision of bus priority within the Scheme. | No |
| Mainline J11-J12 | | | | | |
| 12/12/2014 | 129 | North Wessex Downs AONB | Relating to the North Wessex AONB: Proposed replacement signage should also be sensitively placed to ensure they are not visible from the wider landscape beyond the motorway corridor. | Replacement signage will need to be placed within the design parameters given in the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The visual effect of the signs on sensitive receptors is taken into consideration during the design process. Planting proposals are provided in the Environmental Masterplan, submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order, 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. | No |
| Mainline J3-J4 | | | | | |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | HGV direction signing needs to be concentrated on J5 and J3 to minimise pressures on Heathrow airport via the M4 Spur and the Heathrow Villages. | The signage strategy has been discussed with the Highways Agency's specialists and the Highways Agency's maintenance service provider. The Preliminary Design shows the terminal destinations being retained as they are. The Highways Agency intends to continue engagement with Heathrow regarding the Detailed Design and traffic management for the Scheme. | No |
| Mainline Junctions 4a – 5 | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 13/11/2014 | 087 | British Pipeline Agency Limited | <p>Thank you for the consultation regarding the above planning application.</p> <p>The proposed works are in close proximity to a high-pressure petroleum pipeline system and we wish to enquire that any works in the vicinity of the pipeline are carried out in accordance with our safety requirements.</p> <p>The most important points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) These Pipelines carry refined petroleum at extremely high pressure. 2) Any construction must be kept to a minimum of 3m from the pipelines. 3) All excavations (including hand trail holes) within 3m of the pipeline must be approved and supervised by us. Before any work (including hand trial holes) starts in the vicinity, our Technician must locate and mark the pipeline on site. BPA require a minimum of 7 days notice to arrange supervision (under normal circumstances). 4) The exact location of the pipeline to be marked by us in consultation with the developer prior to detailed design. 5) Nominal cover is only 0.9m (3') 6) Normal vertical clearance for new services in 600mm. 7) These Pipelines are protected by cathodic protection and you should consult us if you are laying HV cables or ferrous services (with or without cathodic protection). 8) Heavy vehicular crossing points to be approved before use across the easement. 9) Tree planting is prohibited within the 3m easement. 10) No lowering or significantly raising of ground level throughout the easement. <p>When planning works involved in crossing or working within the wayleave, plan of work, drawings, Method Statement and Risk Assessment for the written acceptance of our Engineering before works start.</p> | <p>The Agency has engaged with The British Pipeline Agency to obtain information on apparatus in proximity to the Scheme. The Agency will take account of these comments throughout the detailed design of the Scheme, and will continue to engage with the British Pipelines Agency to ensure the assets are protected. In this regard, protective provisions to protect oil pipeline apparatus have been included in the DCO submitted with the Application.</p> | No |
| Mainline Junctions 5 – 6 | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>The proposed order limits crosses within Chalvey Depot. Chalvey Depot is operated by SBC contractor to deliver refuse/waste/highways etc and Civic Amenity site including Amey Offices. Currently acquiring additional land for capital redevelopment of the whole facility. Red circle highlights SBC land potentially affected. Temporary or permanent land take has potential to impact of this redevelopment short/long term. Depot to remain available to contractor. Redeveloped depot to be available to new contractor by Nov 2017 with a minimum six month prior lead in.</p> <p>SBC owned statutory allotment not affected except potentially boundary which needs to be secured.</p> | <p>Part of Chalvey Depot has been identified as within the limits of land to be used for the Scheme. The land is required temporarily for the conversion of the existing hard shoulder to a running lane, and for the widening of Windsor Rail Bridge. The existing bridge is to be widened on its southern side in order to minimise the effects on residential and business premises.</p> <p>Any land required for the Scheme will be acquired through the Development Consent Order process, which will consider the impact of the Scheme as a result of the compulsory acquisition proposed.</p> | No |
| Non-Specific Location | | | | | |
| 05/12/2014 | 057 | Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution Limited, SSE plc | <p>Response to S85 alert - we need to talk about collaborative working and scheduling our programmes around your work phases. Please provide as much information as possible, as soon as possible.</p> | <p>SSE apparatus has been identified within the limits of the Scheme. The Agency has liaised with SSE's Plant Protection Team which has already provided some initial responses with associated reference numbers for areas of possible impacts on SSE's assets. The Agency is currently awaiting cost estimates from SSE for any required alterations to SEE plant.</p> <p>In addition, protective provisions for the benefit of electricity undertakers are provided in the DCO, which accompanies the Application.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 04/12/2014 | 632 | BT Group plc | <p>BT plant does exist in the vicinity and its position will be located on site if required. Please contact our plant Protection Officer, this will provide you with free on-site advice and check of location for any BT apparatus. Damage however caused is repaired on a chargeable basis.</p> <p>On the information available, alteration or diversion of BT plant will be necessary. This has been highlighted to Halcrow Group Limited who corresponded with our office earlier this year.</p> <p>BT has no objections to the proposal providing any costs of diversionary work necessitated are born by the applicant.</p> | <p>The Agency identified BT plant as part of the Scheme's research, and continues to engage with BT as part of its stakeholder engagement processes.</p> <p>Any of BT's assets affected by the Scheme will be covered by protective provisions for the benefit of operators of electronic communications code networks, which have been provided in the DCO.</p> | No |
| ITS and Lighting | | | | | |
| 27/01/2015 | 638 | Winnersh Parish Council | <p>Please find below the comments of Winnersh Parish Council regarding the M4 J 3-12 Smart Motorway Variable Mandatory Speed Limit.</p> <p>The Parish Council is in principle in support of the project. The Parish Council expresses concern regarding the effect of gantry illuminations on local residents, particularly those adjacent to King Street Lane, Winnersh. The Council asks for these effects to be minimised.</p> | <p>The impact of road and gantry lighting on residential receptors is considered in Chapter 8 of the ES, Landscape. This shows that there will be a no change magnitude of impact on the baseline night time landscape resulting in a neutral significance of effect</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Additionally, Slough Borough Council recommends that there is a potential to explore further links between Slough Borough Council's ITS strategy and the Highways Agency's use of signs, gantries and technology as part of the Smart Motorways scheme.</p> | <p>The Highways Agency welcomes collaboration with local authorities and will continue liaison with Slough Borough Council throughout the Detailed Design stage.</p> | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 129 | North Wessex Downs AONB | <p>It is recommended that should existing lighting be replaced the opportunity should be made to reduce the impact of light pollution on the AONB through directional downlighting and an appropriate level of LED lighting and not to increase existing levels of "sky glow."</p> | <p>We agree with the suggested approach and this is the proposed lighting solution in the Preliminary Design. The lighting design will use the latest LED luminaires with a central management control system, for the lighting levels to be remotely controlled to allow dimming of lighting levels, and even switching off, to ensure that levels are appropriate to the level of road use. The design will be finalised during the detailed design stage. .</p> | No |
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | <p>Lighting - We note that the Highways Agency has not finalised the lighting scheme and we wish to be consulted on any proposals when available.</p> | <p>The lighting design will use the latest LED luminaires with a central management control system, for the lighting levels to be remotely controlled to allow dimming of lighting levels, and even switching off, to ensure that levels are appropriate to the level of road use. The design will be finalised during the detailed design stage.</p> | No |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon, Mandip Malhotra | <p>With regard to proposals for lighting, it is understood that the extent of lighting is currently under review. It is requested that where possible lighting should be removed. However if new lighting is required, catenary lighting should be considered.</p> | <p>No lighting will be removed as part of the Scheme. The existing lighting will be replaced with the latest LED luminaires with a central management control system, for the lighting levels to be remotely controlled to allow dimming of lighting levels, and even switching off, to ensure that levels are appropriate to the level of road use. The design will be finalised during the detailed design stage.</p> | No |
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | <p>Lighting</p> <p>The lighting scheme should be developed with potential impacts upon bats and invertebrates in mind. It may be possible to consider the placement of lights in relation to sensitive adjacent habitats e.g. woodlands and rivers, or the timing of their use and the lighting levels. Bats can be significantly impacted by light levels and the type of lighting. For more information refer to:</p> <p>http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html</p> | <p>The lighting design will use the latest LED luminaires with a central management control system, for the lighting levels to be remotely controlled to allow dimming of lighting levels, and even switching off, to ensure that levels are appropriate to the level of road use. The design will be finalised during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The white light produced by LEDs, as far as the latest research has established, has the lowest, in any, impact on bats.</p> | No |
| Land Owners | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 05/12/2014 | 011 | Environment Agency, Sam Smith | Request for more information on the plans sent as part of the land referencing process | Information was provided as requested. This was in relation to previous correspondence, not the S42 consultation. | No |
| 26/11/2014 | 057 | Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution Limited | There are sections of the highway which has our cabling running under, over and parallel, bridges our cabling runs through and of course cabling supplying electrical feeds to your existing apparatus on the road (power for loops, CCTV, VMS & lighting etc). As soon as the public consultation and development consents are completed can we arrange a meeting to discuss quote and programme what additional feeds and disconnections of supplies are required within your expansion site for your assets. Also we can make arrangements for vegetation clearances and maintenance / renewal to our overhead and buried cables running adjacent to your proposed sites as although they are not within your works boundaries I would like to get their works completed before your works start as understandably with a scheme this size you'll have temporary depots and materials storage areas which I would like for to keep our staff and works away from when they are in full flow as I am sure you don't want us tree cutting or suspending your supply. | The Agency identified SSE plant as part of the Scheme's research, and continues to engage with SSE teams as part of its stakeholder engagement processes. The Agency engaged with SSE to obtain information on the company's apparatus. Commencing in February 2014 it made requests to SSE for C3 estimates of costs to deal with SSE apparatus affected by the Scheme. The engagement by SSE in response to the C3 requests was welcome and helpful and the information provided has been very useful in the Scheme's development. Any of SSE's assets affected by the Scheme will be covered by protective provisions for the benefit of Electricity undertakers, which have been provided in the DCO. | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 092 | Affinity Water Limited | Please can you give us our reference and confirm who has been dealing with the matter? | The company has been identified as a statutory consultee under section 42 (1) (a) of the Planning Act 2008 and also as having apparatus within the limits of the scheme (and therefore also consulted under section 42 (1) (d)). This apparatus has been identified through C3 estimate correspondence with an Assistant Project Manager in Developer Services at the company. | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 127 | ESP Connections Limited | I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works. | The response is noted. | No |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | With regard to construction impacts, the submitted general arrangement plans viewed to date do not clarify the scope / extent of either permanent or temporary work on individual sites. As more detailed proposals become available, they should be accompanied by existing / proposed levels surveys, and tree / vegetation surveys, - supported by plans and appropriate cross-sections to a suitable scale. | The Application for a Development Consent Order will be accompanied by a set of plans and drawings compiled in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. | No |
| 21/11/2014 | 251 | BT Group plc, BTC Group, BT Wholesale Limited, British Telecommunications plc, Telereal Trillium Limited | I confirm that I have been unable to identify any land or buildings owned or occupied by BT or Telereal Trillium within the area you have indicated. Please be aware that this advice does not extend to BT's telecommunications apparatus located in the public highway or under private land, nor does it include BT's deed level tunnels. | The response is noted. BT's telecommunications apparatus has been addressed separately. | No |
| Need for smart motorway | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Safety considerations</p> <p>Slough Borough Council would finally like to recommend that the safety elements of the scheme are seriously addressed and publicised. It is our recommendation that adequate marketing and awareness raising needs to be undertaken in order to make residents aware of how to react in the event of an emergency situation on a motorway with no hard shoulder. This is particularly important in Slough, where a large number of residents use the motorway every day.</p> | <p>The Highways Agency has developed national campaign material to help deliver the smart motorways message which is located on its website: http://www.highways.gov.uk/publications/smart-motorways-campaign-material/</p> <p>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, 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.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Scheme has held public information exhibitions and provided unmanned information boards at motorway service areas adjacent to the Scheme to help local understanding. The Agency will continue working with local councils throughout the proposed works.</p> | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London | <p>TfL needs to understand how the M4 will be 'smartly' managed. What are the main objectives? What will HA be doing on a daily basis to meet these objectives? How will HA be monitoring their performance?</p> | <p>As requested by TfL, a meeting was held on 9 December 2014 to discuss this issue, allowing them to provide a full response to the consultation by the close of the consultation period. The full response is listed under reference 106.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council - Highways Department | <p>Following receipt of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, support info and Consultation document Wokingham Borough Council has the following comments:</p> <p>The council support the objectives of the scheme and specifically welcomes the acknowledgment that the M4 motorway needs to be improved to reduce congestion and support the economy which in turn will facilitate further economic growth within the region. Wokingham Borough Council along with the other Thames Valley Local Authorities and the Thames Valley LEP recognise the importance of the M4 as a major strategic route through out support for the HA's local pinch point scheme to improve the M4 junction 10 thus ensuring good connection for our residents to London, the West of England and Wales, the M25 and Heathrow.</p> <p>The Council also supports the principals of the proposed smart motorway scheme.</p> | <p>The response is noted.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 16/12/2014 | 263 & 491 | Metropolitan Police Service, | <p>Further to your letter of 10th November 2014 the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) acknowledges and supports the need for greater capacity and improved journey time reliability on the M4 motorway between the M25/Heathrow Airport and central London.</p> <p>We accept that the aim of the infrastructure modifications that accompany the conversion of the hard shoulder to a permanent running lane is to support a managed motorway environment, in terms of Variable Mandatory Speed Limits (VMSLs) and lane control. However, it remains our view that the level of engineering interventions on existing All Lane Running (ALR) motorways does not deliver acceptable levels of safety in accordance with our relevant duty of care responsibilities, both to members of the public and our own officers and employees. The ALR concept also impacts on routine police patrol and officers may find themselves in situations of increased risk as they conduct necessary enforcement activities (e.g. tactical pursuit and containment).</p> <p>As you will be aware following continuing discussions with the MPS Traffic Management Unit, we have many concerns in regard to the ALR concept, primarily regarding the design and lack of intervisibility between many of the lane control signals, the distance between and size of Emergency Refuge areas (ERAs) and the removal of street lighting on links between junctions. It is our view therefore that if the M4 ALR specification is fundamentally unaltered from existing designs, then this raises significant safety, response and operational challenges for the MPS which we should like to place on record.</p> <p>In addition to our general concerns in regard to the ALR specification, there are particular operational and policing issues raised by employing this concept on the M4 motorway. The M4 link between M25/Heathrow Airport and Central London is clearly a critical part of the capital's infrastructure. Any changes that make monitoring vehicles or individuals using it more difficult, or increase the potential for serious collisions and subsequent prolonged road closures are a cause for concern, not only for the management of traffic flows and collisions but also in terms of crime and counter terrorism. The retention of street lighting and Police Observation Points (POPs) therefore are vital on this link. The design of the motorway between junctions 4 and 4B, with a very wide central reservation and, in ALR form, five lanes on each carriageway, also introduces operational and safety challenges in regards to incident response and resources required.</p> <p>The MPS has been engaged in dialogue with the Highways Agency (HA) since the first proposals for ALR on M25 were received. You will be aware that we made strong representations objecting to the scheme from the outset. In the relatively short period that ALR has been operating between junctions 23 and 27 there has been insufficient time for meaningful analysis, particularly of serious road traffic collisions. We acknowledge that initial data, in terms of live lane breakdowns and incidents is broadly in line with HA predictions but, at this early stage, our concerns remain. Whilst acknowledging that VMSLs have been proven to reduce overall collisions, you will be aware that our primary concern is in regard to serious or fatal collisions resulting from a broken down vehicle stopping in a live lane. This is a collision scenario that all agree is more likely to occur with ALR, and it is noteworthy that Essex Police recently recorded four such broken down vehicle collisions in a three week period on their section of the ALR M25.</p> <p>We refer to our letter of December 2012 which addressed in detail issues regarding proposed changes to M25. The same issues are relevant to the M4 scheme, and whilst we acknowledge that much detailed design work remains to be carried out, we must reiterate our continued objection to the ALR concept which we believe is fundamentally flawed in terms of safety with the current/proposed level of engineering interventions. The significant risk it represents is not balanced by the control measures proposed, which we believe to be insufficient, nor mitigated by the capacity gains that are expected to result from the scheme. Your earlier letter (Ref: 39514451-PIN-00-ZZ-DB-CO-3226) of 3 November 2014</p> | <p>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 discretionary stops (i.e. illegal stops) outnumber breakdowns by between 8 and 10 times. These are usually drivers stopping to use their mobile phone, read a map, etc.</p> <p>During the 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 emergency refuge area (not affected by emergency refuge area spacing). Of the remaining 29 per cent, there would be a percentage that was able to reach an emergency refuge area, or exit the network, hard shoulder intra-junction (if present). The information in this paragraph was provided by the RAC in response to a consultation on managed motorways.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Some broken down vehicles will not be capable of 'limping' to a refuge area and will come to a stop in a live running lane but, the extra controls provided through smart motorways' features will mitigate this risk. This is achieved by creating an emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway) and 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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>For those who breakdown (particularly at night) and cannot get off the carriageway or to an emergency refuge area, the advice is that drivers should put their hazard warning lights on to help other drivers and our staff see them. If they are in the left hand lane, they should exit the vehicle via the left-hand door, if it is safe to do so and wait behind the</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| | | | <p>to Simon Wickenden of our Traffic Management Unit acknowledges our concerns and reveals your continuing research into some of these issues. As there will be a continuing dialogue between the HA and key stakeholders including the MPS in regard to the detailed design of this scheme, we do not propose to address further detail of these matters in this letter.</p> <p>In summary, it is our view that the ALR proposals for the M4 motorway significantly increase the risk of collisions involving stationary vehicles and will impact negatively on our ability to both routinely access live lane incidents quickly and maintain effective police operations. We fully expect dialogue between the HA and MPS to continue as we work towards joint solutions to mitigate the risks and operational difficulties that ALR presents. We should be pleased if you will address all future correspondence to Simon Wickenden of our Traffic Management Unit at: 11 Grove Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 4AG.</p> | | |
| 20/12/2014 | 416/579 | London Fire Brigade Enterprises Limited, | The London Fire Brigade are standing members of the M25 ALR Smart Motorway emergency services group; this group has helped all agencies to better understand the potential impacts of a change of road use, and the associated joint working principles that may be required to deal with incidents on this section of motorway during construction and for the finished system. We consider that replication of the constitution of the M25 group to the M4 would be considered good practice, and that London Fire Brigade will be included within the group. | Engagement has been undertaken centrally with leaders of Emergency Services who represent their respective governing bodies: Association of Chief Police Officers ("ACPO"), Chief Fire Officers Association ("CFOA") and Association Ambulance Chief Executives ("AACE"). Additionally, central engagement has also been undertaken with Emergency Services' incident responders, the main concerns that have transpired are: restricted access to incidents, the increased risk to breakdowns outside peak traffic times and the increased demand and risk that All Lane Running ("ALR") places upon day to day emergency service operations. The Agency is working with ACPO, practitioners and Project managers collaboratively at a local Scheme level, and would welcome the opportunity to continue close engagement with the emergency services going forward. | No |
| Noise | | | | | |
| 16/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | We are concerned that there will be an increase in noise levels as a result of the scheme. There are no proposals to provide additional protection from noise to the sensitive receptors, other than some locations of low noise surfacing, especially in areas identified under the Noise Action Planning. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report states there will be a negligible increase in noise levels but an increase greater than 3dB does represents a doubling of sound pressure level. | <p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA for the Scheme. It is predicted that there will be negligible changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. The noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). Some additional noise barriers will be provided. 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 entire extent of the Scheme.</p> | Yes |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 22/02/2015 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | <p>Wokingham Borough Council is concerned about proposals for noise mitigation along the route of the extended motorway.</p> <p>The documentation is not clear about the exact extent of noise mitigation or its form but during the consultation period there has been communication between the Highways Agency and John Redwood and local Councillors that suggests there will be some noise barriers and a low noise surfacing. It is now our understanding that low noise surfacing will be used along the entire stretch of motorway that passes through the Borough. It would be very helpful to have confirmation of this.</p> <p>I understand that the Highways Agency have given an assurance to John Redwood that there will be noise barriers installed along the motorway at Sindlesham. There are a number of hot spots of noise pollution caused by traffic on the M4 through the Borough. In addition to Sindlesham there are areas in Earley, Emmbrook and Winnersh as well as areas of Shinfield that would greatly benefit from physical noise protection.</p> <p>We would like an assurance that all opportunities to improve noise mitigation are taken as part of this project regardless of whether it falls within the statutory requirement to do so.</p> <p>Noise from fast moving traffic on a busy motorway is a major cause of stress to many residents within Wokingham Borough and this project represents an excellent opportunity to reduce that impact.</p> | <p>No additional noise barriers are proposed for this 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). 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 entire extent of the Scheme. It is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation, as reported in the ES.</p> | Yes |
| 16/12/2014 | 006 | West Berkshire District Council | <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report details the location of the construction compounds. There is the likelihood that existing sensitive receptors will be affected by noise and air quality from the compounds due to their very close proximity. It is recommended that application under Prior Consent of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 is made to West Berkshire Council to protect the residents from noise and also prepare a construction management plan to include air pollution (including dust and vehicle and plant emissions).</p> | <p>Noise and air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme. An Outline CEMP is provided with the Application, which includes measures to control impacts from construction. The Agency will review whether an application under COPA 1974 is necessary or appropriate in the circumstances..</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>15.0 Road traffic noise is the most pervasive environmental noise source in the UK affects more than 92% of dwellings in England and Wales, 2% are affected by motorway noise, and prolonged exposure to high levels of road traffic noise can give cause to harm to public health through impact on cognitive processing and learning, particularly children, heightened annoyance, anxiety and stress which may lead to cardiovascular disease⁶.</p> <p>16.0 The European Noise Directive (2002/49/EC) aims are "define a common approach intended to avoid, prevent or reduce on a prioritised basis the harmful effects, including annoyance, due to the exposure to environmental noise". The Directive Member States to monitor environmental noise problems (using the Lden and Lnight), informing and consulting the public about noise exposure and its effects, addressing local noise issues (no limit value is currently defined, unlike for air quality) and developing a long-term EU strategy (principally aimed at reducing the number of people affected by noise in the longer term). Member States are required to draw up 'strategic noise maps for major roads, railways, airports and agglomerations'⁷. These were enshrined within English Legislation under the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006, as amended.</p> <p>17.0 For new or improved highways, the Land Compensation Act 1973 allowed regulations to be promulgated to provide compensation for dwellings affected by increased noise. These regulations are the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975, as amended 1988. If certain criteria are met, the highway authority must offer secondary glazing and alternative ventilation for habitable rooms of dwellings so affected. This relates to new highway or altered highways where additional carriageway is being constructed. Properties within 300m of the highway will be eligible if the use of a highway causes or is expected to cause noise at a level not less than the specified level L 10 (18-hour) of 68dB(A). if—</p> <p>(a) the relevant noise level is greater by at least 1dB(A) than the prevailing noise level and is not less than the specified level, and</p> <p>(b) noise caused or expected to be caused by traffic using or expected to use that highway makes an effective contribution to the relevant noise level of at least 1dB(A).</p> <p>18.0 DEFRA has also adopted a Noise Action Plan to reduce road noise (including major roads)¹⁰. The Action Plan aims to promote good health and good quality of life (wellbeing) through the effective management of noise. This Action Plan will be relevant to highways authorities, including the Highways Agency. It is intended that this Action Plan will assist the management of environmental noise in the context of Government policy on sustainable development. It has been estimated that the approximate number of people associated with the Important Areas (noise "hotspots") identified through the process described in the Action Plan for the major roads outside agglomerations is just under 51,000. However the Important Area is not defined but is likely to close to the specified level quote above. It is noted the last round of noise mapping took place in 2012 and next round in 2017 it will need to take account of the increase capacity on the M4 when it is fully operational in 2022.</p> <p>19.0 The M4 has been strategically noise mapped and there are a number of noise hotspots identified these are referred to under DEFRA guidance 'Important Areas'. Within the Slough jurisdiction there are 8 'Important Areas'. The Highway Agency has submitted plans to reduce the road traffic noise (including the use of noise barriers, and low noise surfacing).</p> | <p>There are 39 Important Areas ("IAs") between junctions 3 and 12 of the M4, 8 of which are in the Slough jurisdiction. The Noise Action Plans for these IAs were consulted in the development of the mitigation strategy for the Scheme. With only one exception (an IA not in the Slough area), the investigation outcomes were the provision of low noise surfacing or no further works planned.</p> <p>Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). There will be 6 additional noise barriers in the Slough area - one between J7 and J6 and five between J6 and J5. No additional noise barriers are proposed between J5 and J4b.</p> <p>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 entire extent of the Scheme.</p> <p>With the additional noise barriers and the low noise surfacing, it is predicted that there will be negligible or minor decreases in noise levels to properties between J7 and J4b with the Scheme in operation.</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out to ascertain whether any residential properties within the Scheme corridor might qualify under the Noise Insulation Regulations ("NIR"). The outcome is that no properties would satisfy the NIR criteria and qualify.</p> <p>An assessment of construction noise and vibration impacts is provided in the Environmental Statement and will be fully developed in the CEMP. A range of good site practices will be adopted in order to mitigate construction phase noise and vibration. These will be secured in the CEMP, an Outline version of which accompanies the DCO application.</p> <p>On Scheme opening, it is predicted that only 2 residential properties would experience a minor increase in noise level of just over 1 dB (out of a total of 23025 residential properties in the detailed study area). Only 505 residential properties would experience a negligible increase in noise levels (< 1 dB). The remaining properties would experience no change or decreases in noise level.</p> <p>In the long term, with the Scheme in operation, it is predicted that no residential properties would experience increases in noise levels greater than negligible. If the Scheme did not go ahead, approximately 13% of residential properties in the detailed study area would experience negligible increases in noise levels, when compared to the Do Minimum scenario in 2022. With the Scheme in operation, approximately 20% of residential properties in the detailed study area would experience negligible increases in noise levels, when compared to the Do Minimum scenario in 2022. The maximum increase would only be approximately 1.7 dB.</p> | Yes |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>20.0 The World Health Organisation (WHO) has recommended a night time noise guidelines of L_{night}, outside 40 dB and an interim target of L_{night}, outside 55 dB. The latest DEFRA Action Plan advises that just less than 1 million people in England experience road traffic noise L_{night}, outside 55 dB. The onset of significant community annoyance in the daytime is observed above levels of Leq, 16 hours 55 dB. The DEFRA Action Plan identifies more than 2 million people experience road noise above this level.</p> <p>21.0 Therefore the M4 road traffic noise and air pollution are material impacts to be fully considered by the Planning Inspector. Exposure to elevated levels of road traffic noise and air pollution directly links to public health outcomes. The Highway Agency needs to ensure that if the proposed smart M4 leads to an increase in noise levels and air pollution above EU limits, mitigation is required to prevent unacceptable exposure to residents.</p> <p>31.0 With reference to the EPI we note and comment specifically as follows on chapter 6 Air Quality and chapter 12 Noise and Vibration affecting Slough.</p> <p>40.0 A detailed noise assessment of demolition, piling and construction will need to be completed within the CEMP and will need to be approved by the Local Authority.</p> <p>41.0 It is noted within the noise study that 44,259 residential properties and 74 schools, 52 places of worship, 54 community facilities and 1 hospital lie within 1km of the scheme. All of these are considered sensitive receptors. A do-nothing and do-something assessment has been undertaken to compare the existing with proposed scheme. It is noted the EU does not specify noise limits.</p> <p>42.0 Also it is assumed the entire stretch of the M4 between junction 3 and 12 would have been resurfaced with a low-noise surface, however in the submission the Highway Agency proposes to resurface the existing hard shoulder and far-side lane, so clarification is required on this issue?</p> <p>43.0 It is noted seven properties experience a minor increased in road traffic noise levels as a result of the scheme against do minimum scenario and 27% experience a negligible increase in noise when comparing the opening year of scheme with existing. When comparing 2037 (scheme open 15 years) against do minimum of 2022 29% of residents experience a negligible increase.</p> <p>44.0 Between Junction 7 and 6 (6,878 residential properties lie within 1km of the motorway). One additional noise barrier is to be erected and 5 existing noise barriers and low noise of the carriageway already in place. Junction 6 to 5 (6,450 residential properties lie within 1km of the motorway) (5 additional noise barriers to erected and low noise surfacing of two sections of the carriageway). Junction 5 to 4b (3,012 residential properties lie within 1km of the motorway) 7 existing noise barriers and 5 sections with low-noise surfacing. There will be 4 additional barriers and low noise surfacing of 2 sections of the motorway).</p> <p>45.0 It is clear M4 with or without the scheme exposes significant numbers of residents above the WHO interim target of L_{night}, outside 55 dB level, there is clear evidence of impacts to public health above this level. The motorway is noisy and has 8 Important Areas within the Slough jurisdiction that require noise mitigation even without the scheme. There is a requirement on the Highways Agency under the DEFRA Noise Action Plan to take steps to minimise noise the local authority.</p> <p>46.0 The following environmental noise information is required with respect to the smart motorway scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> We would request detailed noise mapping of all our residential properties within Slough both do minimum and do something? <input type="checkbox"/> We seek clarification of all slough residential properties that may be entitled to noise compensation or insulation under the Land Compensation Act 1973 and the Noise | <p>Slough Borough Council Planning Department request further information, namely:- Detailed noise mapping of all residential properties within Slough for both Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios.</p> <p>This information is available, but does not form part of the Environmental Statement, which presents noise change contours. A separate package of information was provided to Slough Borough Council Planning Department.</p> | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>Insulation Regulations 1979, as amended 1988. ?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It appears that a significant number of properties will experience (what is termed a negligible increase of more than 1dB as a result of this scheme, but how many will also experience the specified level of L 10 (18-hour) of 68dB(A)?</p> | | |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>An acoustic barrier will be required, as a matter of course, along the entire length of the motorway widening, especially where it runs in close proximity to residential or noise sensitive premises. It is also expected that if a new lane is effectively being created, then the traffic flow and vehicle movements would naturally increase to the new capacity, and with that would come an increase in traffic noise.</p> <p>It is understood that the noise monitoring took place in various locations along the stretch, and some of these were in the borough. One of these points was by the Sipson Road where the M4 runs in an elevated section behind several rows of houses, and that some acoustic barrier works were planned but the maps on the public consultation merely state that there are noise sensitive premises within a 1km radius of the motorway. The Highways Agency have stated verbally that low noise tarmac will be applied and barriers erected, as well as keeping the current barriers in place but there is no written confirmation in the provided reports that this will be used on the sections where noise would be an issue.</p> <p>Confirmation and details of these proposals is therefore required to allow further comments can be made. The information provided has been limited and as such Officers are unable to make appropriate detailed comments at this time. At the very least Officers would like to see some form of confirmation that the monitoring was carried out in accordance with use of CRTN and the design manual for roads and bridges - no results have been given of the L90 or any other standard measurements and this information is therefore requested.</p> <p>Based on the information available, any noise monitoring must be carried out in accordance with the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and the mediation measures are installed so that the background noise does not exceed that of the current levels. These results must be made available to the Environmental Protection Unit so that further comment can be made.</p> | <p>It is not considered that an acoustic barrier is required along the entire length of the Scheme. 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.</p> <p>As stated above, low noise surfacing will be employed across all lanes of the Scheme along the complete Scheme extent. Existing noise barriers will be retained or replaced like-for-like (including those between J3 and J4). A small number of additional noise barriers are proposed (none are proposed between J3 and J4).</p> <p>Noise monitoring for the Scheme was carried out according to the requirements of the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise' ("CRTN") (DoT, Welsh Office, 1988). All of this information relating to noise monitoring, low noise surfacing, proposed noise barriers and calculated noise level changes resulting from the operation of the is included in the ES. Specific information for the eastern end of the Scheme can be provided to Hillingdon Council.</p> | No |
| 11/02/2015 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | <p>I had some feedback from our local MP that he had been given an assurance that noise barriers that will be installed as part of the M4 smart motorway scheme. In particular along the stretch that runs through Wokingham.</p> <p>I don't recall seeing anything written down to this effect. Are there any specific plans that I can share with our Members here? There is some concern that certain areas will benefit from barriers and others will not.</p> <p>Is John also right in saying that "low noise" surfacing will be used to resurface the entire length of motorway through Wokingham as a part of the project?</p> <p>It would be good to have some clarification on these issues – which are seen as great news for Wokingham residents</p> | <p>No additional noise barriers are proposed for this 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). 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 negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.</p> | Yes |
| Aborefield and Newland Parish | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 15/12/2014 | 231 | Arborfield and Newland Parish Council | There are residents in this Parish [Arborfield & Newland Parish] who live a little over 200 metres from the current highway boundary, and our first concern is for their environment. We note that the initial findings of the Environmental Assessment currently being prepared, issued in the form of Preliminary Environmental Information, are that air quality and noise impacts will be negligible. However, we look forward to seeing the finer detail of the proposals and the associated full environmental assessment. One issue that has been troublesome in recent years is that of reflected noise, caused by the erection of poorly absorbing barriers to protect a community on one side of a road, only to cast a reflected noise envelope over properties on the opposite. | Noise and air quality assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation. These results are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which is submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order. 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). 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. Subsequent to public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. | Yes |
| Barriers | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 086 | The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead - Highways Department | An assessment, using ADMS Urban on the effect of the elevation of Windsor Road - M4 Overbridge on ground level concentrations show that when the elevation is increased by 2 metres ground level concentrations at receptor points decrease by up to 28%. This demonstrates that the use of taller noise barriers would reduce the air quality impact of the M4 on the AQMA. The new noise barriers will also better contain the traffic noise from the new traffic lanes. The noise barriers would need to extend 350 metres to the west and 250 metres to the east of Windsor Road Overbridge. The proposed scheme is an opportunity to mitigate the motorway air quality and noise impact in the area. | Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). There will be some additional noise barriers to mitigate localised noise increases. 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. Subsequent to 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 changes in noise levels in this area with the Scheme in operation. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. | Yes |
| 18/12/2014 | 135 | Dorney Parish Council | NOISE LEVELS It was stated by the Consultant at the Council meeting that noise levels would drop with the use of the hard shoulders. Dorney Parish Council feels deeply concerned by this analysis. We have had similar statements concerning workings between M4 junction 7-8/9 previously which proved woefully inaccurate. Dorney Parish Council is very concerned about noise levels and would like to see existing noise barriers substantially increased as they are ridiculed for their inadequacy. We would like assurances that any future work on the motorway would include low noise surfacing. Noise levels are particularly unacceptable to users of the school. Teachers are unable to take classes outdoors due to the noise of the motorway traffic and this also affects classroom teaching when the windows are open during hot weather. Also concern was raised regards an increase in noise levels during proposed construction work. An invitation was made to the consultants to visit the school in order to experience these problems and the invitation was accepted. | The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process and is reported in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. 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. Subsequent to public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. No additional noise barriers are proposed for this location. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this location. | Yes |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | <p>The Environmental Study compares "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" options. The study assumes an increase in M4 traffic volume but does not consider that this is an issue to be addressed. We note, however, that the Agency is taking the opportunity to address the unsatisfactory drainage of the Motorway. We would like the Agency to adopt a similar approach to the environmental issues arising from the increasing motorway traffic and to ameliorate the effects of noise and atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>Noise - Please explain the logic behind the decision to lay low-noise surfacing on one carriageway but not the other between J8/9 and J7 (part). The current 60Db noise level recorded in Eskdale Gardens during the survey work is unacceptable, see Table 12.6 of the PEI. The seven metre bund constructed over some of the stretch between the A330 overbridge and the A308 underbridge has partially collapsed. The Parish Council has planted some trees to stabilise it and to improve the visual effect. Motorway noise may be heard over a large proportion of Holyport and Bray. The noise amelioration barriers installed are less than two metres high and have no noticeable effect.</p> <p>Recommendation - The BPC suggests raising barriers on both sides of the motorway within the Bray/M4 AQMA. A height of six or seven metres above ground level is suggested. This would ameliorate both the noise and atmospheric pollution experienced by residents. We also suggest the extension of these barriers from, on the south side, the end of the western end of the Westbound on-slip of J8/9 and on the north side from 380metres to the west of the A330 overbridge to a point 350 metres to the east of the A308 underbridge on both sides. The extended barriers could be reduced in height to four or five metres and their length is open to negotiation. Barriers are effective against all noise sources, not just tyre noise, and atmospheric pollution so the BPC would prefer those specified in addition to the low-noise surface currently suggested.</p> <p>The Agency has undertaken to address adverse environmental impacts by minimising them during the detailed design process and the adoption of appropriate working practices. Bray Parish Council wishes to work with the Agency and the Borough Council to meet these objectives and mitigate the risks, ensuring that the impact on the Parish residents is minimised.</p> | <p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. 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.</p> <p>No additional noise barriers are proposed between junction 7 and junction 8/9. There are existing noise barriers in this location, which will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition).</p> <p>It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>Appropriate working practices will be adopted to minimise adverse effects as a result of the Scheme as detailed in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application.</p> | Yes |
| Construction | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>24.0 The hard shoulder will be permanently used for free running across all Slough Junctions, 5, 6 and 7 and will be resurfaced with a quieter road surface, there will also be retaining walls built, new gantries, electronic signs and new replacement bridges, new signage and emergency refuge areas. There will be piling activity and also dust generation. As advised this stretch of road experiences poor air quality and excessive noise from motorway traffic.</p> <p>25.0 The following overbridges in Slough that will be demolished and reconstructed, are Huntercombe Spur, Oldway Lane, Wood Lane, Datchet Road and Recreation Bridge in other words the majority of overbridges and most of these are very close to residential properties. The following underbridges/culverts will also require works within Slough, widening of Windsor Rail underbridge, Junction 5 Langley Interchange (West and East) and Langley subway and Service Culvert in Datchet close to the Myrke.</p> <p>26.0 It is also clear that a significant amount of the smart motorway works will focus on this relatively small stretch of motorway between junction 5 and 7, and in our view Slough is particularly vulnerable and needs special attention with respect to safeguarding of residents from excessive noise and air pollution both during the construction and operational phase.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment undertaken for air quality effects is focussed upon the effect of the Scheme upon local air quality. This includes the evaluation of changes in air quality at sensitive receptors, such as those referred to, due to the Scheme with particular reference to locations anticipated to be subject to poor air quality in the opening year of the Scheme. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. Proposals to control these potential impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP, which accompanies the Application. In addition, the CEMP includes the adoption of appropriate working practices to minimise adverse effects from noise as a result of the Scheme.</p> | No |
| Earley/Winnerish | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 27/01/2015 | 638 | Winnersh Parish Council | Please find below the comments of Winnersh Parish Council regarding the M4 J 3-12 Smart Motorway Variable Mandatory Speed Limit. The Parish Council is in principle in support of the project. The Parish Council expresses concern regarding the effect of noise on residents on local residents, particularly those adjacent to King Street Lane, Winnersh. The Council asks for these effects to be minimised. | 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). 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 negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation. With particular reference to King Street Lane, properties on this link will experience negligible / minor decreases in noise levels. | Yes |
| 08/12/2014 | 136 | Earley Town Council | In considering the proposals, it appeared that they did not include noise barriers and not all lanes were proposed to be surfaced with 'quiet tarmac'. Councillors reiterated the comments previously made to the Highways' Agency regarding the need for quiet tarmac and for adequate and appropriate noise barriers to be provided and particularly where the motorway ran through residential areas. | Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). There will be some additional noise barriers to mitigate localised increases in noise. 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. Subsequent to 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 Earley with the Scheme in operation. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. | Yes |
| Junction 3 | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London | Air Quality and Noise Levels TfL needs to better understand how it will affect air quality and noise levels within its boundary - the Preliminary Environmental Information Report does not indicate this. It is essential to understand what impacts, if any, on air quality and noise levels TfL can expect in west and central London including on the A4, A30, A40 and the A312 as a result of changes in traffic flows. | These roads are outside the detailed study area. However, they were included in the screening process and changes in the Basic Noise Level, resulting from traffic changes due to the Scheme, were calculated. This data can be provided. Meetings were held with TfL on 19 May 2014, and 9 December 2014 to discuss TfL's concerns. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 278 | Greater London Authority | However, given the concerns set above regarding traffic modelling the GLA needs to better understand how the proposal will affect air quality and noise levels within its boundary. It is essential to understand what impacts, if any, on air quality and noise levels can be expected in west and central London including on the A4, A30, A40 and the A312 as a result of changes in traffic flows. The GLA and TfL would welcome further discussion to fully understand the assessment of traffic and therefore air quality and noise. Conclusion At this stage the principle of the M4 Smart Motorway project cannot be supported; however the GLA and TfL wish to have further discussions regarding traffic, air quality and noise implications, particularly for the M4 east of the proposed works. | These roads are outside the detailed study area. However, they were included in the screening process and changes in the Basic Noise Level, resulting from traffic changes due to the Scheme, were calculated. This data can be provided. Meetings were held with TfL on 19 May 2014, and 9 December 2014 to discuss TfL's concerns. | No |
| Road Surface | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council - Highways Department | With regard to noise, whilst the scheme proposes the use of TSCS (low noise surfacing) in some locations residents that live adjacent to the motorway have endured constant and increasing noise pollution for many years. The introduction of the smart motorway scheme will move the running lanes closer to receptors thus causing more discomfort for our residents. The council believe that the Highways Agency should take this opportunity to address this issue for our residents to improve their quality of life and implement additional noise mitigation wherever possible. | Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). There will be some additional noise barriers to mitigate localised increases in noise. 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. Subsequent to 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 changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. | Yes |
| 19/12/2014 | 279 | Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Limited | <p>6. At page 17, in the section NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR CONNECTIVITY... the document goes into more detail, and qualifies the LEP's support as being conditional on appropriate mitigating measures, "We welcome the planned M4 Smart Motorway Scheme from Junction 3 out to Junction 12, due to start construction in 2016. This should include screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>9. Finally at page 19 which describes Package 6 – Enhancing the Strategic Transport Network, the detail of the scheme is again spelled out, "With regard to the strategic road network, we welcome plans for the early implementation of the M4 Smart Motorway scheme but will lobby for it to include appropriate screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>10. The officers have considered the detail of the works proposed by visiting your exhibition and by reading the consultation booklet.</p> <p>11. We note with interest the noise-impact benefits promised from low-noise surfacing and the indication of additional noise barriers to mitigate impacts where increasing traffic noise is anticipated.</p> <p>14. It is therefore apparent that you have already considered the issues raised by the LEP. We hope that your commitment to successful mitigation of these impacts will include a contingency sum for post implementation works where it can be shown that there are unanticipated adverse impacts, or that the mitigation deployed has been unsuccessful.</p> <p>15. We have no comment to make on the fine detail of the proposed new structures and alignments; this is best left to residents and local authorities with detailed knowledge of each location.</p> <p>16. Please contact us again if you have any further questions.</p> | Noise reduction measures are proposed as part of the Scheme. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced like-for-like if in poor condition). There will be some additional noise barriers to mitigate localised increases in noise. 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. Subsequent to 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 changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. Results of the noise assessments are reported fully in the Environmental Statement which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. Noise and vibration monitoring, including real time noise and vibration monitoring, is provided in the Outline CEMP to ensure and demonstrate compliance with all noise and vibration commitments. | Yes |
| Operations and Safety | | | | | |
| Emergency Refuge Areas | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| 10/12/2014 | 238 | Theale Parish Council | <p>Theale Parish Council has considered the consultation documents provided and Members have attended the public meetings and, as a result the council would like to raise the following concerns relating to J11-J12.</p> <p>Unlike the other Smart motorway projects the M4 project would use the hard shoulder on a permanent basis, not just when traffic flows were heavy. Under these circumstances the council is of the opinion that there are too few refuges and they are too far apart to ensure the safety of all motorists. This is a heavily used section of the M4 and there are very frequent incidents on it, partly owing to the sheer volume of traffic. The council would request that the number of refuges in this section is increased so that stricken motorists can exit the carriageway quickly and therefor safely.</p> | <p>Through experience of operating schemes on the M42 and M6 in the West Midlands, the Agency produced a new design standard for schemes starting main construction after 2013, where the hard shoulder is converted into a running lane on a permanent basis and fewer big structures such as gantries and ERAs are needed.</p> <p>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 ERAs will not have a detrimental impact on the safety of the road user.</p> <p>Evidence supports the view that many road users will still be able to make it to an ERA in an emergency, even when the distance is increased.</p> <p>ERAs 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 60mph drivers will still pass one possible 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.</p> <p>Some broken down vehicles will not be capable of 'limping' to a refuge area and will come to a stop in a live running lane, but the extra controls provided through 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.</p> <p>The operational and safety aspects of the Scheme are given in chapters 9 and 10 respectively of the Engineering and Design Report.</p> | No |
| Incident Management | | | | | |
| 12/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London | <p>TfL needs to understand how HA will manage incidents and how it will co-ordinate with TfL's London Street Traffic Control Centre (LSTCC) when the scheme is in operation. Presumably, it is proposed to develop a joint strategy to support existing real-time monitoring currently employed by both TfL and HA?</p> | <p>As requested by TfL, a meeting was held on 9 December 2014 to discuss this issue, allowing them to provide a full response to the consultation by the close of the consultation period. The full response is listed under reference 106.</p> | No |
| 20/12/2014 | 416/579 | London Fire Brigade Enterprises Limited | <p>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.</p> | <p>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 shows that around 90% of stops on the hard shoulder are unnecessary; replacing it with ERAs 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 an ERA.</p> <p>Some broken down vehicles will not be capable of 'limping' to an ERA and will come to a stop in a live running lane, but the extra controls provided through 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.</p> <p>The Agency will use the technology we are installing as part for the Scheme to provide an access route for emergency services. Importantly, this can be provided on any lane.</p> <p>The operational and safety aspects of the Scheme are given in chapters 9 and 10 respectively of the Engineering and Design Report.</p> | No |
| Variable Speed Limit | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 08/12/2014 | 136 | Earley Town Council | It was noted that there was an intention to introduce variable speed limits onto this section of the M4 and this aspect of the proposals was very much welcomed. | 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 be set according to traffic conditions. | No |
| Other | | | | | |
| 26/11/2014 | | Environment Agency | Thank you for your enquiry. As you will appreciate, it is unfortunately not possible for us to provide bespoke comments to each local authority. We have therefore prepared a checklist of issues which we would like to see in Local Transport Plans and their associated Strategic Environmental Assessments. We hope you find this document useful. I have passed it onto our contact in our London office to comment on any possible air quality issues, he will contact you directly if necessary. | The Agency notes this response, and has received a full response listed under reference 490. | No |
| 11/12/2014 | 039 | GTC Pipelines Limited, | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Independent Pipelines Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Independent Power Networks Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Quadrant Pipelines Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | The Electricity Network Company Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | ,Independent Water Networks Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Brookfield Utilities (UK) | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Independent Fibre Networks Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| | | Utility Grid Installations Limited | I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time | This response is noted. | No |
| 21/11/2014 | 075 | Three Rivers District Council | We have no comment to make on the proposals. The M4 is not referred to in any current local planning policy. | This response is noted. | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 085 | Forestry Commission - South East and London Area Office | Thank you for your letter of 10 November. I am writing to advise you that as far as I can ascertain we have no interests that would be directly affected by these proposals. | This response is noted. | No |
| 12/12/2014 | 236 | NHS Wokingham CCG, NHS South Reading CCG, NHS North & West Reading CCG, NHS Newbury and District CCG | Please be informed that we have no specific comments or concerns on the scheme. | This response is noted. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|--|-----------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 17/12/2014 | 237 | The Coal Authority | I refer to your consultation of the 10th November 2014 on the above scheme and your follow up letter of the 20th November 2014. As you will be aware the project is entirely located outside of the defined coalfield. As such there are no issues of ground instability arising from mining legacy or other factors within our remit to be considered. Consequently I can confirm that The Coal Authority has no comments to make on the proposed infrastructure project. | This response is noted. | No |
| 11/12/2014 | 246 | Ealing Council, Ealing Council - Planning Services | In accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended), the Council of the London Borough of Ealing has considered your consultation received 20/11/2014, accompanied by drawing Ref: Correspondence dated 20/11/2014, concerning the following: Site:M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12. Proposal: Smart Motorway Scheme (Statutory Pre-Application consultation until 21st December 2014 Planning Act 2008 Section 42). The Council RAISES NO OBJECTION to the proposal. | This response is noted. | No |
| 20/11/2014 | 248 | Ministry of Defence, Defence Infrastructure Organisation | I can confirm that the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal. | This response is noted. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 277 | Natural England - Consultation Service | Thank you for your consultation on the above. We have no comments to make on the information provided with this consultation. | This response is noted. | No |
| Other Environment/ES Related Responses | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 038 | South Bucks District Council | 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, and described in detail, as part of the EIA process. The results of this assessment, and mitigation measures proposed, are reported in the ES, which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. 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 measures will be developed into a final CEMP by the Contractor, which will be discussed and agreed with Local Authorities. | No |
| 23/12/2014 | 044 | South Bucks District Council | Representing SBDC Environmental Health, I am interested in the long and short term impact. I support the scheme as proposed- but urge a positive approach to protecting local residents and improving long term environmental quality. Smart signage could be used to encourage environmentally friendly driving styles. | The impacts of the Scheme on local communities have been considered, and described in detail, as part of the EIA process. The results of this assessment, and mitigation measures proposed, are reported in the ES, which accompanies the application for a Development Consent Order. 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 measures will be developed into a final CEMP by the Contractor, which will be discussed and agreed with Local Authorities. The comment regarding smart signage is noted. Understanding the needs of road users and providing them with relevant information during their journey is an integral part of the Agency's operations, and the Agency is continually working to improve the delivery of messages to road users. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Slough Borough Council will wish to see appropriate mitigation for adverse landscape, access, and environmental impacts. This mitigation will need to cover issues such as; the overall quality of public amenity spaces; noise mitigation; replacement and new landscape planting, including off-site landscape mitigation where appropriate; security boundary fencing to protect from new running lanes; protection of accesses and design to integrate new easy access measures, especially where accesses traverse slopes which may be raised/steepened by the raising of over-bridges; and safety and protection and restoration measures where access to the works will be across Council land. In the case of the latter, Slough Borough Council would expect the appropriate licence/wayleave arrangements to be made specific to these works. The provision of environmental barriers for the scheme also depends on the outcome of an environmental assessment. It is understood that the M4 through the Borough is identified in DEFRA noise mapping, but this assessment should be ongoing and comprehensive, so that the scheme does not impact negatively upon Slough's environmental objectives and strategies.</p> | <p>Impacts of the proposed scheme on the environment have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment process and mitigation has been proposed where appropriate.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals are set out in the Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference 7.4, Annex A), 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme. These measures will be developed into a final CEMP by the Contractors, which will be agreed with Local Authorities.</p> <p>The effects of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES that accompanies the DCO application.</p> | No |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>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.:</p> <p>Sheet 54/61, Ch 16400 -15500</p> <p>Visual impact of proposed gantry G2 -12 from Little Benty (residential area) to north. Sheet 55/61, Ch 15500 -14600</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Visual impact of proposed gantry G2-07 from the Brambles (residential area) to north.</p> <p>Visual impact of proposed vegetation loss, widening, new gantry from Wordsworth Way (residential area) to north.</p> <p>Sheet 56/61 Ch 14600 - 13700</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sheet 58/61 Ch 13700 -12800</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sheet 59/61 Ch 12800 - 1900</p> <p>Visual impact of gantry G1-05 from Savoy Avenue and Cleave Avenue (residential area) to north.</p> <p>Sheet 60 and 61/61Ch 11900 - 10100</p> <p>Visual / acoustic impact of vegetation removal and road widening to west bound slip road to north of Cranford Park, west of A312 / J3.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>The effects of the Scheme on the receptors identified are addressed in Chapter 8, Landscape of the ES.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 19/01/2015 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | Thank you for your letter dated the 12th December in relation to the M4 Junctions 3-12 Smart Motorway Project. In order to progress with the Environmental Statement for this scheme you have requested assistance in identifying developments for consideration in the cumulative assessment. At present a list has been compiled of all developments within 1km of the scheme. I can confirm that details of the developments currently identified are correct and we are happy for these to be included for consideration within the cumulative assessment. A number of further developments which may be of interest have also been identified and are outlined in the table attached for your consideration. | The Agency can confirm that these developments have been incorporated into the Cumulative Effects assessment at Chapter 16 of the ES. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 257 | Public Health England | <p>PHE notes that we provided a scoping response to the planning inspectorate on 3rd September 2014 and recommend that this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence.</p> <p>PHE notes that the submitted documentation includes an assessment of the likely impacts on human health arising from transport related emissions to air, construction related emissions, and land contamination. We can confirm that we have no objections to the methodologies used for the assessment of health impacts via air, land or water and that we have not identified any significant omissions in the associated documentation. At this time we do not provide comments relating to noise and vibration.</p> <p>In terms of land contamination, PHE accepts that likely impacts can be managed or mitigated by the use of good construction practice which will be included in the forthcoming Construction and Environmental Management Plan. Whilst the development has the potential to impact on several source protection zones PHE acknowledges that this issue predominately falls under the statutory remit of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>We do however note that the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment does not contain a specific section summarising the potential impacts on human health. PHE understands that the promoter will wish to avoid unnecessary duplication but believes that the summation of the possible health impacts from changes to air quality, emissions to water, waste management, and contaminated land into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration.</p> <p>Likewise we note that EMF impacts have not been mentioned. It is possible that the scheme does not result in the movement or construction of any significant sources of EMF but we would ask that this be confirmed or that the necessary assessments be included with the next submissions. We hope that the above is useful but should you have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>We note that the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment does not contain a specific section summarising the potential impacts on human health. Likewise we note that EMF impacts have not been mentioned.</p> | <p>Impacts on health are fully addressed in the various topic-specific chapters of the ES, in accordance with the National Networks National Planning Strategy. No separate health impact chapter of the ES has therefore been provided as there is a need to avoid duplication of information.</p> <p>The Agency can confirm that the Scheme does not result in the movement or construction of any significant sources of EMF.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 279 | Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Limited | <p>6. At page 17, in the section NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR CONNECTIVITY... the document goes into more detail, and qualifies the LEP's support as being conditional on appropriate mitigating measures.</p> <p>"We welcome the planned M4 Smart Motorway Scheme from Junction 3 out to Junction 12, due to start construction in 2016. This should include screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>9. Finally at page 19 which describes Package 6 – Enhancing the Strategic Transport Network, the detail of the scheme is again spelt out,</p> <p>"With regard to the strategic road network, we welcome plans for the early implementation of the M4 Smart Motorway scheme but will lobby for it to include appropriate screening, noise reduction and air quality measures."</p> <p>10. The officers have considered the detail of the works proposed by visiting your exhibition and by reading the consultation booklet.</p> <p>12. Similarly, we note with interest the promised mitigation of adverse landscape and visual impacts through careful siting and design of new structures along with additional planting and screening.</p> <p>14. It is therefore apparent that you have already considered the issues raised by the LEP. We hope that your commitment to successful mitigation of these impacts will include a contingency sum for post implementation works where it can be shown that there are unanticipated adverse impacts, or that the mitigation deployed has been unsuccessful.</p> | <p>The Agency notes that the issues raised by the LEP have been considered.</p> <p>The assessment of visual, noise and air quality effects has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the resultant mitigation proposals are reported in the Environmental Statement which is submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order, and are secured by way of the Outline CEMP and requirements in the DCO.</p> | No |
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | <p>The Highway Agency is proposing to improve a 32 mile stretch of the M4 between junction 3 (Hayes) and junction 12 (Theale) by upgrading it to a smart motorway. Buckinghamshire County Council recognises the benefits the scheme will have when complete, with a reduction in congestion on the M4, smoothing of traffic and improvements in journey time reliability. Careful consideration however needs to be paid to the impact on the County road network during the construction period.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment:</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment is being carried out in two stages; a preliminary environmental report (which forms part of the consultation) and an environmental statement (yet to be made available).</p> <p>The preliminary environmental report is very brief and more detail is required in order that the County Council can provide comprehensive comments. The County Council would wish to be consulted on the environmental statement, which is to contain the full results of the EIA and will accompany the Development Consent Order application.</p> | <p>Effects of the proposed scheme on the environment have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment and mitigation has been proposed where appropriate. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report was intended to inform consultees of the findings of the assessment up to that time. Since then, further assessment work has been undertaken and consultee comments have been considered. The Environmental Statement accompanies the Development Consent Order application and the Agency would be happy to discuss the findings with all Local Authorities.</p> | No |
| 18/12/2014 | 490 | Environment Agency | <p>Waste</p> <p>The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 for dealing with waste materials are applicable for any off-site movements of wastes. The developer as waste producer therefore has a duty of care to ensure all materials removed go to an appropriate permitted facility and all relevant documentation is completed and kept in line with regulations. If any waste is to be used onsite, the applicant will be required to obtain the appropriate waste exemption or permit from us. We are unable to specify what exactly would be required if anything, due to the limited amount of information provided. It is advisable to have a site waste management plan (SWMP) for all new construction projects worth more than £300,000. The level of detail that your SWMP should contain depends on the estimated build cost, excluding VAT. You must still comply with the duty of care for waste. Because you will need to record all waste movements in one direction, having a SWMP will help you to ensure you comply with the duty of care. Further information can be found at http://www.netregs-swmp.co.uk</p> | <p>An Outline Site Waste Management Plan ("SWMP") for the Scheme has been prepared and is appended to the Outline CEMP, as well as an Outline Materials Management Plan ("MMP") and an Outline Logistics Plan. These documents will be further developed and updated by the main contractor, as required, as the Scheme progresses.</p> <p>Waste will be properly managed through the further development and implementation of the Outline CEMP, Outline MMP, Outline Logistics Plan and Outline SWMP and waste capacity within the study area has been considered within the Assessment Section of the ES. While the waste assessment does not include the promotion and operation of the waste infrastructure sites in these areas, the sites included in the Outline SWMP have been confirmed by the local authorities to have the capacity and capability to manage the waste produced by the Scheme, as well as valid licences and consents.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP and Outline MMP also outline that all waste management contractors and/or the main contractor will be required to be in possession of appropriate licences, permits, waste transfer notes, hazardous waste consignment notes and waste exemptions.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 05/12/2014 | 631 | Reading Borough Council | 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 chapter of the ES, and are shown on drawing 16.1 in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement. | No |
| Scheme Construction | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | Firstly, we strongly believe that a mechanism must be established in order to recover the cost incurred by Slough Borough Council as a result of the ongoing technical appraisal with the Highways Agency, and consultants acting on the Agency's behalf. Moreover, a number of side road orders and Public Rights of Way diversion/temporary closure orders will need to be processed, for which the legal and staff costs will need to be reimbursed by the Highways Agency. The total cost based on the M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway Public Consultation proposals would be around £14,000 for temporary closure orders, permanent public path diversions and creation agreement. Cost concerns about the scheme have been raised at a Berkshire-wide level, and other local authorities have also expressed concerns about these cost implications. We therefore consider that these concerns should be considered and rectified as a matter of priority. | The Highways Agency has been investigating avenues available to pay for reviews of information by Slough BC on the M4 Junctions 3 to 12 smart motorway. Unfortunately, the Agency is unable to pay for any fees associated with Slough BC reviewing the design of the Scheme. | No |
| Construction Programme | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 038 | South Bucks District Council | 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. | Detail on construction of the Scheme is provided in the Engineering Design Report ("EDR") (Document Reference 7.3). A number of areas in South Bucks have been considered in the air quality assessment. At Lake End Road, the receptor closest to the junction is predicted to experience a medium (+2.8 µg/m ³) increase with a do something annual mean concentration of NO ₂ of 47.7 µg/m ³ . At Dorney, the property on Meadow Way closest to the M4 is predicted to experience a medium (2.0 µg/m ³) increase in annual mean NO ₂ concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place above the objective the objective value (40.4 µg/m ³). All other properties to the south of the M4 in this area are predicted to experience a small (0.7 - 1.4 µg/m ³) increase in annual mean NO ₂ concentrations, and predicted annual mean concentrations with the Scheme in place below, or well below, the objective the objective value (23.2 - 30.9 µg/m ³). For receptors located between junctions 5 and 4b, three receptors are predicted to experience a small (up to +0.8 µg/m ³) increase in concentrations below, or just below, the objective value (35.1-37.5 µg/m ³) and one receptor an imperceptible increase (<0.4 µg/m ³), well below the objective (26.5 µg/m ³). Receptors located along the M40 are predicted to experience imperceptible decreases (-0.3-<0.1µg/m ³) in annual mean NO ₂ concentrations. Overall, these results, along with the results predicted elsewhere in the study area, are considered not to be significant for air quality. | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | We note the works are expected to commence in 2016 and continue for a period of 5 years until 2021. We would request the phasing of the works is started from junction 3 to 7 first to prevent significant cumulative impacts which may occur if Davies Commission recommends the expansion of Heathrow, as this will also involve significant alterations to the M25 and could lead to significant congestion on the strategic and local road network and significant localised impacts on air quality. | The western section of the scheme (Junction 12 to Junction 8/9) should be more straightforward and quicker to build than the eastern section (Junction 8/9 to Junction 3). This is due to the presence of significant 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. A contractor for the Scheme has not yet been appointed by the Agency but the Agency is closely monitoring the developments at Heathrow so they can be considered prior to confirmation of the proposed delivery phasing. | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | 4) Disruption caused by the construction of the A330 overbridge - We expect this to be significant even though the replacement bridge can be built alongside the current one. The construction traffic causes concern as simultaneous to the M4 programme we anticipate major housing development and infrastructure projects in the area. We would like to discuss the scheduling of works to minimise disruption. | <p>The Agency will aim to minimise the disruption to A330 traffic during the construction of the replacement overbridge. Details on the traffic management will be developed once a Contractor has been appointed to the Scheme. The effects of this construction are detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES.</p> <p>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.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 276 | Wokingham Town Council | <p>Wokingham Town Council's Planning & Transportation Committee has studied the details of this scheme and wish to make the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The overall time frame for the project should be published, as "a period greater than 18 months" is open-ended. * The time frame for each phase and stage of the works should be specified. * The construction work on the highway and structures should be staggered to minimise disruption to commuter journeys, both on the motorways and on adjacent feeder routes. | <p>An indicative time chainage diagram was included as part of the consultation documents showing an overall duration of the Scheme (five years) and initial estimates for the different areas of work. A detail 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.</p> <p>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 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.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 279 | Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Limited | <p>1. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP welcomes the proposals to introduce Smart Motorway provisions on the M4 between Junction 3 and Junction 12.</p> <p>2. This support was endorsed at the meeting of the Executive Board held on Tuesday 9 December, 2014.</p> <p>3. That meeting confirmed its support for the Highways Agency proposals as presented in the public consultation exercise in November 2014, and drew on the following statements from the Thames Valley Berkshire Strategic Economic Plan¹ as the basis for its support.</p> <p>4. The Strategy, at page 2 includes a positive reference to this scheme in the preface, “[The Strategy needs] improvements to the M4 motorway to proceed sooner, rather than later, and certainly on schedule”</p> <p>5. At page 9, in the section OUR CONNECTIVITY, the arguments for transport investment are fully rehearsed, “The biggest single risk to the future economic contribution of TVB concerns our transport and communications infrastructure. “WHY OUR CONNECTIVITY MATTERS “The growth of our economy has been – and continues to be – fundamentally shaped by our connectivity: “[...]” “the importance of our links with London cannot be overstated – particularly through the M4 motorway, the Great Western Mainline and the Reading to Waterloo Mainline”</p> <p>7. The IMPLEMENTATION PLAN sets out in more detail what projects will deliver the aims and objectives of the Strategy. At page 4 (in Box 1.1), the scheme is mentioned by name in the summary section, “We need commitments from central government to deliver national transport priorities to schedule –particularly Western Rail Access to Heathrow and M4 motorway improvements”</p> <p>8. At page 9 in the detail of “Our ask” in Box 2.1 the document reiterates the need for this scheme to proceed, “We need firm commitments from government to deliver Western Rail Access to Heathrow (WRATH) as soon as practical and no later than by 2021, and M4 motorway improvements starting in 2016”</p> | <p>The Agency notes the LEP's support for the Scheme. Subject to successfully achieving consent the Agency looks forward to delivery of the Scheme by Winter 2021/2022 supporting the important economic contribution offered by the region.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 12/12/2014 | 426 | West Berkshire District Council | 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. | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Yes |
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | The County Council would also wish to be consulted on the construction proposals and programme for delivery of the M4 Smart Motorway project. Information regarding the origins of bulk construction material and destinations for the bulk waste from the scheme should be provided. Buckinghamshire County Council would wish to comment on routes and times of operations, if it is the Highway Agency's intention to use the County road network. | <p>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.</p> <p>An assessment of materials used in construction of the Scheme and waste generated by the Scheme is provided in Chapter 11 of the ES. An Outline SWMP for the Scheme has been prepared and is appended to the Outline CEMP, as well as an Outline MMP and an Outline Logistics Plan. These documents will be further developed and updated by the main contractor, as required, as the Scheme progresses.</p> <p>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, 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. However, 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.</p> | No |
| Existing Allotments | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | Potential increased noise and pollution impacts on park and allotments. Road safety barriers required adequate to protect tenants. Permanent or temporary impact on approximately 20 tenanted plots. Immediate issue with letting of vacant plots - advance warning preferable. As advised by HA (5th Dec 2014 consultation, The Centre), will continue to re-let annually and HA will address impacts arising at later stage as appropriate. Model car club is park tenant on north side | <p>The Agency is currently discussing alternative access arrangements with Thames Water to either reduce the extent of the works required or remove the need for works entirely. The Agency hopes that this will significantly reduce the impact on the allotments. There will be a temporary impact on an area within the allotments during construction of the water main subway but the land will be returned to allotment use once construction is completed.</p> <p>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, they will be replaced. However, the Agency will not be installing additional noise</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>barriers along the remainder of the allotment boundary. All lanes on this stretch of the M4 will be re-surfaced with low-noise surfacing.</p> <p>The Agency appreciates that dust and vehicle emissions are an undesirable side-effect of construction works. 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. These measures are included in the CEMP, which is part of the Outline Environmental Management Plan, submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>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, and will be based on the Agency's DMRB. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required.</p> | |
| Site Compounds | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 038 | South Bucks District Council | <p>2) The impact of the proposed Construction Sites</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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 been appointed, and the detailed design is still to be developed, the Agency will aim to minimise waste and use of imported materials where practicable and deliver as much material as possible directly to the motorway. This will minimise the construction traffic on local roads. The Agency will fully engage with all the local authorities to ensure it captures their knowledge of the specific issues and sensitive areas and ensure they are considered in the selection of the construction compounds and any proposed mitigations. Following further consideration and consultation comments to date, the Agency no longer proposes to take forward compounds 1, 10, 12 and 13 (compound 10 being relatively close to Iver).</p> | Yes |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>30.0 We also note that at least three or four construction compound will be required and at least one will include site offices, we note that four of the sites are in or close to Slough, we would expect details to be submitted early in the process to the Local Authority and we would also be requiring all site traffic to be at least Euro 6/VI compliant, we would also expect some site vehicles to be plugged in electric (full or hybrid).</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. The Scheme is at preliminary design stage and a contractor to construct the works has not yet been appointed by the Agency. The Agency will fully engage with all the local authorities to ensure it captures their knowledge of the specific issues and sensitive areas and ensure they are considered in the selection of the construction compounds and any proposed mitigations (including initiatives for the specifications for site traffic).</p> | No |
| 10/12/2014 | 238 | Theale Parish Council | <p>The council is also concerned about the proposal to site the depot in Wigmore Lane, Theale. This area is subject to an HSE DPZ as a consequence of being in the 'danger' zone of the Murco Petroleum Depot. The position proposed for the depot also suggest the partial removal of a bund which was originally constructed to protect house in Wigmore Lane from the petroleum depot.</p> | <p>Following further consideration of the suitability of this area and consideration of a number of consultation responses, it is no longer proposed to take this forward as a potential construction compound for the Scheme.</p> | Yes |
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | <p>The construction phase will present its own challenges to the residents of the parish:</p> <p>1) Location of a construction site on the Littlewick Green Show Ground. This location is in close proximity to residential properties, and has been used previously as a construction site, when restrictions in the operating methods were agreed with the contractor. Using the site, within the previous footprint, to service local construction could be acceptable if similar restrictions to the last time were agreed. The use of an enlarged site for the duration of the project, however, would be unacceptable to local residents. Also, between Holyport Village Green and Cresswells Farm the A330 is too narrow for two HGVs to pass; so alternative access routes should be utilised. If this site is used, consideration should be given for a temporary "Works Only" slip road on the A308M or M4 for access rather than the entrance and exit being on the A330.</p> | <p>As this area is the proposed main compound for the Scheme, it is very likely that the Contractor will require a larger area than when the site was used previously. However, the final layout will be agreed following the appointment of a Contractor for the Scheme. When planning the compound layout, the effects on local residents, environment and, particularly in this location, cultural heritage assets will be considered. The compound layout and access arrangements will be considered as sympathetically as practicable. The Agency notes the suggestion regarding the direct construction access onto the A308M but, as there is a scheduled monument adjacent to the A308 in this area, the proposed site area has been curtailed to avoid this area. The Agency will discuss access locations and routes with the local authorities. However, the Contractor is highly likely to access the motorway via the northbound A330 and A308(M).</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Yes |
| 19/01/2015 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council | <p>Farmland off Old Basingstoke Road - Contractor's Compound Location - The site currently identified as a potential location for a contractor's compound (farmland off Old Basingstoke Road) would not be deemed as a suitable location as the site is currently under construction as Park & Ride facility (F/2013/0884).</p> | <p>The Agency notes that the site is currently under construction as a park and ride facility. Whilst still identified as a potential compound the Agency would like to investigate the possibility of agreeing with the Council to the use of part of the area identified.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|--------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 12/12/2014 | 426 | West Berkshire District Council | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Following further consideration of the suitability of compound 1 and consideration of a number of consultation responses, it is no longer proposed to take this forward this site as a potential construction compound.</p> <p>With regards to construction compounds 2 and 3, as the Scheme is at preliminary design stage and a contractor to construct the works has not yet been appointed by the Agency the details of the compound layouts, traffic movements and mitigations have not yet been finalised. The Agency will seek detailed liaison with the council regarding the development of the compounds and routing of vehicles to avoid unsuitable roads and maximise the use of the M4, in connection with the development of the CTMP. The Agency notes the comments regarding the remodelling of the A4/Calcot Retail Park / Dorking Way Junction will contact the Council to discuss this issue in more detail.</p> | Yes |
| Traffic Management | | | | | |
| 20/12/2014 | 416/579 | London Fire Brigade Enterprises Limited | The London Fire Brigade are particularly interested in how emergency access arrangements will be provided and maintained during construction and for the finished system. | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | No |
| Structures | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 038 | South Bucks District Council | <p>1) The impact of bridge closures on the local area</p> <p>The main concerns for SBDC relate to the construction phase. In particular:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Yes |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Construction and traffic management issues</p> <p>Additionally, the Huntercombe Spur (Junction 7) overbridge is due to be replaced under the Highways Agency's proposals. This has the potential to negatively impact the A4 during construction, and may lead to traffic management issues before and during works. Oldway Lane overbridge and Old Slade Lane overbridge are also due to be rebuilt, and their heights increased. Slough Borough Council is concerned that the diversion of the right of way prior to opening these new bridges may have an adverse effect on road users. Moreover, both the Wood Lane overbridge and the Datchet Road overbridge are due to be replaced, and their heights increased. Slough Borough Council believes that these height increases may have an adverse effect on the profile of Wood Lane and Datchet Road, and on residents. Further diversions may also be needed during the works, which may lead to further negative impacts on residents and road users. In addition to this, the Recreation Ground is also due to be rebuilt and its height is due to be increased. The diversion of access that will occur as a result of the closure of the existing bridge may also impact negatively on road users and residents. Slough Borough Council therefore request that these issues are addressed before and during implementation so that effective mitigations can be put in place in order to limit the scheme's impact on residents and road users.</p> | <p>Huntercombe Spur is part of the Highways Agency's Strategic Road Network. The current proposals take this into account and have been developed such that the existing route will remain open at all times, hence the effect on the local network from works on this structure should be minimal.</p> <p>With regard to the other issues, proposals for diversion routes were submitted to Slough Borough Council and tentatively agreed. The increase in construction depth of the replacement structures is of the order of 1 m - 1.5 m over the existing structures to finished road level, as a result of the change in form from a four-span to a single-span structure which has been made primarily for safety reasons. The visual effect of the new bridges is assessed in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8, Landscape which is submitted with the Application.</p> | No |
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | <p>3) Disruption caused by the works to the A308 underbridge - The A308 is already overloaded and this road will get busier because of the work being undertaken on the M4. Any work on this bridge should be scheduled to keep disruption to a minimum.</p> | <p>No works are planned for A308 Windsor Road underbridge as part of the Scheme.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 279 | Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Limited | <p>15. We have no comment to make on the fine detail of the proposed new structures and alignments; this is best left to residents and local authorities with detailed knowledge of each location.</p> <p>16. Please contact us again if you have any further questions.</p> | <p>This comment is noted.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 23/12/2014 | 489 | Buckinghamshire County Council | <p>Road Bridges:</p> <p>The following roads in Buckinghamshire County Council's jurisdiction will be directly affected by the proposed smart motorway working:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Marsh Lane · Lake End Road · Old Slade Lane (an old road bridge that is now gated and used as a public footpath) <p>Marsh Lane and Lake End Road bridges are Highway Agency owned structures. Buckinghamshire County Council would want to be consulted on the review process and may possibly need to be a signatory to the AIP. Please find below the contact details for the Team Leader of Highway Structures Management.</p> <p>Discussions need to be had at an early stage with Buckinghamshire County Council regarding the detailed design and construction proposals of the Marsh Lane and Lake End Road bridges. For example, should the new structures be built on the line of the existing, requiring a temporary structure to the side, or off line requiring a permanent realignment of the approach ramps. In addition there are likely to be issues relating to increasing the clearance under the bridges, as this will result in the road levels of Marsh Lane and Lake End Lane being raised making them more prominent in the landscape.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire County Council is aware that the Highway Agency intends to set up workshops in the New Year to discuss this in more detail. Early engagement would be fully supported by Buckinghamshire County Council.</p> | <p>A meeting between HA and South Bucks was held on 9th March 2015, where issues regarding these bridges were discussed.</p> <p>The concerns raised 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>With regard to the other issues, proposals for diversion routes were submitted to Slough Borough Council and tentatively agreed. The increase in construction depth of the replacement structures is of the order of 1 m - 1.5 m over the existing structures to finished road level, as a result of the change in form from a four-span to a single-span structure which has been made primarily for safety reasons. The visual effect of the new bridges is assessed in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 8, Landscape which is submitted with the Application.</p> | Yes |
| Datchet Road Overbridge | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Red line (proposed order limits) includes land forming part of the Local Nature Reserve; Native scrub habitat and vegetative screen to M4/noise suppression. Red line also includes public access to LNR and Herschel Park car park</p> | <p>Part of the Local Nature Reserve, including the native scrub habitat and vegetative screen to M4/noise suppression is required temporarily for access and working space to extend a Water Main and Gas Main subway.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals are included 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.</p> <p>Part of the access road off Datchet Road to the Local Nature Reserve and Herschel Park is required temporarily for possible realignment of private means of access as part of the reconstruction and realignment of Datchet Road. The Agency will work with the Council to minimise disruption and any inconvenience, via the provisions of the CEMP.</p> | No |
| Huntercombe Spur Overbridge | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>Proposed order limits includes SBC owned land - Statutory allotment. Tenanted, obliged to give one year notice of termination. Important screen vegetation.</p> <p>Red line also includes Public open space - prominent landmark. Access control necessary to control historical problems with motorbikes. Solution to include easy access for pedestrians travelling east/west and providing access to PROW. Public open space - Important boundary trees and trees of landscape significance/public amenity.</p> | <p>Part of the SBC owned allotments and public open space is required temporarily for access and working space to construct the realigned Huntercombe Spur and new Huntercombe Spur overbridge.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals are set out 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.</p> <p>The Agency notes the access control issues relating to historical problems with motorbikes, and will work with Slough Borough Council to ensure control is maintained.</p> | No |
| Lake End Road Overbridge | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 18/12/2014 | 135 | Dorney Parish Council | <p>Dorney Parish Council has studied the plans and has convened meetings with consultants working on this project to fully understand the implications. As a result of this study, Dorney Parish Council wishes to raise the following concerns affecting the local community of Dorney regards the Smart Motorway and the work to the 3 bridges in the parish being Lake End Road Bridge, Marsh Lane Bridge and the Jubilee River Bridge:-</p> <p>A. Lake End Road Bridge</p> <p>Marsh Lane is not a viable diversionary route if Lake End Bridge is built 'on-line' as being proposed. The reasons for this is as follows:- (i) The surface of Marsh Lane is not adequate to cope with the increase in traffic as it is an unclassified road (the only good length of surfacing is the small area leading up to the bridge), (ii) There is a sharp 'S' bend in the road making it impossible for large vehicles (7.5 tonne +) to pass side by side, (iii) This diversionary route would cause huge disruption to Dorney School where 80% of children come from outside Dorney Reach catchment area. It would not be suitable for the 'Walk to School' scheme which is used by 30 to 50 school children run by volunteers. Also Lake End Road is the main route for the school buses, (iv) There has been a significant increase in traffic along Lake End Road since Tescos has opened at the Bishop Centre (near Maidenhead) as well as being a 'rat run' for drivers heading to central Slough and Heathrow Airport/M25. It would be difficult for the diversionary route to cope with the high volume of traffic and would also divert this traffic through the village centre, (v) One significant affect would be to Dorney Rowing Lake which has become a renowned national centre for rowing and other events since the 2012 Olympics. Major national and european championships are held at this site. When planning permission was granted, Lake End Road was designated as the main access route to avoid the village centre. All public information and traffic signs earmark Lake End Road as the main travel route to Dorney Rowing Lake. A diversionary route would cause major adverse implications, (vi) Local businesses such as Dorney Kitchen Garden Centre, would be adversely affected with traffic being diverted away from the area, (vii) Access by emergency vehicles may be compromised.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Dorney Parish Council concludes that the preferred solution for the local community would be the 'off-line' option for renewing the bridge in Lake End Road. Although it may take longer to build there would be less disruption.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Yes |
| OB Marsh Lane | | | | | |
| 18/12/2014 | 135 | Dorney Parish Council | <p>B. MARSH LANE BRIDGE</p> <p>It is accepted that building a bridge 'off-line' would be difficult as it would have an impact on nearby properties and this section of the motorway has steep embankments. However Dorney Parish Council would like to point out that if an on-line bridge is built:- (i) A temporary pedestrian crossing would be needed, (ii) Access to the school would need to be maintained at all times, (iii) The land which is earmarked for the temporary construction site is used for horses with stables in this area and this needs to be taken in to consideration, (iv) Access to the Village Hall is via Marsh Lane and this would need to be retained particularly as the Village Hall is the main parking area for dropping off and picking up of the school children as well as the users of the hall.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | No |
| OB Oldway Lane | | | | | |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | East side: Steep access to top of embankment, potentially worsened if levels raised. Design to accommodate needs of PROW users. West side: Embankment recently planted to screen M4/noise reduction | Current proposals at this location involve provision of a combined pedestrian / cycleway / equestrian structure. Although headroom to the existing structure from the M4 carriageways will increase to approximately 5.8 m, the level of the finished route is unlikely to vary significantly due to reduction in constriction depth below the route. Planting which is removed as part of construction activities will be replaced as shown on the Environmental Masterplan which is submitted as an Annex to the EDR along with the Application. The Agency will continue to engage with Slough Borough Council during the detailed design stage. | No |
| OB Recreation Ground | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | Access to park. Sole access to allotment site. Depot and site construction traffic will potentially impact on car/foot traffic. On north side Slough Moto-cross is park tenant. Potential long term impact on moto-cross track short or long term facility. Park access and circulation road need to secure agreement and terms for use if required. Road surface not fit for heavy vehicles. Landscape planting to be replaced. | Recreation Ground overbridge will be replaced online requiring closure of the route, for approximately eight months, during the works. A Contractor has not been appointed to the Scheme yet so some of the details of construction methodology are not available. Access for the works will be off Upton Court Road. The Contractor will be responsible for ensuring that the road is suitable for the construction traffic and returning the road to Slough Borough Council in no worse condition than at commencement of works. The Contractor will liaise with Slough Borough Council when planning the works to minimise the effects on the moto-cross track and allotments, via means of the CEMP and CTMP. Replacement planting which is removed as part of construction activities will be replaced as shown on the Environmental Masterplan which is submitted as an Annex to the EDR along with the Application. | No |
| Sipson Road Subway | | | | | |
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | 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 |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 15/12/2014 | 265 | Sustrans Limited | <p>I have read the S140566_M4_junction3_to_12_consultation_brochure and would like to make the following comments;</p> <p>1. J3-4 - No impact on bridges or underpasses and LCN+ 88/88a unaffected</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Comments noted | No |
| UB Thames Bray Bridges | | | | | |
| 18/12/2014 | 135 | Dorney Parish Council | <p>RIVER BRIDGE</p> <p>Dorney Parish Council accepts that the bridge will need to be widened. However, we would like it addressed that an increase in the width of the bridge may exacerbate the 'rumbling' noise which is heard when it is used and this needs to be recognised in the consultation plans.</p> | The rumbling noise is likely caused by traffic effects on the bridge expansion joints, highways drainage system and existing bridge surfacing, which will all be replaced/upgraded as part of the widening works. This should reduce these effects (even with the bridge widening in place), although they may not be entirely eliminated. | No |
| Traffic and Economics | | | | | |
| Impact on local roads | | | | | |
| 19/12/2014 | 066 | Slough Borough Council - Planning Department | <p>27.0 Additionally, we have significant concerns regarding the increase in local road traffic through the Slough strategic network which is already at capacity at a number of junctions and experiences heavy congestion during peak hours. Slough will over the next 3 years (2015 – 2017) be investing in widening the A332 corridor and A355 as well as the A4 to provide a dedicated bus lane. All these schemes are aimed at reducing congestion, improving traffic flow, improved journey reliability, facilitating regeneration, promoting economic growth, and aiding the modal shift to mass transport (buses) and improving air quality.</p> <p>28.0 Road traffic and congestion within Slough is the biggest cause of air pollution and the Borough has 3 other air quality management areas (AQMA 2 Brands Hill, AQMA 3 Tuns Lane and AQMA 4 Town Centre). These schemes are aimed at reducing congestion and hence emissions and to promote bus use. Additionally, we will also be investing into the electrification of the highway to promote, electric/hybrid plugged in cars, taxis and buses and also other forms of low emission vehicles as part of our low emission strategy that will be developed in 2015. We are concerned that a significant increase in capacity on the smart M4 could in turn lead to significant congestion on the local network.</p> | <p>The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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.</p> <p>The Agency will continue to work with Slough Borough Council as the Scheme progresses through the DCO process and Detailed Design.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 12/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London | The HA has stated in its consultation material that it has computer based transport modelling to show that this scheme will result in reduced congestion on the M4 and improved journey time reliability. Linked with this, it is identified that the changes to M4 will result in a net positive impact on the surrounding road network. TfL would like to understand the rationale behind this conclusion and would like to see the relevant traffic modelling, specifically around the A4 and A312 areas. | The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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. As requested by TfL, a meeting was held on 9 December 2014 to discuss this issue, allowing them to provide a full response to the consultation by the close of the consultation period. This is recorded under reference 106. | No |
| 08/12/2014 | 136 | Earley Town Council | Whilst welcoming the proposals to increase the capacity of the M4, Councillors were concerned that trunk roads off the motorway may not be able to cope with the increased traffic volumes. Therefore, it was requested that the Highways Agency, in conjunction with the proposals for the M4, should look at the future capacity of the A329(M) and the road networks around Junction 12. Furthermore, it was considered that the increased capacity of the M4 motorway would mean that construction of a third Thames crossing was vital in ensuring the free flow of traffic leaving the motorway | The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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 |
| 15/12/2014 | 231 | Arborfield and Newland Parish Council | Our second concern relates to the impact on traffic flows on motorway feeder routes. Wokingham Borough has a highly mobile population with one of the highest levels of car ownership in the country. Throughout the Borough, roads are heavily congested at peak times, and traffic overflows onto less suitable routes, often through local communities. In Arborfield Cross, for example, we already have significant flows of traffic travelling through the village en route to the M4 motorway at Junctions 10 and 11, and this will increase as 3500 new homes are built at Arborfield Garrison over the coming years. Our expectation is that, in addition to increasing the attractiveness of the M4 motorway as a strategic route, consideration is being given to the additional demands that this will place on the adjoining road networks and the communities that surround them, and complementary proposals to deal with this included in the scheme. | The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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 |
| 16/12/2014 | 239 | Bray Parish Council | 2) General increase in traffic caused by constraints on the M4 - This issue has to be addressed by the RBWM which is responsible for the local roads; however, we expect the Highways Agency to cooperate wherever possible. | The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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 |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 255 | Wokingham Borough Council - Highways Department | <p>Reviewing the documents gives rise to a number of concerns particularly around the use of Driver Stress as a proxy to assess the impact of the scheme on the local roads.</p> <p>The Driver Stress assessment is the only information available to the local authority to determine the extent of the impact on our local roads; however the data as published in the report is of no use. Driver stress is determined using vehicle flow and vehicle speed. The data on traffic flows with and without the scheme is given for the M4 motorway but is excluded from the assessment of the local roads. Without this information it is impossible for Wokingham Borough Council to make a judgement and therefore urge the Highways Agency to provide this traffic flow information available before proceeding with the scheme.</p> | <p>The Driver Stress assessment is a required component of the EIA for the Scheme and has been assessed, as reported in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. That assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the approach set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 13 of the ES also considers the effects of the Scheme on local roads. 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.</p> <p>The Agency will continue to work with the Council as the Scheme progresses.</p> | No |
| Traffic Modelling/Forecasting | | | | | |
| 11/12/2014 | 046 | Taplow Parish Council | <p>Our concern is that it may well save time for journeys within 3-12 ,but seems unlikely to improve times into London. Do we have any idea what per cent of traffic on that stretch come off by junction 3 ?</p> | <p>The Scheme is designed to address congestion between junctions 3 to 12. It is not the intention to attract a significant volume of additional traffic into central London. The issue has been considered by Transport for London, as the responsible highway authority for London's roads, and it is understood TfL is content.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 106 | Transport for London | <p>Transport for London (TfL) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Highways Agency's proposals to convert the M4 to a Smart Motorway from junctions 3 to 12.</p> <p>It is not feasible at this stage to support the consultation proposals for the reasons stated below. However, TfL looks forward to working with the Highways Agency to better understand the impact the proposals may have on London's roads so that both organisations can collaboratively work to mitigate any issues and risks arising.</p> <p>Traffic Modelling</p> <p>TfL has met with the representatives of the Agency (9 December 2014) and requested further modelling information so that it can understand how the identified 10 per cent uplift (circa 400 vehicles per hour) in AM peak flow on the M4 eastbound through junction three will affect traffic in west and central London. London has a growing economy which, in recent months, has led to a circa three per cent growth in traffic in outer London. Our analysis shows that for every two per cent increase in traffic growth, Journey Time Reliability has fallen by around 0.5 per cent.</p> <p>Information regarding the destination of this extra traffic has so far not been presented to TfL. It is therefore not known if this additional traffic will pose operational risks to key interchanges such as Hammersmith Gyratory or closer to central London. There is an additional concern that this extra traffic may have a negative effect on the major investment programme that TfL is undertaking to</p> | <p>Subsequent to this representation, it is now understood that at the West London Transport forum meeting on the 22nd January 2015, TfL reported that they had modelled the M4 Scheme effects on their network and were satisfied that the impacts were not significant.</p> | Yes |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 09/02/2015 | 241 | London Borough of Hillingdon | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>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.</p> | <p>The effects of the Scheme on local roads is 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. As part of this work, the Agency contacted all local authority planning departments along the length of the Scheme to obtain their list of committed developments and also reviewed all relevant local development frameworks/plans. The list of cumulative developments is provided in Appendix 16.1 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A Road Safety Audit ("RSA") has been done on the preliminary design, and is included as an appendix to the Engineering and Design Report. A further RSA will be made of the detailed design.</p> | No |

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

| Date Received | Representor No. | Consultee/ Organisation | Representation | Highways Agency Response | Proposed Change |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 19/12/2014 | 278 | Greater London Authority | <p>I refer to the pre-application consultation on the above national infrastructure project. On 19 December 2014 Sir Edward Lister, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, acting under delegated authority, considered a report on this proposal, reference D&P/3542/01. A copy of the report is attached in full. The Deputy Mayor considers at this stage the principle of the M4 Smart Motorway project cannot be supported at this stage given the concerns set out in the attached report regarding traffic modelling; however the GLA and TfL wish to have further discussions regarding the traffic, air quality and noise implications, particularly for the M4 east of the proposed works.</p> <p>The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Principle of development - London plan; Mayor's Transport Strategy 2) Green Belt - London plan 3) Ambient noise - London plan; the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy 4) Air quality - London plan; the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy <p>For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plans in force for area within London are the Hounslow and Hillingdon Unitary Development Plans, the Hillingdon Local Plan (part one) and the London Plan with 2013 Alterations.</p> <p>The draft National Roads and Rail National Policy Statement, National Planning Policy Framework, Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework, draft Hillingdon Local Plan (part two), the draft Hounslow Local Plan, the draft West London Waste plan and the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (intended to publish version) are also material considerations.</p> <p>Principle of development</p> <p>While the proposal to create additional capacity by making use of the existing hard shoulder, as opposed to further widening, has relative benefits, the GLA is unable to support it at this stage, given the uncertainty over the traffic modelling and the impact east of the proposed works (See below).</p> | <p>Subsequent to this representation, it is now understood that at the West London Transport forum meeting on the 22nd January 2015, TfL reported that they had modelled the M4 Scheme effects on their network and were satisfied that the impacts were not significant. Accordingly, the Highways Agency would wish to be further advised on the GLA's position. The plans and policies referred to in the representation have been taken into account as part of the assessment of the Scheme, both in the ES and the Planning Statement (Document Reference 7.1).</p> | Yes |
| 12/12/2014 | 426 | West Berkshire District Council | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> | No |
| 19/12/2014 | 588 | South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>The effect of the Scheme on local roads is 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.</p> | No |