

APPENDIX 32: QUESTIONNAIRE - COMMENTS RECEIVED

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX 32 VOLUME 5.2 QUESTIONNAIRE – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Questionnaire – Comments received

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
Additional information request				
08/01/2015		Request for scheme information	Information provided 18 February 2015	No
05/12/2014	003	I have tried to access the plans of your proposals on your website but cannot open them. Can you email the relevant plans for this stretch on the south side of the M4.	Information provided on 5 February 2015, with an extended period of consultation to 6 March 2015.	No
14/11/2014	008	We are unable to identify the properties in which you believe we have an interest. May we please ask you to re-submit with the following information to assist us: The full address and post code for any properties affected by the proposed motorway scheme which you have identified as being subject to a 1st Legal Challenge in favour of us at HM Land Registry.	Following further consideration of the Order limits, the Agency has reduced the extent of land that falls within the Order limits. The land interests of the respondent now fall outside of the Order limits.	Yes
10/11/2014	023	I write in response to your letter of 10 November 2014. As mentioned in your letter, can you please arrange to sent me by post paper copies of: 1. Scheme Summary leaflet, 2. Section 48 Notice, 3. Planning Act fact sheet, 4. Questionnaire, 5. Statement of Community Consultation, and additionally; 6. a DVD containing the Preliminary Environmental Information Report.	Information provided on 27 November 2014	No
14/11/2014	048	Please provide a copy of the PEI report and proposed scheme drawings on CD	Information provided on 2 December 2014	No
26/11/2014	057	Please provide as much information as possible	The Agency has identified SSE plant as part of the Scheme's research and will continue to engage with SEE's teams as part of the stakeholder engagement processes. The Agency has engaged with SSE to obtain information on SSE's apparatus. Commencing in February 2014, the Agency made requests to SSE for C3 estimates of costs to deal with SSE's apparatus that is anticipated to be affected by the Scheme. The Agency has included protective provisions in the draft DCO for the protection of statutory undertakers, including SSE.	No
21/11/2014	089	Request for complete a Development Questionnaire	The concerns of Network Rail are addressed under reference 245.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/11/2014	094	Please provide us with a copy of the PEI report, the proposed scheme drawings as well as hard copies of the consultation documents (e.g. questionnaire, factsheet, exhibition flyer, scheme plans, consultation brochure, statement of community consultation)	Information provided on 25 November 2014	No
12/12/2014	130	Request a copy of the PEI Report and Scheme Drawings which will be available on a CD, together with hard copies of the consultation documents	Information provided on 9 December 2014	No
18/12/2014	493	It would be very much appreciated if you could please forward me a CD copy of the PEI Report in connection with the M4 J3 to 12 Smart Motorway consultation.	Information provided on 2 December 2014	No
12/11/2014	630	I am unable to trace any mortgage information for the above. Please resubmit with a relevant mortgage account number or property address details so that I can make a further search.	The relevant land for this interest is located at Ascot Road. No land is required from this interest as it falls outside of the Order limits.	No
Air Quality				
Increased Air Pollution				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/12/2014		<p>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.</p>	<p>EHOs and air quality officers were contacted by URS on behalf of the Agency to establish general baseline air quality data.</p> <p>The results of the air quality assessment are reported fully in the Environmental Statement, which accompanies the application for development consent for the Scheme ("Application"). All Wokingham Borough Council ("WBC") sites that are located in representative locations have been included in the assessment. The data presented in section 6.6.2 only displays those measurement locations that exceed the objective value. All measurement locations considered in the assessment are presented in the Appendix.</p> <p>There are 391 individually-modelled receptors within WBC's 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 WBC's 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. Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. However, proposals to control these potential impacts, including mitigation measures, are set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP"), which is an appendix to the Outline Environmental Management Plan that has been submitted with the Application, and are also set out in ES Chapter 6: Air Quality.</p> <p>Noise impacts of the Scheme are addressed in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. This identifies mitigation measures for the construction phase of the Scheme, which are considered to be sufficient to mitigate anticipated impacts.</p>	No
16/12/2014	006	<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>Proposals to control these potential impacts, including mitigation measures, are set out in the Outline CEMP, which is an appendix to the Outline Environmental Management Plan that has been submitted with the Application, and are also set out in ES Chapter 6: Air Quality and ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. The Outline CEMP will become a finalised CEMP following discussions between the Agency and its Delivery Partner.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	<p>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.</p>	<p>The air quality assessment for the Scheme was undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation ("SAC") and the Site of Special Scientific Interest ("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 or SAC. The results of the air quality assessment are reported fully in the ES, which accompanies the Application.</p> <p>Proposals to control noise and pollution impacts, including mitigation measures, are set out in the Outline CEMP, ES Chapter 6: Air Quality and ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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 studies.</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</p>	<p>The following comments are numbered to correlate to the issues that are raised:</p> <p>5.0 Effects on AQMA1 have been identified and assessed in ES Chapter 6: Air Quality.</p> <p>6.0 The air quality assessment 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. This is a small adverse effect in the context of the wider Scheme, which is outweighed by the benefits that the Scheme will bring and the effect will decrease over time as the emissions of vehicles improve.</p> <p>7.0 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</p> <p>8.0 The assessments undertaken for the Scheme were focused on the effects of the Scheme on local air quality, rather than the effects of the motorway network as a whole, as is required by the methodology set out in the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant during operation and proposals to control construction impacts are set out in the Outline CEMP</p> <p>9.0 The air quality assessment addresses the effects of the Scheme against the health based objective values set out in legislation (the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010)</p> <p>10.0 The effect of the Scheme on concentrations of NO2 has been a key focus of the assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality. The effect of the Scheme on air quality is not predicted to be significant during operation.</p> <p>11.0 & 12.0 The assessment of PM2.5 does not currently form a part of the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
			methodology. Therefore, such an assessment has not been completed for this Scheme. The assessment that has been carried out for the Scheme is appropriate.	
19/12/2014	086	<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.</p> <p>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. This is based on</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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	098	<p>Point 3: "Page 33 Impacts on the environment 4.1.3 The environmental assessment covers the effects of the Scheme on: air quality, cultural heritage, landscape, ecology and nature conservation, geology and soils, materials and waste, noise and vibration, effects on all travellers, community and private assets, road drainage and the water environment. Air quality/ 5 AIR QUALITY</p> <p>5.1.1 The air quality assessment considers the potential air quality effects of the Scheme on local and regional air quality as a result of: a) Dust from construction activities and a lesser extent emissions from plant and vehicles; and b) Changes in emissions due to improved vehicle flows once the Scheme is open. 5.1.3 The overall impact of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation is assessed as not significant. 8.1.4 Air quality (nitrogen deposition) and noise levels from the Scheme are predicted to be negligible and unlikely to result in significant additional impacts." Point 3. Dust and emissions from vehicles and machinery will definitely affect the organic vegetables adversely. And I have to disagree strongly with point 8.1.4.</p>	<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. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant. 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.</p>	No
12/12/2014	106	<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
11/11/2014	204	<p>This will be in addition to the increased noise and air pollution caused by additional traffic using the motorway hard shoulder.</p>	<p>Effects on noise and air quality have been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme, including the need for appropriate mitigation measures, as reported in the ES. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant. Low noise surfacing will be provided across all lanes of the carriageway as part of the Scheme.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/12/2014	239	<p>The Environmental Study compares "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" options.</p> <p>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</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

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
17/12/2014	250	- Encouraging increased traffic will result in increased noise and air pollution.	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. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant. 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
19/12/2014	255	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.	The assessment undertaken for air quality, as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, is focused 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.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	266	<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</p> <p>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</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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	355	<p>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>	<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

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	602	<p>The plot already suffers from a lot of traffic noise and air pollution and as I do spend a considerable amount of time on my plot any increases in noise and/or air pollution will make cultivation very unpleasant. What plans are there to build a permanent barrier that will reduce increased pollution and protect us? Increased pollution levels will also affect my crops as I aim to grow my fresh vegetables organically. Certainly during the construction period there is bound to be a huge amount of dust making conditions unsuitable for us to work in.</p>	<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. The effect of the Scheme on air quality during operation is not predicted to be significant. 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.</p> <p>The use of barriers is not currently an approved technique for mitigating air quality effects on road schemes. Road traffic air quality assessments are primarily focused on inorganic contributions to local air quality, such as particulates and oxides of nitrogen and rates of nitrogen deposition. In some locations with sensitive vegetation such as Sulham and Tidmarsh Woods and Meadows SSSI an evaluation of effects on vegetation has been undertaken. This has not identified any significant effects upon these sensitive sites. Additionally, the changes in oxides of nitrogen and rates of nitrogen deposition due to the Scheme are within the range of normal variation with varying meteorological conditions.</p>	No
DCO Process				
12/12/2014	133	<p>Could you give an indication of the likely timescale for the Development Consent Order to receive consent (assuming it does) and how long after that it would be until the works commence on site?</p>	<p>The timescales set for the determination of the Application are prescribed under the Planning Act 2008, which aims to reduce the decision-making period for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this Scheme. Following the prescribed maximum timescales in the Planning Act 2008, it is expected that the Secretary of State will make a decision on whether to grant development consent for the Scheme around September 2016. Assuming that consent is granted, the Agency aims to start construction work in late 2016 or early 2017, with a phased programme of work expected to be completed in 2021/2022.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	602	<p>With this uncertainty hanging over us, how can we know whether we can continue to work our plots? When will we know for sure what the plans will be?</p> <p>My allotment is my means of exercise, relaxation, socialisation and, as mentioned previously, an important food source for my family.</p> <p>Please, if it can be avoided in any way at all, don't destroy our allotments.</p>	<p>The timescales set for the determination of the Application are prescribed under the Planning Act 2008, which aims to reduce the decision-making period for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this Scheme. Following the prescribed maximum timescales in the Planning Act 2008, it is expected that the Secretary of State will make a decision on whether to grant development consent for the Scheme around September 2016. Assuming that consent is granted, the Agency aims to start construction work in late 2016 or early 2017, with a phased programme of work expected to be completed in 2021/2022.</p> <p>Further details about works at the allotments can be found under the "Existing allotments" section.</p>	No
Consultation Documents				
05/12/2014	009	<p>I am disappointed that the HA did not respond to my telephone enquiry in November.</p> <p>The HA communication to tenants did not state any reference the The Myrke and was quite confusing, so firstly I am concerned that all tenants do not understand the implications of the proposed plans and therefore would not lodge an objection. This either because they assume the letter referred to where the live not where the grow (as I did initially) or that they are not able to read complex English. I would request acknowledgement of this email especially that my previous request for information was ignored. I am also appalled that the letter from Lynne Stimson states an incorrect email address and an incorrect website address. Why?</p>	<p>The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. The Agency has offered to meet with Fiona MacTaggart MP, Slough Allotments Federation and tenants to describe the works in this location and discuss their concerns directly.</p> <p>The letter containing the incorrect email address and website was reissued with correct details, and respondents still had more than the statutory required time to respond to the consultation following the reissuing of the letter. The Agency also notes that the sending of letters was not the sole method of consultation, as newspaper notices announcing the consultation were also published in local and national newspapers and public exhibitions were held.</p>	No
11/12/2014	035	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Agency notes this response and has updated its records accordingly.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The EIA carried out for the Scheme has assessed the impacts on local residents and infrastructure, and no significant adverse impacts are predicted.</p> <p>The Agency welcomes the opportunity to continue close engagement with the local authority going forward.</p> <p>The six-week period allowed for consultees to provide responses to the consultation was longer than the four-week period required by statute and the Agency considers that consultees were afforded an appropriate amount of time to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>Stakeholders will also have an opportunity to provide comments on the Scheme to the Planning Inspectorate during the pre-examination stage (around the end of April 2015 to July/August 2015) if the Application is accepted, and discussions with local authorities will be continued by the Agency into the examination stage. It is expected that the Secretary of State will make a decision on whether to grant development consent for the Scheme around September 2016. Assuming that consent is granted, the Agency aims to start construction work in late 2016 or early 2017.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	098	<p>The first time I became aware of anything was after receiving a letter about the scheme. I had no idea what the letter referred to, or why I was sent it. Only later did someone from our allotment site: The Myrke, explain what it was about. The Slough Borough Council was unable to provide any facts. The exhibition I attended couldn't answer any of my questions and didn't attempt to try. The website is clear, but no particular reference is made to the allotment site and what will happen there.</p> <p>The letter we received gave no indication that it referred to the allotments. It was only via others that we learnt of this project. The letter did not make any provision for anyone for whom English is not their first language to get translated text and this would have significantly affected the way the information was received and most of the plot-holders still appear to know nothing of the planned works.</p> <p>I tried to find out everything I could via the website but it was too general and there was no specific note made of how the allotments would be affected.</p> <p>The documents at the library were too confusing for me, so I attended the presentation at the shopping centre in Slough. It was, unfortunately a total waste of time. I sent the following email* (see footnote at end of letter) but received no response.</p> <p>I emailed once again but again received no response so the following is based on my interpretation of the website information and whatever I could glean from the council and other plot holders.</p> <p>Footnote: * Email sent to HA but no response received.</p> <p>'Good day</p> <p>I have an allotment at the Myrke site in Datchet. What happens to the allotments is very important to me as I have to grow as much of my own food there as possible.</p> <p>Please can you advise me exactly how the Myrke allotments will be affected by this project?</p>	<p>Slough Borough Council provided the Agency with the contact details for the allotment tenants that are predicted to be affected by the Scheme. The Agency issued allotment tenants with a notice of a proposed application for a development consent order in November 2014. This notice was issued to all statutory consultees and those with an interest in land affected. It provided details of where further information about the Scheme could be found, and a web address and links to the Scheme proposals on the Agency's website.</p> <p>The Agency also met with Slough Borough Council's Parks Manager in November 2014 in order to discuss the Scheme. The Agency described the allotment and adjacent bridge works and confirmed there would be no permanent loss of land.</p> <p>The Agency acknowledges that the small area available at the shopping centre exhibition restricted the amount of material and display boards that could be shown, but that such exhibitions were established in order to provide information in a readily-accessible manner. The Agency will take account of these comments when arranging future exhibitions. The public response to the other venues and materials has generally been positive.</p> <p>The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. The Agency has offered to meet with Fiona MacTaggart MP, Slough Allotments Federation and tenants to describe the works in this location and discuss their concerns directly.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
30/01/2015	098	<p>I have recently received the attached letter from a constituent, who is a resident of The Myrke. She writes how she feels that she was not properly included in the consultation process for changes to the M4. This is something I hear often and I would like to know what you have done and are doing to ensure those that are tenants of allotment plots are properly consulted. It is not appropriate for residents to feel that they are being ignored.</p>	<p>Public consultation on the Scheme has been undertaken in accordance with the legislative requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and, following consultation with local authorities within the area on the proposed approach and timing, as set out in a published Statement of Community Consultation. Prior to both the Public Information Exhibitions held in March 2014 and November 2014, the Agency sent over 21,000 letters to properties adjacent to the M4 publicising the exhibitions, as well as notices in various local and national newspapers. Responses received during the consultation period have been considered by the Agency to inform the final Scheme proposals prior to the submission of the Application.</p> <p>The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants. The Agency has offered to meet with Fiona MacTaggart MP, Slough Allotments Federation and tenants to describe the works in this location and discuss their concerns directly.</p>	No
12/12/2014	117	<p>E.ON does not have any operational equipment that would be affected by the scheme and will not be raising any comments.</p>	<p>The Agency has noted this response and updated its records accordingly.</p>	No
09/12/2014	241	<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>	<p>The Agency held a meeting with the London Borough of Hillingdon on 27 January 2015, at which these comments were discussed. A further consultation response has been received following that meeting (reference number 636) which supersedes this.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	245	<p>Future Steps</p> <p>Network Rail expects that the DCO will include Network Rail's protective provisions. These are well precedented in both TWA Orders and DCOs. Easements will be required where land rights are needed over, on or under Network Rail's land. An asset protection agreement is in place for some preliminary survey works, but further asset protection agreements and bridge agreements will need to be entered into in order to protect the railway.</p>	<p>The Agency has included protective provisions in the draft DCO for the protection of Network Rail. These provisions have been precedented in other DCOs.</p> <p>The Agency will liaise with Network Rail regarding asset protection agreements during the detailed design of the Scheme.</p>	No
11/12/2014	288	<p>First of all, I wish to register the fact that the residents in The Myrke, Datchet are still struggling to come to terms with the proposals for the scheme, since we were first advised of this proposal in late April 2014 - with no prior consultation. We need more detail, sketches etc about precisely what is planned for the areas close to our homes e.g. land at the rear of the properties, the embankment, and footpaths - things which are going to affect us on a very personal level.</p>	<p>The preliminary design for the Scheme has now been completed, and plans depicting both the land required for the Scheme and the works to be carried on such land are included as part of the Application.</p> <p>The ES that has been submitted with the Application also sets out a detailed description of the Scheme and the predicted effects of the Scheme on nearby locations.</p>	No
National Grid				
09/12/2014	088	<p>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. 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> <p>FURTHER DETAIL PROVIDED</p>	<p>NGET apparatus has been identified within the Order limits. The Agency has engaged with NGET to obtain information on NGET's apparatus. Commencing in April 2014, the Agency made requests to NGET for C3 estimates of costs to deal with its apparatus affected by the Scheme. Discussions with NGET in response to the C3 requests are still on-going and helpful. The information provided by NGET has been very useful in designing the Scheme's development and changes have been made to the preliminary design to account for NGET's assets.</p>	Yes
Ecology				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	094	<p>Also, the removal of the existing Datchet Road Bridge may include destroying some, or all, of the mature vegetation on the Datchet Road (west-side) embankment which runs behind the homes on The Myrke. These mature trees and plants provide essential visual and aural screen to the traffic and should not be removed.</p> <p>The proposed scheme includes digging up the current approach to the existing Datchet Road Bridge and landscaping it. It is essential that this be designed with dense evergreen woodland/shrubs/plants to increase the visual and aural screen rather than being an open, social area that could attract fly-tipping and/or loiterers.</p>	<p>The proposed Datchet Road Overbridge at The Myrke is intended to be constructed east of its current location. Mitigation proposals are provided in the Environmental Masterplan, which accompanies the Application. These are at a preliminary stage and will be developed further with the detailed design of the Scheme. The design illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that allows for further planting to provide screening.</p>	No
25/11/2014	098	<p>Point 7: "Ecology and Nature conservation /8 ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION 8.1.1 The Scheme potentially lies within the area of influence of internationally, nationally and locally designated sites. 8.1.2 Baseline studies confirmed the presence of protected species of fauna, namely great crested newts, reptiles (grass snake and slow worm), bats, otters, water voles and badgers. Nesting birds were found in the vegetation alongside the motorway and on adjoining land. Dormice were not found. 8.1.3 The Scheme will not result in any direct impacts on designated sites and non-designated sites of nature conservation value, but those adjoining the M4 or along watercourses downstream of construction works, may be indirectly impacted by construction noise, night-time lighting, and dust, or as a result of connected hydrology and changes in water quality. 8.1.4 On Scheme opening, the main impact on fauna is likely to be increased mortalities due to the replacement of the existing central reserve with a concrete barrier. Once the new vegetation has matured, operation of the Scheme is not considered to change the current environment of the M4 corridor. The overall effects on nature conservation and ecology are assessed as neutral. Ecology and nature conservation Ecological surveys were undertaken at targeted locations based upon the potential of the habitat to support protected species. It is not anticipated that any direct impacts will occur to any designated sites as a result of the proposed scheme. Mitigation measures for any impacts to protected species during construction will be set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan" Point 7. This is a major concern and I totally disagree that there wouldn't be direct impacts on both flora and fauna. There would be considerable loss of hedgerows if the northern and western boundaries of the allotment site are affected – loss of natural vegetation and loss of habitat for birds, voles, rabbits, hedgehogs, foxes and many other species.</p>	<p>A full assessment of direct and indirect effects on all ecological receptors has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and is reported in the ES.</p> <p>With appropriate mitigation measures in place, effects on ecological receptors will be neutral. Mitigation measures are provided for in the Outline CEMP, which is secured by a requirement in the DCO, and are, therefore, required to be delivered.</p> <p>Any lost vegetation will be replanted with locally-appropriate, native species of trees and shrubs and wildflower meadow, with particular emphasis on fruit-bearing varieties in order to provide support for native species of fauna.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/11/2014	209	<p>I am totally opposed to the development along the M4, it will destroy wild life, the environment and the allotments at the Myrke Datchet. In my experience because of the amount of vehicles on the road right now which is increasing year on year will fail to improve the traffic flow and congestion and if it was to go ahead would destroy to much of the countryside which is already being eaten away. It would also destroy the community of 100 allotments at the Mryke some of which have been in the hands of gardeners etc for 20 years or more. THIS CANNOT GO AHEAD.</p>	<p>Effects of the Scheme on the environment have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process and reported in the ES. Mitigation has been proposed where appropriate to minimise the effects of the Scheme on wildlife.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p> <p>The design illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that allows for further planting to provide screening. The Scheme will be provided with low noise surfacing across all lanes of both carriageways.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	489	<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 an 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) 	<p>The landscape scheme is set out on the Environmental Masterplan ("EM") (Document Reference 7.4, Annex A) which 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 will be provided. 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>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	490	<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 agree 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
Environment				
Noise				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	288	<p>2) I am very concerned about the Datchet Road embankment, the only protection many of the residents have against high M4 noise pollution from the eastern side of the motorway and indeed from the Datchet Road. This is now an area of dense and well-established woodland which must be preserved, and even augmented (the addition of evergreens would increase protection year-round). It would take decades to replace this. It is also worth bearing in mind that such woodland also helps to cut down on air pollution from traffic fumes (and during construction itself). Page 2 Noise impacts (see also note 2 above)</p> <p>1) Noise barriers - It is essential that the Highways Agency will indeed go ahead with its current proposal for the installation of noise barriers along a 150m stretch between the M4 and The Myrke, along with the low-noise surfacing on lanes 1 and 4.</p> <p>2) Re-surfacing and screening - I am very concerned that very little re-surfacing has been done in recent years. It has been suggested that the HA (responsible for the M4 as part of the trans-European Network) should put in place the Acoustic Screening which has been provided elsewhere on the network. Its installation here is long overdue (even if the new "smart M4 scheme" doesn't go ahead as planned).</p> <p>Another helpful suggestion would be that the HA make provision for householders to have double/secondary glazing fitted in their homes. These homes date from Victorian and Edwardian times, and many have the original windows. The HA's help in this matter would be greatly appreciated, and would be a drop in the ocean compared with the rest of the budget. please consider this; the best glazing on the market must surely be a help in combatting the noise pollution we face here, some only 35 metres away.</p>	<p>An additional noise barrier is proposed to be erected in this area in order to mitigate the noise impacts on local residents.</p> <p>Further, the Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is, therefore, predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to properties in this area with the Scheme in operation. The provision of additional noise barriers in certain locations and low-noise surfacing across all lanes of the M4 as part of the Scheme are sufficient mitigation. Therefore, the Agency is not intending to provide double/secondary glazing.</p>	Yes
Flooding				
23/12/2014	094	<p>The area around The Myrke is designated as a high flood risk so it is essential that the proposed scheme does not exacerbate this and mitigation is built into the design. The preliminary report as it stands does not provide any comfort in this regard.</p>	<p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported fully in the ES, also addresses flood risk.</p> <p>This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	098	<p>Point 10: "Drainage and water environment 2.1.5 The existing central reserve drainage system will be replaced with surface water channels or linear drains, and some sections of verge drainage will be replaced with new linear drains. 14 ROAD DRAINAGE AND THE WATER ENVIRONMENT 14.1.1 The proposed works to the eight overbridges located within the floodplain could result in displacement of flood water and a localised increase in flood levels potentially requiring floodplain compensation to be provided. This will be assessed and quantified within the Flood Risk Assessment. 14.1.2 The Scheme design includes replacement of the existing drainage system where required and additional storage within the drainage system to maintain current discharge rates to outfalls. Consequently there will be no significant change resulting from the small increase in impermeable surface area from the creation of the ERAs, paving of the central reserve and any modifications for the slip and side roads. The operational impacts may range from moderate adverse (changes to the morphology of the River Thames at Bray Bridge) to slight beneficial (no deterioration in water quality despite an increase in traffic and potential for pollutants in the drainage water). 14.1.3 Overall the Scheme is unlikely to have a detrimental impact upon the existing surface and / groundwater resources." Point 10 As far as I understand it, The Myrke allotment site, lies in the Thames floodplain and Datchet is where some of the worst flooding occurred in 2013. The Myrke River and the Jubilee River both contributed to the problems. Has this been adequately researched?</p>	<p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported in the ES, also addresses flood risk.</p> <p>This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	<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. 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 ES includes an Outline CEMP which sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise and visual impacts. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractor(s), and will be agreed with Local Authorities.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	268	<p>Page 4-13</p> <p>4.2.36 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 (see chapter 15). Spillage control devices and other pollution interceptors will be provided at all ERA sites, prior to the outfalls.</p> <p>4.2.37 The need for floodplain compensation measures is under consideration as part of the EIA process and will be established within the flood risk assessment study and the outcome will be reported in the ES.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>Where are the outfalls East & West of the Mill Lane Underbridge ?</p> <p>We ask this as there has been a continuous overspill of water from the embankment on the Northeast side of the bridge. This forms an ever-present wet area across the road (which has been there for the last 4yrs despite numerous complaints to local council) and in winter this freezes, forming a dangerous frozen area of road.</p> <p>Who's responsibility is ditch maintenance where ditches are within the boundary created by the 4 bar fencing that runs along the motorway?</p> <p>The ditch running along the Northern edge of the M4, from the 'Betty Grove Culvert (post marker P60/5B - as marked on Drawing 9.2a Habitats) to the edge of our property (post marker P60/1B) is very badly blocked, restricting the flow of water, which then flows across the field into the River Lodden.</p> <p>Who's responsibility is maintenance of the ditch that run inside parallel fences that sit roughly at right angles to the M4, discharging into the River Lodden, obviously built during the original construction of the motorway, marked on M4- PEIR_Drawing_04-1_Scheme-Plan_Sheet-01-19_J12-J10.pdf, page 16 as Ward Bdy Drain CD close to Post Marker 60/1 ?</p>	<p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported in the ES, also addresses flood risk.</p> <p>This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p> <p>Maintenance of ditches within the motorway boundary are the responsibility of the Highways Agency's maintenance service provider:</p> <p>Rees Evans - General Manager EM Highways Services Ltd. Easton Lane Motorway Compound, M3 Junction 9 Winchester Hampshire SO23 7TY Tel: 01962 893000</p> <p>The Agency believes that the ditches that the respondent refers to are outside the motorway boundary and are therefore the responsibility of Wokingham Borough Council:</p> <p>Wokingham Borough Council Civic Offices, Shute End Wokingham RG40 1BN Tel: 0118 974 6000 Text: 07786 200 974</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/12/2014	288	<p>Flood risk - I am concerned about how the flood risk will change, in spite of HA's preliminary Environmental Report Item 14.1.1. Even now, no one (the Environment Agency, Slough Council, our MP, to name some of those who should be involved) is currently taking responsibility for keeping the Myrke Ditch clear, despite constant requests in light of the floods in February 2014. There must be a clear and carefully considered approach to protect both The Myrke, and the motorway from main drainage flooding that neither the works nor the end result adversely affect the flood plains around The Myrke. Work will certainly be needed in this area following the flooring in February this year. Any additional flooding caused directly by the scheme would be totally unacceptable by the community here.</p>	<p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported in the ES, also addresses flood risk.</p> <p>This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p>	No
23/12/2014	489	<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 ERA sites, prior to the outfalls.</p> <p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported in the ES, also addresses flood risk.</p> <p>This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p> <p>In accordance with the SuDS hierarchy, infiltration systems such as soakaways will be implemented as a SuDS solution for the Scheme. The details of the proposed drainage strategy can be found within the Drainage Strategy submitted with the Application.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	490	<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 ERA sites, prior to the outfalls.</p> <p>Flood risk impacts on rivers and runoff from the carriageway surfaces have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports for the Scheme which accompany the Application. The EIA, as reported in the ES, also addresses flood risk. This includes an assessment of flood extent and any suitable flood compensation (available within the Agency's land), on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage where required.</p> <p>There are no major main river route alterations proposed. Therefore, flood modelling is not required.</p> <p>Increases in built foot print may occur at Bray Bridge. An assessment of flood extent and compensation for this, on a volume-for-volume and level-for-level basis to prevent a loss of floodplain storage, will be provided if required. This assessment is set out in the Flood Risk Assessment that accompanies the Application and is also reported in the ES.</p> <p>Consents and licences for the Scheme, including Flood Defence Consent, will be applied for in a timely manner as the Scheme progresses through detailed design.</p>	No
Footpaths/PROW				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	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>Details of the effects of the 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> <p>The effects of the Scheme on open space have been addressed in the Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) have been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme.</p>	No
23/12/2014	094	The proposed scheme includes retaining the existing footpath and extending it to meet the new Datchet Road Bridge. Detailed design should include additional lighting and minimise access from the footpath to the rear of houses on The Myrke. Improvements should be discussed with Slough Borough Council.	The inclusion of lighting is a matter for the local authority as this land is outside of the Agency's land ownership and would need to be maintained by the local authority.	No
11/12/2014	288	Footpath - I am concerned that even through it is proposed to extend the present footpath and include it in the overall scheme, the HA have no authority to make any concomitant improvements necessary (e.g. additional lighting etc). Surely HA themselves should be working with Slough Council on such a matter of personal safety for the residents. Thus cooperation would appear to me to be absolutely essential.	The inclusion of lighting is a matter for the local authority as this land is outside of the Agency land ownership, and would need to be maintained by the local authority.	No
23/12/2014	489	<p>Rights of Way:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please find below the contact details for the Strategic Access Advisor</p>	Details of the effects of the 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
Further Consultation Responses				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/01/2015	Compound consultation 101	<p>RE compound 5. Over several months we have made enquiries to establish (and possibly share) information on related environmental, traffic and highway information in the above area (copy e-mails attached). During the last consultation cycle I understand that the HA has reported to consultees their intention to use our client's land as a location of a temporary works compound and yet I understand this has not been agreed with the land-owners. Whilst my clients' are potentially receptive to offering the site for temporary works (for a period of time) we cannot guarantee our respective timescales are conducive which may be crucial to both parties.</p> <p>We also appreciate that you may have received numerous consultation responses from existing properties but as a potentially Section 42/49 Party (PA'08) we would hope that the HA would be keen to formally engage in more detailed consultation.</p> <p>We have established a number of environmental (baseline) conditions in detail and have begun to forecast these for a future development scenario. As these studies establish some environmental constraints (primarily noise, landscape and flooding) there will be some effects on the developable area of my clients' site. If we can review the HA's proposals in more detail we believe there are opportunities to review and verify the potential detail of these assessment, explore opportunities to accommodate aspirations of our respective interests and potentially deliver a more pragmatic solution (in accordance with the EIA Regulations) both in terms of timescales and environmental (particularly landscape) impacts. To establish the scale of these benefits however we need to advance some dialogue relating to issues and options that might serve our mutual interests and thus would welcome your feedback at your earliest convenience.</p> <p>As we have failed to elicit much of a response to date, I wonder if you could inform us of the timescale of a likely response if you are unable to arrange a meeting in the coming weeks, particularly as the HA has just begun a new consultation? http://www.highways.gov.uk/roads/road-projects/m4-junctions-3-12/ I would also like to seize this opportunity to highlight that it is very difficult to read the Appraisal Summary Table and welcome a higher resolution version of this</p>	<p>The Agency intends to meet with this respondent during April 2015 in order to discuss the Scheme and construction compound 5.</p> <p>The Agency wrote to this respondent on 12 March 2015 and provided the improved version of the Appraisal Summary Table.</p>	No
Highways and Diversions				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	426	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 the Agency will maintain three lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to maintain traffic flow. The Agency will use established traffic management techniques during construction of the Scheme as set out and secured in the CTMP. There will be some overnight closures of the M4. Traffic management proposals during the construction period are set out in the CTMP that will be finalised with the relevant local authorities, along with other stakeholders, prior to the start of construction.	No
23/12/2014	489	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
Datchet Road				
05/12/2014	009	3. I would like your assurance that a sufficiently robust permanent barrier would be installed along the allotment boundary. I am concerned that with the hard shoulder becoming a lane of fast moving traffic the risk of accident to tenants working on their plot, just the other side of the fence, would be great.	The barrier system has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design of this System will take place in the next stage of the Scheme design and will be based on the Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the M4 and specify the type of barrier required, which will be appropriate to address the risk raised by this respondent.	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	094	<p>Creation of Additional Running Lane - There is no existing hard shoulder on the west-bound carriageway adjacent to the north end of The Myrke. The proposed scheme therefore requires the creation of an additional lane which may require permanent land take of The Myrke if the space between the existing carriageway and wooden fence (separating the carriageway from The Myrke) is not sufficient. At the consultation on Wednesday 26th November in Datchet, the project team explained that their belief was that the space was sufficient but this was subject to a detailed review.</p> <p>The current order limit for the scheme proposal does include the north end of The Myrke. Any intrusion into The Myrke itself, and permanent land take of The Myrke, would be unacceptable as it would effectively bring the motorway closer to our homes bringing with it noise and pollution. It is complicated further by the existence of mains gas, water and sewers situated here. It would also result in the removal of existing vegetation, which provides a screen between The Myrke and the motorway.</p> <p>The proposed scheme doesn't seem to have considered widening the motorway on the east-bound carriageway, which is further away from housing, to negate the potential need to intrude on The Myrke and impact on the utilities mentioned above.</p> <p>The above points need to be addressed in detail as part of the proposed scheme's review process as they have serious implications on people's lives, rights and well-being.</p>	<p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme.</p> <p>At this location no permanent residential land-take is required as shown on the Land plans (sheet 23 of 31) (Doc. ref. 2.2)</p> <p>Proposals to control noise and pollution impacts, including mitigation measures, are set out in the Outline CEMP, ES Chapter 6: Air Quality and ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. There are predicted to be no significant adverse impacts in respect of air quality as a result of the Scheme and effects of the Scheme in respect of noise impacts are predicted to be beneficial across the Scheme extent.</p> <p>As stated, further design will be required to finalise the design in this location, which will take place in the next phase of the Scheme, when topographical survey data will be available. At this stage the design team will endeavour to minimise any impacts on the Myrke.</p> <p>To adjust the alignment of the M4 so that widening was only required on the eastbound carriageway, the radius would need to be reduced to below the desirable minimum. This would require a relaxation of the design standards, which cannot be undertaken because the radius would be below that required for a 70mph motorway, which is a safety risk for road users.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	268	<p>Page 4-14</p> <p>4.2.40 It is envisaged that the majority of the existing safety barrier in the verges will be removed and replaced with a new safety barrier, in order to facilitate the construction of the works. Additional verge safety barriers will be provided at new hazards, such as gantries, signs and CCTV cameras. Where a new safety barrier is to be provided in the verge, this will normally be a steel safety barrier system, either using tensioned corrugated beams or open box beams as illustrated in Figures 4.8 and 4.9.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>Will this be replaced along the boundary to our properties? What is the strength rating of the new barriers ?</p> <p>Especially considering the latest HGV accident in Nov 2014 where the vehicle went through the barrier and impacted a bridge support at J11...</p> <p>If a similar incident occurs at our location, what will stop it travelling down the bank into our houses?</p>	<p>The barrier system has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design of this System will take place in the next stage of the Scheme design and will be based on the Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the M4 and specify the type of barrier required, which will be appropriate to address the risk raised by this respondent.</p>	No
11/12/2014	288	<p>Major utilities, possible disruption - Here I quote directly from a neighbour who has the same concerns about this possible, very serious disruption. I quote: "Very careful measurements will have to be taken so as not to disrupt gas mains, water and sewerage arrangements (including a fire hydrant) and a culverted stream operating at the northern end of The Myrke cul-de-sac. To avoid making endless potential problems here it would seem to be a sensible option to closely examine the take up of any needed motorway land enlargement from the re- constituted green land on the northern Herschel Park side of the motorway. This would avoid completely any main services complication at the northern end of the Myrke and stressful household disruption; also it would be comparatively easy to re-configure the lanes on "up and down" directional running "hard shoulder" - I have to ask why is the Herschel Park land not the obvious land to use for this development? The current order limits for the scheme does not allow for the possibility of widening the M4 on the Herschel Park side. This would clearly obviate any need to intrude into the Myrke with its massive disruption of daily life for the people who live there for 5 years once work starts</p>	<p>The Agency will liaise very closely with all statutory undertakers that own such apparatus in order to ensure that the assets are considered when works are to be carried out..</p> <p>The Agency has considered the proposals suggested by this respondent. However, the current motorway alignment adjacent to the Myrke is built to the minimum desirable radius for this standard of highway. To adjust the alignment of the motorway so that widening was only required on the eastbound carriageway, the radius would need to be reduced to below the desirable minimum. This would require a relaxation of the design standards, which cannot be undertaken because the radius would be below that for a 70mph motorway which is a safety risk for road users.</p> <p>Stopping Sight Distance would also require a relaxation from standards due to the reduced radius. The carriageway currently falls towards the central reserve on a camber of around 3%, which is below current standards. By further reducing the radius, this substandard feature would further exacerbate safety risk. Therefore, the respondent's proposals cannot be taken forward for the Scheme.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	602	The works would bring a lane of very fast moving traffic very near to the back of my allotment plot and I am deeply concerned and seek assurance that a sufficiently robust barrier will be in place to prevent any vehicles from breaking through the boundary fence.	The barrier system has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design of this System will take place in the next stage of the Scheme design and will be based on the Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the M4 and specify the type of barrier required, which will be appropriate to address the risk raised by this respondent.	No
Junction 12				
12/12/2014	083	Whilst writing we would also advise you that we also have an interest in land at Pincents Lane at J12. We are aware that Ikea have proposed significant changes to the motorway junction and adjoining highway and doubtless your scheme will have some impact on their plans. We would therefore be grateful if you could advise us as to the changes, if any, that are likely to arise to the highway at J12 and your understanding of the programme of implementation that has been agreed with Ikea.	The M4 at junction 12 currently has three lanes through the junction and also three lanes to the east. As part of the Scheme, the hard shoulder to the east of the junction will be converted to a running lane, resulting in four lanes. This will create a dedicated lane for westbound traffic leaving the M4 and a dedicated lane for traffic joining the M4 eastbound. Three lanes will be maintained through the junction.	No
12/12/2014	426	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 (J12 EB), it is unlikely that Ramp Metering ("RM") will be required. However this RM site will require further review before a decision is made to remove the RM. The decision to retain or decommission the RM site will be agreed by Specialist Technical Support Services ("STSS") / Netserv at the Detailed Design stage of the Scheme.	No
Junction 4				
21/12/2014	283	- We would welcome engagement with the Highways Agency on the signage strategy for the M4 managed motorway, so that we can ensure efficient entry/exit of Heathrow Airport;	The signage strategy has been assessed by the Agency's specialists and the Agency's maintenance service provider. The Preliminary Design shows the terminal destinations being retained as they are. The Agency intends to continue engagement with Heathrow Airport regarding the Detailed Design of the Scheme and the envisaged traffic management in order to take account of Heathrow Airport's concerns.	No
Junction 5				
19/12/2014	066	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 J3-J4				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	HGV direction signing needs to be concentrated on J5 and J3 to minimize pressures on Heathrow airport via the M4 Spur and the Heathrow Villages.	The signage strategy has been assessed by the Agency's specialists and the Agency's maintenance service provider. The Preliminary Design shows the terminal destinations being retained as they are. The Agency intends to continue engagement with Heathrow Airport regarding the Detailed Design of the Scheme and the envisaged traffic management.	No
Mainline J4-J4a				
21/12/2014	283	- We welcome the widening of M4 Junction 4 to 4B to five lanes in each direction;	This is noted by the Agency.	No
Mainline Junctions 4a – 5				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
13/11/2014	087	<p>Thank you for the consultation regarding the above planning application. 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. 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

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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>Smart motorways have less effect on the environment than conventional road widening as they need less land.</p> <p>Part of Chalvey Depot has been identified as within the Order limits. The land is required temporarily for the 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, rather than its northern side, in order to minimise the effects on residential and business premises.</p> <p>The works will not affect the allotments near Chalvey Depot.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme</p>	No
Mainline Junctions 7 – 8/9				
17/12/2014	250	<p>BOTTLENECK: Re-Design of the M4 Junction 8/9. The Junction which serves the link between the M4 and the road to the M40 needs a re-think. This junction is not designed to handle the large amount of traffic needing to go from the M4 towards the M40. This results in cars queuing on the M4 itself at busy times. Getting onto the M4 from the road from the M40 is also slow. A partial / full spaghetti junction approach would make a big difference to the smooth running of the M4 in the Slough / Maidenhead area.</p>	<p>The Scheme does not include the major redesign of interchanges, such as providing freeflow slips, as it is outside the scope of the Scheme. As part of the Scheme, all of the slip roads at Junction 8/9 are to be improved to include a ghost island, thus increasing the capacity of the junction, which will alleviate, to an extent, the problems identified by this respondent.</p>	No
Non-Specific Location				
05/12/2014	057	<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 Order limits of the scheme. The Agency has been liaising with SSE's Plant Protection Team, which has already provided initial responses with associated reference numbers for areas of possible impacts of SSE's assets. Cost estimates from SSE for any required alterations to plant are awaited by the Agency.</p> <p>The Agency accepts the importance of SSE's assets and has provided protective provisions for the protection of SSE in the draft DCO submitted with the Application.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
04/12/2014	632	<p>BT plant does exist in the vicinity and its position will be located on site if required.</p> <p>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 has identified BT plant and will continue to engage with BT as part of the Agency's stakeholder engagement processes.</p> <p>The Agency accepts the importance of BT's assets and has provided protective provisions for the protection of operators of electronic communications wide networks in the draft DCO submitted with the Application.</p>	No
ITS and Lighting				
19/12/2014	066	<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 Agency welcomes collaboration with local authorities and will continue liaison with Slough Borough Council throughout the Detailed Design stage.</p>	No
12/11/2014	214	<p>There is already unacceptable noise and light pollution where the raised section of the M4 crosses the River Thames between J7 and J8. Better noise abatement measures are already needed. I appreciate that the scheme is of National importance and is probably going to go ahead irrespective of the levels of complaint from those residents immediately effected by the scheme. However, the scheme must have appropriate noise and light nuisance abatement measures implemented. This is especially so along the stretch where the M4 approaches and crosses over the River Thames as noise travels far upstream and downstream from the raised sections along the river corridor and in relation to which local residents have already raised complaints.</p>	<p>The proposed 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	<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 proposed 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

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	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.	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.	No
17/12/2014	250	Electronic Signage. This project is being sold to the public with increased electronic information signage being lumped in. Electronic Signage is a totally different issue and more information, particularly in relation to delays further up the route can only be a good thing.	The benefits of electronic signage have been an important factor in its inclusion in the design of the Scheme.	No
15/12/2014	268	<p>Page 4-14</p> <p>4.2.41 The full extent of the Scheme, except for the section between junction 8/9 and junction 10, is currently lit with either central reserve or verge lighting. The lighting design will be developed during detailed design to consider whether lighting should be retained or removed from the links where it is currently in place. For the purposes of environmental assessment, a worst case scenario has been assessed for visual intrusion based on the following:</p> <p>a) All the existing sections of the motorway and slip roads that are currently lit will remain lit;</p> <p>b) The unlit section between junction 8/9 and junction 10 will remain unlit; and c) Where lighting is required, existing lighting will be removed and replaced with modern light emitting diode (“LED”) lighting with a central management control system.</p> <p>& Page 4-29</p> <p>4.5.15 Lighting proposals are currently under review but for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed that new lighting will be provided for the whole length of this section. Lighting Columns will be mounted on top of the new concrete barrier to carry LED luminaires 12m above the carriageway.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>If replaced and located in the new concrete centre barrier, what will the diffuser angle of the new lighting be?</p> <p>Our concern is that light will spread beyond the m/way verge into our properties, creating a visual disturbance.</p> <p>Given a choice, our preferred, first choice would be no lighting, second choice would be verge mounted lighting facing into the carriageway.</p>	<p>The proposed lighting location in the central reserve will have the luminaires installed horizontally and the photometric settings will ensure that the minimum amount of light is required to illuminate the road to the required level.</p> <p>The central reserve lighting arrangement will result in minimal light distribution outside of the motorway boundary (i.e. into or onto local residents' properties) and the extent of this will be less than if verge-mounted lighting was to be used.</p> <p>Lighting will not be provided as part of the Scheme in sections of the M4 that are currently unlit.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	489	<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 impact on bats of any type of lighting.</p>	No
Land Owners				
05/12/2014	010	<p>Caller is requesting further information regarding the M4 J3 to J12 smart motorway scheme, and as to whether land she rents near it may be affected</p>	<p>Part of the land (approximately 5293 square metres) rented at this location is required temporarily for access and working space for the online reconstruction of Marsh Lane overbridge.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme</p>	No
05/12/2014	011	<p>Request for more information on the plans sent as part of the land referencing process.</p>	<p>The Agency provided the information requested and notes that this was in relation to previous correspondence, not the section 42 consultation.</p>	No
08/12/2014	017	<p>Would you be kind enough to advise how this scheme will actually impact on our property so we can assess if there is a need for a response. We are presuming that item 7. of the Notice of Proposed Application (compulsory acquisition of land including rights in and over land required for the project or facilitate or incidental to the project) is the most likely but we would obviously like details/maps of intended works to be able to fully assess this.</p>	<p>Part of the access road off Datchet Road is required temporarily for possible realignment of a private means of access as part of the reconstruction and realignment of Datchet Road.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
10/11/2014	023	As the owner of property adjoining the M4 and land owned by the Highways Agency ("HA"), my principle concerns are: (A) The extent to which the HA may be considering the Compulsory Purchase of land owned by me and my wife.	<p>Part of Pigeonhill Eyot (approximately 522 square metres) falls within the Order limits and is required temporarily for widening Thames Bray Bridge. A small section of the respondent's land (approximately 0.7 square metres) falls within the area required permanently at motorway level for construction and operation of the Scheme. At river level, acquisition of the respondent's land will be on a temporary basis, with rights retained for permanent inspection and maintenance access.</p> <p>The Agency will also need to access its site using Amerden Lane, but has noted the concerns of local residents and will seek to minimise disruption and any inconvenience by working with local residents.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme.</p>	No
26/11/2014	057	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.	<p>SSE apparatus has been identified within the Order limits of the Scheme. The Agency has been liaising with SSE's Plant Protection Team, which has already provided initial responses with associated reference numbers for areas of possible impacts of SSE's assets. Cost estimates from SSE for any required alterations to plant are awaited by the Agency.</p> <p>The Agency accepts the importance of SSE's assets and has provided protective provisions for the protection of electricity undertakers in the draft DCO submitted with the Application.</p> <p>The Agency will continue to liaise with SSE in respect of its concerns.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
17/11/2014	064	Please could you provide information relating to how my client is affected by the scheme?	<p>An EIA has been carried out, which is reported in the ES. This addresses the predicted impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>Land plans have been prepared and submitted with the Application, which depict the areas of land that are intended to be compulsorily acquired on temporary and permanent bases. A Book of Reference has also been prepared and submitted with the Application, which details each parcel of land that is to be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme in order to minimise effects on affected landowners as far as possible.</p>	No
12/12/2014	091	Our client owns land between Ascot Road and Monkey Island overbridges. I note that in the notice of a proposed application for development of consent order you have included the proposed acquisition of land including rights. The object of writing this email is to enquire whether in the Highways Agency proposals you intend to acquire any land from the Clothworkers Company or is all the work going to be carried out within the Highway Agency land.	<p>At this location, it is intended that works will be contained within the existing highway boundary. As such, no acquisition of the respondent's land is anticipated.</p> <p>Land plans have been prepared and submitted with the Application, which depict the areas of land that are intended to be compulsorily acquired on temporary and permanent bases. A Book of Reference has also been prepared and submitted with the Application, which details each parcel of land that is to be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition.</p>	No
12/12/2014	092	Please can you give us our reference and confirm who has been dealing with the matter?	The respondent 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 Order limits (and therefore has also been 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 respondent company. The Agency has received a C3 estimate reference number, which has been provided directly to the respondent company.	No
24/11/2014	093	Can you let me know why we are a statutory consultee please?	<p>The respondent company has been identified as an occupier of Heston motorway maintenance depot. Therefore, it has been included as a statutory consultee under sections 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Land in this area has been identified as a potential temporary construction compound for use during construction of the Scheme. This can be seen from the Land plans and Works plans that have been submitted with the Application.</p> <p>This information has been provided directly to the respondent.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	094	<p>From a personal point of view, we are extremely concerned that the current order limit includes the unregistered land at the foot of our garden, as well as our neighbours' vehicular access to the rear of their properties. Clearly this is totally unacceptable to us and we would like confirmation of the project team's belief (on 26th November) that this land would not be required, subject to a detailed review of services.</p>	<p>Following further consideration of the suitability of these areas and consideration of consultation responses, the Agency can confirm that the unregistered land at the rear of the respondent's property is not required for the purposes of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Land plans (sheet 23) submitted with the Application show the intended permanent and temporary land acquisition requirements at this location.</p> <p>The vehicular access to the rear of properties at this location is also no longer required and has been omitted from the Application.</p>	Yes
25/11/2014	099	<p>As per your letter dated 10th November 2014 I have filled out the online questionnaire requesting additional information regarding the works on Junction 4. I would appreciate if you could please advise how my Client is likely to be affected from these works including changes to the infrastructure at Junction 4.</p>	<p>Part of the respondent's leasehold land has been identified as within the Order limits. This land falls within the M4/Stockley Road slip road and will be used for realignment of the M4 Junction 4 (Heathrow) eastbound on-slip.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme in order to minimise effects on affected landowners as far as possible.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	115	<p>Relating to land adjoining the motorway between Ascot Road and Monkey Island Lane overbridges: We consider it is important to find out please, exactly what works the Highways Agency wish to carry out along this length of motorway so that our clients are aware of what is happening and that if any proposed works infringe upon their operation for sand and gravel extraction and the aftercare and restoration after the mineral extraction has come to an end.</p>	<p>Between Ascot Road overbridge and Monkey Island Lane, work is restricted to within the existing highway boundary. No additional land is required to be acquired for the Scheme at this location and construction access will be via the M4.</p> <p>Some land take is required at Monkey Island Lane overbridge and Thames Bray underbridge, which may affect the respondent. Monkey Island Lane overbridge is being replaced with a new bridge to the west of the existing bridge's location. This will include the widening and raising of earthworks, and demolition of the existing bridge. Some of the respondent's land is intended to be acquired on a permanent basis for this work, while some of the respondent's land will be required temporarily for use during construction. The respondent's conveyer under the M4 will not be disrupted by the works.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme in order to minimise effects on affected landowners as far as possible.</p>	No
08/12/2014	123	<p>The caller would like to know the following information about M4 J3-12 Smart motorways. 1. The south side of motorway construction proposal between the Lake End bridge and the Dorney Reach bridge. The caller also would like to know what access is required.</p>	<p>Between Lake End Road overbridge and Dorney Reach, work is restricted to within the existing highway boundary. No additional land is required to be acquired for the Scheme at this location and construction access will be via the M4.</p> <p>Some land take is required at Lake End Road overbridge, which may affect the respondent. Lake End Road overbridge is being replaced with a new bridge to the west of the existing bridge's location. This will include the widening and raising of earthworks, and demolition of the existing bridge. Some of the respondent's land will be required for temporary use during construction but will not be required to be acquired on a permanent basis.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme in order to minimise effects on affected landowners as far as possible.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	127	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 Agency has noted this response and updated its records accordingly.	No
12/12/2014	133	I am under the impression that a bridge which I use over the M4 to access my land to the west of junction 8/9 may be removed which would have massive consequences on my business. Please can you confirm the position. Please can you confirm whether or not the proposal include the demolition of the bridge about 930 metres west of junction 8/9 of the M4 which I use to access land south of the motorway	The Agency can confirm that no bridges to the west of junction 8/9 are proposed to be removed.	No
09/02/2015	241	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 is 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, which show all of the matters requested by this respondent.	No
19/12/2014	245	Impact on Network Rail land ownership The boundary of the DCO at the southern end of the Colnbrook Branch appears to venture on to Network Rail's land south of the A4. Could you please confirm whether it is proposed to take any land or interests in Network Rail land at this location?	The land at the southern end of the Colnbrook branch, south of the A4, was initially potentially required for use as construction compound 10. Following further consideration of the suitability of this location, and consideration of a number of consultation responses, including that of this respondent, it is no longer proposed to take construction compound 10 forward for the Scheme.	Yes
17/12/2014	250	- Values of properties will be reduced due to works and the end result.	The impacts on properties that are predicted as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme have been assessed and reported in the ES. This includes an assessment of noise, air quality and general amenity impacts. The assessment of these impacts concludes that there are no significant adverse impacts on the majority of properties in the vicinity of the Scheme and for a large number of properties the impacts of the Scheme are predicted to be beneficial, particularly in respect of reduction in noise levels. The draft DCO incorporates provisions giving effect to the National Compensation Code. This provides for owners of properties to make claims for compensation in certain circumstances.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/11/2014	251	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The response is noted. BT's telecommunications apparatus has been addressed separately.</p>	No
11/12/2014	288	<p>More generally, referring to questions you have asked.</p> <p>Page 2 Impact on land</p> <p>1) I am concerned about possible land take at the rear of my property, as I am the owner of a long strip of land there and have already been asked on several occasions to submit my details of ownership to you. What is going to happen? When will I be informed of this? Please let me know asap. (see confirmation sheets)</p>	<p>Following the finalisation of the preliminary design, the Agency can confirm that no land owned by this Respondent is intended to be compulsorily acquired on either a temporary or permanent basis.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/01/2015	481	<p>As we are fully aware, the above project is still only in its initial stages, however we believe that the project will go ahead and we run a leisure business adjacent to junction 7 and the bridge that crosses the River Thames.</p> <p>This is our only source of income and whilst this motorway work is being carried out we will not be able to operate due to increased activity and noise levels, this is a huge concern for us.</p> <p>We take advance bookings for the site, as we are one of only two in the area hosting visitors to Windsor, Legoland and London, so we need to know your planned schedule of work.</p> <p>We would very much appreciate a meeting with someone at our property to discuss the implication of the bridge widening and the impact the upheaval will have on our lives/business.</p>	<p>The Agency intends to meet with this respondent in order to discuss the concerns raised.</p> <p>Land at this location has been identified as required to be acquired permanently and temporarily for widening of the M4 and M4 embankment, and access and working space for widening of Thames Bray underbridge during construction.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme in order to minimise effects on affected landowners as far as possible.</p> <p>The impacts on properties that are predicted as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme have been assessed and reported in the ES. This includes an assessment of noise and general amenity impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed during the construction phase of the Scheme, which are provided for in the Outline CEMP</p> <p>The assessment of these impacts concludes that there are no significant adverse impacts on the majority of properties in the vicinity of the Scheme and for a large number of properties the impacts of the Scheme are predicted to be beneficial, particularly in respect of reduction in noise levels.</p> <p>Should the Application be accepted, the Secretary of State is expected to make a decision on whether to grant development consent for the Scheme in around September 2016 and, if consent is granted, work is expected to commence towards the end of 2016 or beginning of 2017.</p> <p>The draft DCO incorporates provisions giving effect to the National Compensation Code. This provides for owners of properties to make claims for compensation in certain circumstances.</p>	No
Need for smart motorway				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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 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
18/11/2014	070	<p>We would like to object to this scheme, as it doesn't solve the problem. It is too dangerous running a motorway without a hard shoulder. We have seen many deaths personally on the M4 over the last 45 years. That is with a hard shoulder!</p>	<p>A number of alternatives to the Scheme have been considered and these are reported in the ES. The Scheme, including the conversion of the hard shoulder into a running lane, has been assessed as the most appropriate method for improving the M4. Safety considerations were included in this assessment.</p> <p>The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required for the M4, without compromising overall safety. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 smart motorway scheme shows that accidents have more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme was launched. The severity of accidents has also dropped significantly.</p> <p>Smart motorways, such as the Scheme, also allow for mandatory, variable speed limits to be imposed on the traffic using the M4 so that vehicles are required to travel at an appropriate speed for the conditions (traffic volume and weather conditions, for instance) that are being experienced at the time.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	094	<p>We have completed the enclosed public consultation questionnaires regarding the M4 junctions 3 to 12 smart motorway and we have a number of concerns that need to be addressed, which we have detailed in this letter.</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposed scheme as it does not appear to achieve the aims as laid out in the Statement of Community Consultation and it will have a detrimental impact on our neighbourhood (The Myrke being in close proximity to the M4 carriageway between junctions 5 and 6).</p> <p>The proposed scheme aims to relieve congestion and smooth the flow of traffic as well as improve journey times and reliability. However, it is not clear who will experience the benefit of this as drivers' views, as stated in section 12.1.3 of the Non-Technical Summary, are not expected to be materially different following completion of the scheme. Therefore, this suggests that drivers are managing their own journey times and don't see any benefits of the scheme. As regular users of the motorway, we would concur with this view.</p> <p>In addition, London-bound traffic would still be reduced to two lanes after junction 3 and, as now, problems on the M25 would still cause knock-on congestion on the M4 starting at junction 4b.</p> <p>The proposed scheme also aims to support economic development and facilitate growth within the region. It seems the reality is that the proposed scheme is attempting to speed up the flow of traffic through the region and on to Heathrow and London; though the success of this is questionable for the reasons mentioned above. Investment within the region's communities and public transport links may be a better use of public funds.</p> <p>The final aim of the proposed scheme is to minimise the effect on the environment but given the long list of impacts outlined in the Public Consultation Brochure this appears to be a non-starter.</p>	<p>The impacts on properties that are predicted as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme have been assessed and reported in the ES. This includes an assessment of noise, air quality and general amenity impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed during the construction phase of the Scheme, which are provided for in the Outline CEMP. Mitigation measures during operation of the Scheme are also proposed in order to minimise the adverse impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment of the impacts of the Scheme concludes that there are no significant adverse impacts on the majority of properties in the vicinity of the Scheme and for a large number of properties the impacts of the Scheme are predicted to be beneficial, particularly in respect of reduction in noise levels.</p> <p>Experience from the early Smart motorway schemes has proved that the Smart motorways concept works. They reduce congestion and improve journey times by smoothing the traffic flow. This is achieved through using variable speed limits and giving more space to road users by making an additional lane (previously the hard shoulder) available as a traffic lane.</p> <p>Use of the hard shoulder as a running lane has also been proven not to worsen safety. For example, on the M42 J3a to 7 near Birmingham, where a smart motorway has been in operation for a number of years, using the hard shoulder as a running lane has not only reduced congestion and improved journey reliability, but also improved safety with accidents more than halving on that section of the motorway. Customer surveys undertaken on this section of the M42 have also recorded improved driver satisfaction as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>The M4 J3-12 Scheme will increase the capacity of the M4 and is also expected to result in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. This will provide a more efficient infrastructure for movement of people and goods within the region in support of the economy. The speed of traffic through the Scheme between J12 and J3 will vary depending on the road traffic conditions and the signals will display mandatory speed limits in accordance with the traffic conditions. The complementary systems on the M25 will provide the South Mimms Control Centre with visibility of traffic flows on both motorways to better manage the knock on effects of congestion and an improved capability to manage incidents. London-bound traffic will be reduced to two lanes after J3 but the Scheme will enable traffic approaching this junction to be managed according to prevailing traffic conditions, so that traffic can flow more smoothly into London.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
			<p>The Agency will continue to work with the Local Highway Authorities on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>The Scheme has been subject to EIA, as reported in the ES, with mitigation measures proposed to minimise any adverse impacts of the Scheme on the environment.</p>	
12/12/2014	106	<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 it 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
17/12/2014	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hard shoulder is often used for breakdown, emergency vehicles and recovery vehicles. - Removal of the hard shoulder could increase risks on the motorway. - The scheme might end up reducing the width of the middle and "fast" M4 lanes which will make use of the motorway more dangerous. 	<p>A number of alternatives to the Scheme have been considered and these are reported in the ES. The Scheme, including the conversion of the hard shoulder into a running lane, has been assessed as the most appropriate method for improving the M4. Safety considerations were included in this assessment.</p> <p>The Scheme will deliver the additional capacity required for the M4, without compromising overall safety. Evidence published in March 2011 from the M42 smart motorway scheme shows that accidents have more than halved in the three years after the pilot scheme was launched. The severity of accidents has also dropped significantly.</p> <p>Lane widths will be within the specifications set out in the Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>Smart motorways, such as the Scheme, also allow for mandatory, variable speed limits to be imposed on the traffic using the M4 so that vehicles are required to travel at an appropriate speed for the conditions (traffic volume and weather conditions, for instance) that are being experienced at the time.</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 one of the many emergency refuge areas ("ERAs") proposed along the Scheme extent.</p> <p>Where vehicles do come to a stop in a live running lane, the extra controls provided through smart motorways' features will minimise this risk. An emergency lane(s) (any lane on the motorway) can be created and traffic can be managed with signs and signals to provide access for the emergency services or traffic officers. It is expected that the overall risk of the new specification is likely to be less than that on a dual three-lane motorway with a hard shoulder.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	255	<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 throughout 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>	The Agency has noted this response and is thankful for the support.	No
21/12/2014	283	We would raise the following points of detail on the proposals: - Where possible, minimum lane running should be increased above three lanes in the Heathrow area;	The design for the Scheme includes a four-lane smart motorway between J5-12 and J3-4, and a five-lane smart motorway between J4 and J4b and westbound between Sutton Lane Bridge and J4b. During construction, 3 lanes of traffic will be maintained on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing.	No
Noise				
16/12/2014	255	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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
22/02/2015	255	<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 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	<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>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.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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 agglomerations⁷. 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 19759, 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— (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 (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 roads¹⁰. 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</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 (2022), 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). 505 residential properties would experience an 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</p>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		<p>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>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>	
11/11/2014	204	<p>This will be in addition to the increased noise and air pollution caused by additional traffic using the motorway hard shoulder.</p>	<p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. It is predicted that there will be negligible changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation due to this approach.</p>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	<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. 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 (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 UK Calculation of Road Traffic Noise.</p> <p>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 Scheme is included in the ES. Specific information for the eastern end of the Scheme can be provided to Hillingdon Council.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
27/11/2014	244	<p>Having lived in Wood Lane since 1966 and have seen the M4 widened from two to three lanes and the inevitable increase in traffic over the past years with of course more noise from the traffic and presumably more air pollution.</p> <p>With the new configuration of using the hard shoulder for the fourth lane the traffic will be closer to the houses in Wood Lane with an increase in noise levels. When the new housing estate north of the M4 and west of Wood Lane was in the planning stage the question of noise from the M4 was discussed. Subsequently a noise barrier was built comprising a large earth mound topped off with a wooden fence, the whole barrier some thirty feet high. This was also extended east past the ASDA supermarket. At that time residents of Wood Lane requested a noise barrier to be constructed to cut down the noise for Wood Lane residents. The request was turned down on financial grounds as there are only sixteen houses in Wood Lane.</p> <p>With the Smart Motorway costing upwards of £800,000,000 the cost of a noise barrier for Wood Lane would be an insignificant amount.</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and these show that no additional noise barriers to Wood Lane are required.</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p> <p>With this low noise surface in place, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation. No additional noise barriers to Wood Lane are, therefore, proposed. The noise assessments are reported fully in the ES which accompanies the Application.</p> <p>Assessments of air quality have been carried out and are also reported fully in the ES. No significant changes in effect in terms of air quality are predicted as a result of the Scheme.</p>	Yes
17/12/2014	250	<p>- Encouraging increased traffic will result in increased noise and air pollution.</p>	<p>Noise and Air Quality assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES. It is predicted that there will be negligible changes or decreases in noise levels with the Scheme in operation and no significant change in effect in terms of Air Quality. All existing noise barriers along the M4 between junction 3 and junction 12 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). There will also be some additional noise barriers provided. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p>	Yes

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/02/2015	255	<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>Additional noise barriers are proposed for this area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following 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
13/01/2015	267	<p>In the absence of more detailed information about the implication for noise which will affect our property we wish to register a holding objection .</p>	<p>There is currently no procedural mechanism to register a "holding objection". During the six week consultation period in November/December 2014, a series of public exhibitions were held to discuss the Scheme with, and provide information (including the results of noise assessments) to, stakeholders. This information was also made available at deposit point locations for the entire six week period.</p> <p>If the Application is accepted, Scheme information will again be made available at publicly accessible locations and on the internet.</p> <p>Stakeholders can register (on the Inspectorate's website) to be kept informed of progress of the Scheme during the DCO process.</p> <p>Stakeholders can also provide comments directly to the Planning Inspectorate during the pre- examination period (anticipated to be late-April 2015 to late-July 2015).</p> <p>The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported fully in the ES. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p> <p>A small number of additional noise barriers are proposed for the Scheme, while existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be negligible / minor decreases in noise levels to properties along the length of the Scheme.</p>	Yes
Ascot Road Overbridge				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
05/12/2014	012	My property is adjacent to the A330 Ascot Road overbridge which you are proposing to widen as a result of the M4 Jn 3 -12 Smart Motorway scheme. I read that you are about to embark upon formal consultation, but as I could not find the consultation brochure on your publications page I thought it best to email you. I am concerned that the widening of the Ascot Road overbridge (as shown on sheet 18 of your redline maps) will result in increasing the gradient of the A330 as it approaches the overbridge on the Holyport side even more than now. As this gradient is immediately in front of my property it will result in greater noise, (as the noise will emanate from a greater height) and reduced privacy to my properties. Can you please let me know what mitigation measures you are proposing to reduce the impact of this?	<p>It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties on Ascot Road with the Scheme in operation.</p> <p>The assessment of noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA and is reported fully in the ES. The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes of the motorway with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p> <p>The new Ascot Road overbridge will be higher than the existing bridge but the tie-in will be extended so that the gradient is not significantly increased.</p>	Yes
Barriers				
05/12/2014	009	The increased noise levels are evident and I would therefore also like to know if there are plans for a long term protective noise reducing barrier.	Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES. It is predicted that the allotments will experience a negligible/minor reduction in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. This is a consequence of the provision of a low-noise surface across all lanes of the Scheme.	No
19/12/2014	086	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 EIA. 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 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 ES.	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	098	<p>Point 4, 5 & 6: "Noise and vibration/11 NOISE AND VIBRATION 2.1.6 Environmental barriers, in the form of fencing to mitigate noise and visual impacts, will be included where the Scheme identifies this form of environmental mitigation is required. Vegetation lost to construction activities will be replanted where possible with locally appropriate species. 11.1.1 39 areas along the Scheme, have been identified where Action Plans have been published setting out proposals to manage noise. As a result of the Scheme no properties will experience a noise increase greater than negligible, as defined by an increase in noise levels of >3dB over 15 years." Point 4. Noise is already a problem at this allotment site and no indication has been made as to what type of 'fencing' or barrier would be erected to mitigate this. Clearly, increased traffic WILL mean increased noise. Point 5. In addition to this, the barrier along the highway side of the allotment needs to be a safety barrier as well because the plot holders are right on the edge of the highway as it is. No mention is made about barrier type or construction along the allotment site. Point 6. The loss of natural vegetation as well as growing areas is of major concern for a number of reasons, not least that this is supposed to be land that is set aside for the growing of vegetables for personal use.</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA. 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 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 the allotments will experience a negligible / minor reduction in noise levels with the Scheme in operation. The noise assessment is reported fully in the ES.</p> <p>The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The barrier 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> <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 replace removed vegetation with native species, which will provide screening as the Scheme and planting matures.</p>	Yes
09/12/2014	214	<p>The raised elevations and approaches to the River Thames Bray Underbridge between J7 and 8/9 already need acoustic boarding and a better vegetation planting scheme to help reduce noise and light pollution. If this scheme is to go ahead, adequate measures will need to be taken this time as the current situation is unacceptable (it is understood that acoustic boarding was supposed to have run the entire length of the approaches up to and over the River Thames on each side but was not completed).</p>	<p>Noise assessments were carried out as part of the EIA and have been reported fully in the ES. No additional noise barriers are proposed to this area following this assessment. Existing noise barriers along the Scheme extent will be retained (or replaced where this is required due to the existing barriers being in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. 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/moderate decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.</p> <p>The assessments show that the existing proposal is sufficient, hence no additional planting will be provided to reduce light pollution.</p>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/12/2014	234	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the M4 Smart motorway. We would like to express our concerns over noise pollution in the area created by the motorway and disruption during the works. Excessive noise pollution during expansion of the motorway bridge near our home or ongoing noise thereafter will negatively impact our quality of life.</p> <p>We spend a lot of time in the garden. The noise from the motorway is already very loud at times, in fact, we can hear it from inside our bedroom on the opposite side of the house, even when all the windows and doors are shut.</p> <p>This is a fabulous part of England, with high numbers of visitors who are attracted by the serenity and beauty of the area. There is a high risk that the noise pollution from the motorway will spoil this.</p> <p>We request that you take our views into account and take action to address our concerns, for instance through the use of noise barriers along the side of the motorway. We understand that these are the most effective way of reducing the noise intensity.</p>	<p>An assessment of construction noise and vibration impacts is reported in the ES.</p> <p>Following this assessment, no additional noise barriers are proposed for this area. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Subsequent to consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p> <p>With this low noise surface in place, it is predicted that there will be minor decreases in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.</p> <p>A range of good site practices will be adopted in order to minimise construction phase noise and vibration. These will be secured in the CEMP, an 'Outline' version of which accompanies the DCO application.</p>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/12/2014	239	<p>The Environmental Study compares "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" options.</p> <p>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</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 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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	268	<p>Page 4-14</p> <p>Improving a Traditional Motorway: Environmental Barriers</p> <p>4.2.43 Environmental barriers, in the form of fencing to mitigate noise and visual impacts, will be included within the Scheme where the EIA identifies that this form of environmental mitigation is required. This is addressed in greater detail in Chapters 8 and 12 of this PEI Report.</p> <p>& Page 4-29</p> <p>Nearside and verge works</p> <p>4.5.16 Work in the central reserve and off side lanes in this section of the motorway is similar to the work proposed for the section from junction 12 to junction 11. Where necessary, the existing hard shoulder will be strengthened to enable it to carry motorway traffic. Other verge features included in the Scheme are: underground ducts to carry power and communication cables, steel safety barriers around hazards, drainage modifications, lighting (at junction slip roads only), environmental barriers and replacement planting.</p> <p>4.5.17 Where the motorway passes over Mill Lane, to the northwest of Sindlesham, there will be 200m of new 2m high noise fence in the northern verge and 50m in the southern verge.</p> <p>Carriageway resurfacing</p> <p>4.5.18 On completion of central reserve and verge phases of construction the adjacent lanes, i.e. the nearside and offside lanes of each carriageway, will be resurfaced in TSCS (low-noise surfacing). In addition full width new TSCS will be provided as follows:</p> <p>a) 620m on each carriageway just east of junction 11 to reduce the noise impact to residential properties on Whitley Wood Lane and Babbington Road to the north and Brookers Hill to the south.</p> <p>b) 1370m on the eastbound carriageway and 90m on the westbound carriageway as the M4 passes between Winnersh to the north and Sindlesham to the south.</p> <p>&</p> <p>Page 12-36</p> <p>Operation</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES.. Additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will also be retained (or replaced if in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Subsequent to public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. With this low-noise surface in place, it is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation.</p> <p>Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers have been provided on figure 12.2 of the ES.</p>	Yes
Construction				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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
11/12/2014	288	<p>3) Noise from construction - I am very concerned about the noise, dust and disturbance which will affect us directly once the work starts, and will continue for 5 years. Some homes in The Myrke are only 35 metres from the proposed site for the construction compound. The scheme's assessment states that there may be significant night time noise (alternative options for the construction site must be considered e.g. there is a proposed construction compound 7 near junction 6 which is 500 metres away from housing with noise levels described as unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>Page 2 air quality impacts - Despite the scheme's assessment that there will be no significant impact to the air quality as a result of the scheme, I am very concerned indeed. There is bound to be a deterioration in air quality during the demolition and building work so close to our homes. And there may also be adverse effects from construction dust and debris in the vicinity of the construction compound 8, only 35 metres away from some of our homes (ref 14.10.23 Main text).</p>	<p>Disruption and construction noise will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, and mitigation measures are proposed and provided for in the Outline CEMP that is an appendix to the Outline EMP, submitted with the Application.</p> <p>A site Liaison Officer will be appointed for the construction period in order to keep people informed and to deal with any queries raised by local communities and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Construction activities could adversely affect air quality in some areas through dust generation and plant emissions. However, proposals to control these potential impacts are also set out in the Outline CEMP.</p>	No
Earley/Winnerish				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	083	<p>We are writing further to your letter of 10 November advising of the proposed alterations to the M4, notably the implementation of the Smart Motorway scheme. We control land at Woodward Close, Winnersh which is near the M4 and on which we have recently gained consent for the construction of a residential care facility. A significant part of the planning process was the assessment of the noise impact arising from the M4. Currently there is a substantial acoustic fence bounding the M4 at the edge of the hard shoulder, clearly utilising the hard shoulder as is proposed is likely to have a negative impact upon the ability of the existing attenuation measures and thus expose the residents of the care facility to an unacceptable level of noise? We would be please to receive details of your proposed improvements to the existing acoustic protection and receive your assurances that the levels of noise measured on our site will not increase following the implementation of the Smart Motorway scheme.</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been undertaken as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES.</p> <p>Additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had also been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. 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 / minor decreases in noise levels to properties in Winnersh (including Woodward Close) with the Scheme in operation due to the provision of low-noise surfacing.</p>	Yes
08/12/2014	224	<p>Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Matthews Green Farm could result in increased noise levels at the site. We also request a copy of any noise assessment work that has been undertaken to assess the changes to road traffic noise that may result from the proposed works to the M4 and A329(M) motorway (both construction and operational) as well as from changes to traffic on the feeder road network. In addition to the above we seek your assurances that where the changes to road traffic resulting from the Smart Motorway Project will increase road traffic noise, appropriate noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into your scheme proposals and designs.</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of the EIA and have been reported fully in the ES. These assessments show that no additional noise barriers are required for this area.</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had also been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Subsequent to public consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. Although Matthews Green Farm is outside the detailed study area, it is predicted that there will be negligible changes in noise levels to this area with the Scheme in operation.</p>	Yes

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	225	<p>Our clients have an interest in land that has the benefit of planning consent for up to 433 new dwellings, a Primary School and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Hatch Farm Dairies could result in increased noise levels at the site.</p> <p>We also request a copy of any noise assessment work that has been undertaken to assess the changes to road traffic noise that may result from the proposed works to the M4 motorway (both construction and operational) as well as from changes to traffic on the feeder road network.</p> <p>In addition to the above we seek your assurances that where the changes to road traffic resulting from the Smart Motorway Project will increase road traffic noise, appropriate noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into your scheme proposals and designs.</p>	<p>Noise assessments have been carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES. These assessments show that no additional noise barriers are required for the Winnersh area, except for two short lengths of barrier where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. Existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</p> <p>It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decreases in noise levels at properties in this area with the Scheme in operation.</p>	Yes
Junction 3				
19/12/2014	106	<p>Air Quality and Noise Levels</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Meetings were held with TfL on 19 May 2014 and 9 December 2014 to discuss TfL's concerns.</p>	No
Junction 4				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
25/11/2014	099	As per your letter dated 10th November 2014 I have filled out the online questionnaire requesting additional information regarding the works on Junction 4. I would appreciate if you could please advise how my Client is likely to be affected from these works including potential increase in noise pollution.	<p>The potential effects of the Scheme during construction and operation have been subject to EIA and are reported fully in the ES.</p> <p>The contractor will employ best practice in order to minimise noise and dust levels during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP includes mitigation measures to minimise the effects of construction on the environment and residents/businesses.</p> <p>There will also be close liaison between the Contractor, the Local Authority Environmental Health Officer and affected residents and commercial operations to ensure that disruption during construction is effectively managed.</p> <p>Regarding operational noise levels, it is predicted that there will be a minor decrease in noise levels to the Premier Inn with the Scheme in operation. This is a consequence of the provision of a low noise surface across all lanes of the Scheme for Scheme opening year (2022).</p>	No
Junction 8/9				
10/11/2014	023	(B) The extent of any noise disruption and nuisance that may occur during lane widening and works to the M4 motorway bridge that passes over the River Thames between J7 & J8. (C) The extent of any ongoing noise nuisance that will emanate from traffic approaching, going over, and exiting from the raised elevation of the M4 as it passes over the River Thames between J7 & J8 and the measures that will be put in place by the HA to minimise and reduce noise nuisance once the scheme is complete and the Smart Motorway is in use. I and other nearby property owners have already raised concerns with the HA about the amount of noise nuisance already suffered as a result of the M4 traffic noise between J7 & J8 and at the failure of the HA to install sound baffling measures along the motorway stretch as it passes over the River Thames between J7 & J8. I wish to understand what noise abatement measures the HA are proposing to install as part of the Scheme.	<p>During construction, the contractor will employ best practice to minimise noise levels during the works as specified in the CEMP. There will also be close liaison between the Contractor, the Local Authority Environmental Health Officers and affected residents and commercial operations to ensure that disruption during construction is effectively managed.</p> <p>Noise assessments have been carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of the EIA and are reported fully in the ES. Existing noise barriers between J7 and J8/9 will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition).</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. 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 or minor decreases in noise levels to residential areas between J7 and J8/9 with the Scheme in operation with this approach.</p>	Yes
Myrke Road				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	094	Further design elements - The proposed scheme does include the installation of noise barriers between the M4 and The Myrke as well as low noise surfacing on lanes 1 and 4. Both of these are essential and should be considered mandatory but the low noise surfacing has a finite effective life so what's the ongoing resurfacing programme? Indeed, in the event that the proposed scheme is not approved, the barriers should be installed anyway and the low noise surfacing, laid in about 2000, requires replacing and maintaining on a regular basis.	The Scheme does include the installation of noise barriers between the M4 and The Myrke as well as low noise surfacing across all lanes. The surfacing will be replaced and/or maintained in the normal manner in which the Agency maintains its motorways. .	No
Road Surface				
19/12/2014	255	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 EIA and reported fully in the ES. 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 Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. 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.	Yes
15/12/2014	268	In addition we feel the additional low-noise surfacing should also be extended by a minimum of 50m, again on the E/B carriageway from chainage 49140m to 49190m. See drawing below.	Following the production of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and public consultation responses, it has been decided that low-noise surfacing will be provided in all lanes for the full length of the Scheme.	Yes
Operations and Safety				
Emergency Refuge Areas				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
21/12/2014	283	<p>- Emergency Rescue Areas should be set at the minimum distance apart from in areas adjacent to Heathrow, to minimise potential disruption on airport access/egress, which can cause a very significant wider economic impact.</p>	<p>Emergency refuge areas ("ERAs") are provided at regular intervals on all smart motorways in accordance with current design standards that have been based on the experience garnered from the smart motorways that are already operational. ERAs must be provided at a maximum spacing of 2,500m and 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.</p> <p>There is no minimum distance apart in the design standard for ERAs. In the preliminary design the ERAs are located in both the eastbound and westbound carriageways approximately half-way between junction 4b and junction 4 and also half-way between junction 4 and junction 3. This equates to a spacing of approximately 1,500m.</p>	No
Gantries				
15/12/2014	268	<p>Page 4-30 4.5.20 Gantries on the eastbound carriageway: a) One gateway gantry positioned shortly after the junction 11 entry slip road. This gantry will carry a single variable message signal type MS4 and a set of four AMIs, one positioned over each lane, to display lane availability and speed limits; b) One intermediate gantry similar to the gateway, but positioned half way along the section; c) Nine additional variable message signals (one MS3 and eight MS4s) positioned over the nearside lane at regular intervals; d) Two ADS positioned at 1 mile and ½ mile in advance of junction 10 showing the exit destinations of Reading (E) Bracknell and Wokingham; and e) One final direction sign on approach to junction 10, showing exit destination as above and M4 through traffic destinations of Greater London and Maidenhead.</p> <p>Question What type and size of gantry will be positioned just prior to Mill Lane underbridge on the Eastbound carriageway and how much ground work will be required to support it, as indicated on M4-PEIR_Drawing_04-1_Scheme-Plan_Sheet-01-19_J12-J10.pdf Sheet 16, bearing in mind the close proximity (approx. 15m) of 'Hillside' to the indicated location?</p>	<p>The gantry proposed to be positioned just prior to Mill Lane underbridge on the Eastbound carriageway is a gantry type 3 - a superspan cantilever. A superspan cantilever is likely to be about 4.5 x 4.5 m, sticking out of the ground by about 1.6m. Drawings depicting the gantry design have been submitted with the Application (Document Reference No. 2.9).</p>	No
Incident Management				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	106	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?	As requested by TfL, a meeting was held on 9 December 2014 to discuss this issue, allowing it to provide a full response to the consultation by the close of the consultation period. The full response is listed under reference 106 in this table.	No
Main Carriageway				
21/12/2014	283	- Once complete, Heathrow welcomes the opportunity to establish formal arrangements for exchanging data and information relating to M4 traffic so that network performance can be proactively managed across Heathrow and Highways Agency roads. Heathrow Airport Limited is committed to working with the Highways Agency to develop the M4 smart motorway scheme to give the best experience for all users.	The Agency will continue to liaise with Heathrow Airport as the Scheme progresses through the DCO process and Detailed Design stage, and once the Scheme is operational.	No
Other				
6/11/2014		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 has noted this response and that a full response has been received. This is listed under reference 490 in this table.	No
11/12/2014	039	I wish to confirm there are no comments at this time	The Agency has noted this response	No
12/11/2014	102	No comments recorded	The Agency has noted this response.	No
12/12/2014	103	I would like at this point to register our interest to respond, and if you could put my name as a contact that would be appreciated. We have a meeting scheduled for Wednesday 3rd December with regards this document and the M4 proposals in general, so we should be in a position to respond at that point.	The Agency has noted this response	No
Other Environment/ES Related Responses				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	3) The impact of the scheme on the Local Communities. 4) The adverse effects of the scheme on the local area. The impact of the process on the local community is concerning. As there is little information on the process in this consultation it is impossible to get an accurate understanding of its actual impact. It is assumed that this issue will be considered and factored in with correspondence with Local Authorities once the constructors have been chosen.	The impacts of the Scheme on local communities have been considered, 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	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	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	29.0 We welcome the opportunity to comment in detail on the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) we are particularly concerned about the impact of piling operations (noise and vibration), night time noise impact and dust impact to our residents in Slough. We are also concerned about the air quality impact on local road network from closures and diversions, and the impact of construction vehicles travelling through the Slough road network.	Assessments of noise, vibration and air quality impacts have been carried out as part of the EIA and reported fully in the ES. The Outline CEMP sets out mitigation measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme in order to minimise the effects of the construction activities on the environment and residents. The Outline CEMP will become a final CEMP that the contractor will have to comply with during construction of the Scheme and the Agency has provided in the draft DCO submitted with the Application that the local authorities, including Slough Borough Council, will have to approve the CEMP.	No
23/12/2014	094	Vibrations - The bridge works are likely to increase the level of vibrations, which may adversely impact some of the homes on The Myrke particularly given their age and shallow foundations. If the scheme goes ahead, all homes on The Myrke should be inspected by an independent structural surveyor, at the Scheme's expense, and each homeowner provided with the resulting report for their property; a similar inspection should be carried out following completion of the scheme to identify any damage. The resolution of any damage should then be funded by the scheme.	Impacts on properties from vibration has been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme and reported fully in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. The ground borne vibrations from the general construction plant and activities are not predicted to be significant for the Scheme and it is proposed to use rotary bored piling rigs for all bridge works. These are not sources of significant ground borne vibration. The appointed contractor will develop a detailed schedule of works and associated methods for all of the works along the Scheme. Receptors which may be affected by specific activities (e.g. ground compaction) will be identified and appropriate steps taken to mitigate the effects, where necessary. This is provided for in the Outline CEMP. The levels of ground borne vibration required to result in even cosmetic damage to properties (e.g. minor cracks in plaster) are unlikely to be reached. Therefore, it is not considered that a pre-construction survey of properties on The Myrke is required.	No
25/11/2014	098	Point 11: "Cultural heritage/6 CULTURAL HERITAGE" Point 11. Although allotments are probably not seen as heritage sites, in the UK, as far back as 1649, the people of this country have been seen as having 'a right to dig'. And I believe allotments are an intrinsic and valuable part of British cultural heritage. Possibly unique in the world and so all the more reason for every one of them to be conserved.	All allotments within 500m of the Scheme have been identified.. No allotments are being permanently adversely affected as a result of the Scheme. Where allotment land is required on a temporary basis for the purpose of construction of the Scheme, the allotments will revert back to their current use once construction is completed. The impacts of this temporary use have been considered as part of the EIA process and the results are reported fully in the ES.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/11/2014	204	<p>Could someone please confirm what mitigation measures will be put in place as the gradient & elevation of the Ascot Road will increase due to the Ascot Road overbridge widening.</p>	<p>The mitigation proposals for visual effects are provided in the Environmental Masterplan which accompanies the Application. These measures will be developed further at the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>The design illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan sets out to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and provide a design that would allow for further planting to provide screening as the planting matures. The impacts of the Scheme with mitigation in place are reported in the ES.</p> <p>Low-noise surfacing will be provided across all lanes of the M4 through the Scheme extent. The noise assessments for this area show that there will be a reduction in traffic noise.</p>	No
09/12/2014	214	<p>The raised elevations and approaches to the River Thames Bray Underbridge between J7 and 8/9 already need acoustic boarding and a better vegetation planting scheme to help reduce noise and light pollution. If this scheme is to go ahead, adequate measures will need to be taken this time as the current situation is unacceptable (it is understood that acoustic boarding was supposed to have run the entire length of the approaches up to and over the River Thames on each side but was not completed).</p>	<p>An assessment of visual and noise effects has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported fully in the ES.</p> <p>The Agency's original intention had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Following consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent. All existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). Accordingly, the majority of receptors along the Scheme will experience negligible or minor decreases in noise impact during operation of the Scheme.</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 planting matures. In addition, the Outline CEMP sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise and visual impacts, which will be developed into a final CEMP by the scheme contractors, and will be agreed with Local Authorities.</p> <p>The M4 embankment in the vicinity of Thames Bray Bridge is presently vegetated, although it does not fully screen / filter the M4 traffic in views from the surrounding area and adjacent properties. The construction work required to the embankment slopes will result in the removal of the vegetation on them. In addition there will be some further vegetation removal on the eastbound side (north side) of the Scheme, within the Order limits in order to accommodate the works associated with a gas main. Due to the earthworks design solution it will not be possible to plant on the new embankment. However, there will be a new 10m wide strip of</p>	Yes

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
			<p>tree planting proposed along the toe of the embankments, which will establish an intervening linear tree belt.</p> <p>No additional noise barriers are proposed to this area, but with the low noise across all lanes through the Scheme extent, there will be a reduction in noise levels for the majority of sensitive receptors.</p>	
09/02/2015	241	<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 Visual impact of proposed gantry G2 -12 from Little Benty (residential area) to north.</p> <p>Sheet 55/61, Ch 15500 -14600 Visual impact of proposed gantry G2-11 from Little Benty (residential area) to north.</p> <p>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. 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</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.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		motorway are listed		
27/11/2014	244	Both the Highways Agency and Mouchel will have looked at the problems associated with the construction of the Smart Motorway. I am sure you know that adjacent to Wood Lane there is an Ancient Monument Site just north of ASDA. I sincerely hope the site will be respected during the construction of the new bridge etc.	The Cippenham Court Moated site is a Scheduled Monument and as such is protected by law. Any impacts the Scheme may have on Cippenham Court have been assessed as part of the EIA process with regard to the relevant planning policy/legislation. The results of this assessment, and mitigation measures proposed, are reported in the ES Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage.	No
19/01/2015	255	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
15/12/2014	268	<p>Visual Amenity</p> <p>8.4.5 Visual receptors, or those who may experience a change in view as a result of the Scheme, principally comprise occupants of residential properties (largely within the urban areas of Reading, Wokingham, Maidenhead, Slough, West Drayton, and Hayes), users of business and institutional properties (such as schools), users of Public Rights of Way ("PRoW")/recreational routes (including National Trails/National Cycle Routes) and recreational access land, and transport routes in the vicinity of the M4. The locations of visual receptors are shown on Drawing 8.2: Visual Effects Drawing ("VED"), Sheets 1 to 16, in Volume 2.</p> <p>8.4.6 Visual sensitivity has been attributed to visual receptors within the study area in accordance with IAN 135/10. Occupants of residential properties and users of PRoW/other recreational routes/recreational access land are attributed high visual sensitivity. Institutional buildings (such as schools) are attributed moderate visual sensitivity. Users of business properties and transport routes are considered to have low sensitivity. The VES, Appendix 8.3 in Volume 3, sets out the sensitivity of the specific receptors identified.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Why do our properties not appear in Appendix 8.3 Volume 3, Visual Effects Schedule- Residential Properties?</p>	<p>The Agency can confirm that these properties have been included in the final VES/VED submitted with the Application.</p> <p>The assessment of visual and noise impacts has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is reported fully in the ES.</p> <p>The original intention of the Agency had been to resurface only lanes 1 and 4 of the Scheme with a low-noise surface, plus some relatively small stretches of carriageway which would have all lanes resurfaced. Subsequent to consultation, it has been decided to resurface all lanes with low-noise surfacing along the complete Scheme extent.</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 planting matures. In addition, the Outline CEMP sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to safeguard vegetation and minimise noise and visual impacts, which will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be agreed with Local Authorities.</p> <p>Additional noise barriers are proposed to the Winnersh area in two short lengths where the M4 crosses Mill Lane. The existing noise barriers will be retained (or replaced if in poor condition). It is predicted that there will be negligible/minor decrease in noise levels to properties in Winnersh and</p>	Yes

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		<p>This is, in our opinion a significant oversight, which could, if left unresolved, have an extensive impact on our enjoyment of our property. Please refer to the beginning of this letter, which explains in detail our property location, proximity to the M4 and the comments around the ZVI line.</p>	<p>Sindlesham with the Scheme in operation. Drawings showing the locations of existing noise barriers and proposed additional noise barriers are provided as part of the ES.</p>	
11/12/2014	288	<p>Environment - I can only hope that all these points and those of my neighbours will be carefully considered, and that the Highways Agency will make every effort possible to minimise the disruption to our lives if this scheme goes ahead.</p>	<p>The Agency has a duty to take into account all consultation responses at the pre-application stage, which it has complied with, and to summarise these in this consultation report. The Outline CEMP sets out the measures to be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme to minimise disruption to local communities. These will be developed into a final CEMP by the Scheme contractors, and will be agreed with Local Authorities.</p>	No
23/12/2014	489	<p>Construction: When assessing the construction impact, as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, it should be noted that there are other major construction schemes planned, within the same timescales, in this area of Buckinghamshire that will need to be taken into account: 1) High Speed Rail 2 2) Heathrow Western Access (rail tunnel from the mainline at Langley to T5) 3) Crossrail 4) Great Western mainline electrification 5) Pinewood Development There is local concern regarding the cumulative impact of construction traffic and the location of the compounds, which Buckinghamshire County Council would wish to see addressed as part of the Development Consent Order application.</p>	<p>These schemes have been included in the EIA in respect of cumulative effects, as has been reported in the ES.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	490	<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 these documents and waste capacity within the study area has been considered within Chapter 11 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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	493	<p>The site for the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is positioned between the M4 and the A4 Colnbrook Bypass and between M4 J4B and 5. The Strategic Rail Freight Interchange proposal is known as the Slough International Freight Exchange (SIFE) and a Public Inquiry regarding the planning appeal in respect of the proposal has been scheduled.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is referenced in the Development Plan for the areas, as follows: "The council has also recently become aware of proposals for Slough Intermodal Freight Exchange (SIFE) on land north of the Colnbrook bypass [...] Any further rail freight facilities at Colnbrook would have to demonstrate that there was a national or regional need for such a development" (Slough Core Strategy Paragraphs 2.29-30).</p> <p>Response to Consultation</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Report that has been prepared in connection with your proposal does not appear to make reference to the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, including within Chapter 16 in respect of potential Cumulative Effects.</p> <p>Prior to the finalisation of your Environmental Impact Assessment, you should review the application documentation for the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, including the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The operational development associated with the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange would include a new railway infrastructure link between Old Slade Lake and the M4 2. The Landscape and Green Infrastructure Strategy for the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange also seeks to enhance the network of right of way in the area, including the use of the Old Slade Lane overbridge by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. <p>Your proposals do not appear to compromise the above objectives; however care should be taken to ensure that your final submission documentation does not prejudice the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.</p>	<p>The Slough International Freight Exchange ("SIFE") was included in Appendix 16.1 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and has been taken into account in the cumulative assessment for the Scheme, as reported in ES Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects.</p>	No
05/12/2014	631	<p>The only allocations within 1 km of the M4 are sites SA2a and SA2b in the Sites and Detailed Policies Document.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	No
Scheme Construction				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Agency has been investigating avenues available to pay for reviews of Scheme information by Slough BC. The Agency is unable to pay for any fees associated with Slough BC reviewing the design of the Scheme. The Agency hopes that it will be able to continue working closely with Slough Borough Council going forwards on this Scheme.</p>	No
09/12/2014	234	<p>We also would like you to take action to ensure that disruption in the area created by the works is minimised, for instance the additional pressure on the roads and noise from the building work.</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. Construction traffic is likely to access working areas directly from the motorway, and will not generally use local roads.</p> <p>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.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
17/12/2014	250	<p>- The cost of over 800 Million pounds could be spent on other road problems eg solving bottlenecks on the M25 / M4 Junction.</p> <p>Who is driving this scheme? I haven't come across anyone who thinks this is a good use of public money. Opinions seem to vary from waste of money to a view that the scheme is potentially dangerous.</p> <p>How much profit will the contractor make out of this scheme? There are so many flaws about this scheme that it makes me wonder if there is some other financial incentive.</p>	<p>The proposals are part of the Government's investment into England's motorways and major A-roads, which will see up to £3 billion a year spent on improving the roads by 2021, underpinning economic growth and high quality jobs.</p> <p>The estimated cost of the proposed Scheme is in the range of £614 million and £862 million, which is anticipated to be a saving of between 15%-25% when compared against other managed motorway schemes, which use the hard shoulder only at peak times. The smart motorway option is a cost effective way of creating additional capacity without the expense and environmental impacts of traditional widening, whilst maintaining the high standard of safety currently provided by the Agency's network.</p> <p>The strategic case for providing additional capacity on the M4 within the Thames Valley was first examined in 'The Thames Valley Multi-Modal Study' (2003), which put forward a range of interventions, as part of a preferred transport strategy. The publication of the Advanced Motorway Signalling and Traffic Management Feasibility Study (Department of Transport 2008) highlighted the causes of congestion in the Scheme area and identified the M4 Junction 3 to Junction 12 as a priority for the provision of additional capacity. Since that time, the Scheme has been announced by the Roads Minister in 2012 as one of six road improvement schemes for development by the Agency, with funding for the Scheme confirmed by the Government in the June 2013 Spending Review, subject to value for money and deliverability. The M4 J3- J12 smart motorway is being delivered in accordance the Government's current transport programme which includes as a key aim, the creation of a national road network fit for the 21st century (National Infrastructure Plan, December 2014). This identifies the Government's Top 40 priority infrastructure investments, including the M4 J3-J12 smart motorway Scheme.</p> <p>Alternatives to the Scheme are also described in ES Chapter 3: Design Iterations and Alternatives, in which it is concluded that the Scheme is the most appropriate method of meeting the objectives for improving the M4.</p>	No
Construction Programme				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	In summary, the main concern South Bucks has for the alterations proposed for the M4 is the method of construction. There are very little details about how the scheme will be carried out to date but is an aspect that needs to be consulted on prior to commencement. Once up and running the concern is how much the increased capacity will add to traffic pollution and whether the experienced change is in relation to that which is predicted in the South Bucks Region.	Detail on construction of the Scheme is provided in the Engineering Design Report ("EDR") (Document Reference 7.3) and the impacts of construction are reported in the ES.	No
19/12/2014	066	Potential conflicts with Slough Borough Council's major schemes. Additionally, the construction period of the Smart Motorways scheme is due to start in September 2016, and take 5 years. Slough Borough Council's three LGF- funded major schemes (SMaRT, A332 route enhancement and A355 route enhancement) are due to be completed by June 2016. There should therefore be no potential conflicts between Slough Borough Council's major schemes and the Highways Agency's proposals, but close liaison is needed on the respective scheme programmes. Temporary compounds will also be needed, and planning issues relating to this will need to be examined when the Highways Agency's proposals are finalised.	The Agency notes this information and agrees that close liaison is required to minimise potential conflicts. The Agency and the Contractor for the Scheme will, therefore, liaise with Slough Borough Council to minimise disruption as far as possible.	No
23/12/2014	094	Datchet Road Bridge & Recreation Ground Bridge - The replacement of the two bridges in close proximity to The Myrke is likely to involve work both day and night for a considerable period of time. This is unacceptable as it would ave serious detrimental impact on the standard of life for all those living on The Myrke.	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. Works outside of normal hours will be minimised where practicable. Although some operations on Datchet Road Bridge and Recreation Road bridge will require work outside of normal working hours (e.g. where lane closures of the motorway are required), the Agency and/or Contractor will liaise with the Local Authority in order to agree the details of any potentially-noisy activities (and seek a consent under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974).	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
16/12/2014	239	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
17/12/2014	250	- The disruption during the building of the new bridges will cause more delays than the scheme will be trying to solve.	<p>During construction the Agency will maintain three lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep traffic flowing. Details on the traffic management will be developed once a Contractor has been appointed to the Scheme, but could involve narrow lanes and contraflow, which have been used on other schemes.</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
21/12/2014	283	- Overnight closures, and phasing and timing of works in the Heathrow area to be planned carefully with Heathrow Airport Limited to avoid operational peaks and impacts on the road network and airport operations;	<p>The Agency recognises that Heathrow Airport Ltd (“HAL”) has a major interface with the M4 and are a key consultee to the Scheme. Whilst a contractor has not yet been appointed for the Scheme, the Agency will liaise closely with HAL so that the effect on HAL's operations is considered during the planning of the construction phasing of the Scheme and, in particular, will liaise regarding any proposed overnight lane and carriageway closures.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	426	<p>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>	<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 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>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	489	<p>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>	<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				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
05/12/2014	009	<p>I am writing to state concerns regarding the proposed Smart Motorway development of the M4 J3-12 with regard to how it will impact Slough Borough Council allotment tenants. Whilst I agree that the Motorway improvement is very important, I hope that we can reduce the impact these works will have on allotment tenants in the Slough area.</p> <p>At The Myrke between Junctions 5 and 6 (opposite Upton Park) where the works will have a significant impact.</p> <p>At The Myrke we have over 170 plots with tenants ranging from those that have tenanted their plot for many years to those that have just started growing and need a little help. We also have a significant number of tenants who do not have English as first language.</p> <p>1. Access to the site and use of the central concrete road is essential and I would like to be assured that access will be available at all times</p> <p>2. All tenants will find cultivation during the works very difficult - it will be very noisy and dusty (some organic growers will have a real problem with contamination levels) and dependent on the time of year may decide not to cultivate that year. Works during winter months when there is less cultivation would be preferable but minimising noise and dust at any time is important.</p> <p>4. You also have on your plan an area identified as 'water main subway lengthening' which suggests that you want to take over up to 20 plots. Most of these plots are extremely well cultivated and have been tenanted by the same person for many years. Some tenants are low income Asian families and their plot is a major food source for their family. Given the attention growers give to the care of topsoil, the work they put-in to the construction of their fences and sheds, any takeover of their plot (for even a limited time) would be devastating. Growing medium could not be restored.</p>	<p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p> <p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<p>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.</p> <p>Model car club is park tenant on north side</p>	<p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p> <p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The barrier 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 Highway Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required.</p>	No
25/11/2014	098	<p>Please can you explain how the roadworks are going to affect the allotment holders at THE MYRKE site in Datchet?</p>	<p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
11/11/2014	209	<p>I am totally opposed to the development along the M4, it will destroy wild life, the environment and the allotments at the Myrke Datchet. In my experience because of the amount of vehicles on the road right now which is increasing year on year will fail to improve the traffic flow and congestion and if it was to go a head would destroy to much of the countryside which is already being eaten away. It would also destroy the community of 100 allotments at the Myrke some of which have been in the hands of gardeners etc for 20 years or more. THIS CANNOT GO AHEAD.</p>	<p>Construction of the Scheme, and particularly works within the M4 verge, will require the removal of existing vegetation in some locations, as shown on the Vegetation Removal plans submitted with the Application. The proposals have been drawn up to reduce this as far as possible and the Scheme includes replacement planting using native species, as detailed in the Environmental Masterplan and assessed in the ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	269	<p>I am the tenant of plot 27b at The Myrke allotment site belonging to Slough Borough Council and wish to raise concerns over the proposed Smart Motorway works on the M4 between Junctions 5/6.</p> <p>I understand that during the proposed construction works access to the allotment site and use of the central road on the site will still be possible. Please could this be confirmed.</p> <p>The works would bring a lane of very fast moving traffic very near to the back of my allotment plot and I am concerned that the barrier will be strong enough to protect me in the event of an accident. The plot already suffers from a lot of traffic noise and as I do spend a considerable amount of time on my plot any increased noise will make cultivation very unpleasant. What plans are there to build a permanent barrier that will reduce this noise level and protect us from vehicles breaking through the fence? I am also concerned about the increased pollution levels as I aim to grow my fresh vegetables organically. Certainly during the construction period there is bound to be a huge amount of dust making conditions unsuitable for us to work in.</p> <p>My plot is also in (or very near to) an area marked within the red line bordering the construction works suggesting that you may need to take over my plot completely for 'water main subway lengthening'. Even temporary use of my plot would destroy years of my work improving the quality of my soil, would remove my shed where I store my tools and would take down my fence. My plot is an essential part of my life and what I grow is an important food source for my family. Taking over my plot will be devastating, can you please confirm if part or all of my plot will be taken over and how you will compensate me if it is.</p>	<p>The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The barrier system has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design will take place in the next stage of the project, and will be based on the Highway Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required.</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 the Agency can confirm that they will be replaced although the Agency will not be installing additional noise barriers along the remainder of the allotment boundary. All lanes on this stretch of the M4 will be re-surfaced with low-noise surfacing, which will minimise noise disturbance during operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
14/12/2014	270	<p>I am a tenant of plot 35A at the Myrke allotment site belonging to Slough Borough Council and wish to raise my strong concerns over the proposed smart Motorway works on the M4 between junction 5/6. I understand that during the proposed construction works access to the allotment site and use of the central road on the site will still be possible. Please could this be confirmed. The works would bring a lane of very fast moving traffic very near to the back of my allotment and I am concerned that the barrier will not be strong enough to protect me in the event of an accident. The plot already suffers from a lot of noise and I do spend a considerable amount of time on my allotment any increased noise will make cultivation very unpleasant. What plans are there to built permanent barrier that will reduce this noise level and protect us from vehicles breaking through the fence?? I am also concerned about the increase pollution levels e.g. dust , as I grow my fresh vegetables organically. My plot is in the red line suggesting you may need to take over completely for the purposes of the water mains. Even temporary use of my plot would destroy years of my hard work and commitment in improving the quality of my soil.; and also you will remove my tool shed and my fence. My plot is an essential part of my life; a place where I take my grandchildren for a windout; and what I grow is an important food source for my family. Taking over my plot will be devastating, can you please confirm how you will compensate me if it is.</p>	<p>The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The barrier system has not been designed in detail at this stage. The design will take place in the next stage of the project, and will be based on the Highway Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required.</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 the Agency can confirm that they will be replaced although the Agency will not be installing additional noise barriers along the remainder of the allotment boundary. All lanes on this stretch of the M4 will be re-surfaced with low-noise surfacing, which will minimise noise disturbance during operation of the Scheme</p> <p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p> <p>We are currently talking to Thames Water about alternative access arrangements to either reduce the extent of the works required or remove the</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	274	<p>I am the tenant of plot 27A at The Myrke allotment site belonging to Slough Borough Council and wish to raise concerns over the proposed Smart Motorway works on the M4 between Junctions 5/6.</p> <p>I understand that during the proposed construction works access to the allotment site and use of the central road on the site will still be possible. Please could this be confirmed.</p> <p>The works would bring a lane of very fast moving traffic very near to the back of my allotment plot and I am concerned that the barrier will be strong enough to protect me in the event of an accident. The plot already suffers from a lot of traffic noise and as I do spend a considerable amount of time on my plot any increased noise will make cultivation very unpleasant. What plans are there to build a permanent barrier that will reduce this noise level and protect us from vehicles breaking through the fence? I am also concerned about the increased pollution levels as I aim to grow my fresh vegetables organically. Certainly during the construction period there is bound to be a huge amount of dust making conditions unsuitable for us to work in.</p> <p>My plot is also in or nearby an area marked within the red line bordering the construction works suggesting that you may need to take over my plot completely for 'water main subway lengthening'. Even temporary use of my plot would destroy years of my work improving the quality of my soil and would take down my fence. My plot is an essential part of my life and what I grow is an important food source for my family. Taking over my plot will be devastating, can you please confirm if part or all of my plot will be taken over and how you will compensate me if it is.</p>	<p>The current design proposals show that a safety barrier is to be installed between the M4 and the allotments. The barrier 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 Highway Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. This will assess the risks along the motorway and specify the type of barrier required.</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 the Agency can confirm that they will be replaced although the Agency will not be installing additional noise barriers along the remainder of the allotment boundary. All lanes on this stretch of the M4 will be re-surfaced with low-noise surfacing, which will minimise noise disturbance during operation of the Scheme</p> <p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	286	No comments. But I have allotments at Myrke which runs along the Motor 4. I understand that you have sewage running underneath the allotment. I would like to know how you will deal with it. I wish I do not have inconvenience going in and out of the allotments.	<p>Disruption, construction noise and dust will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No
18/12/2014	287	I have a plot at the allotment Myrke which runs along the motorway (M4) if you do use any land near the allotment. If you do use land near or around the allotment, we should not feel any inconvenience to go into the allotment. I understand there is a sewage too under the allotment please let us know the position of the sewage.	<p>Disruption will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
15/12/2014	333	<p>The Myrke Allotment garden. Please make sure the road and entrance is clear. If any work to be done in my allotment regarding the drainage system. When work is finish make sure everything put back as normal. Thanking you.</p>	<p>Disruption will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
18/12/2014	602	<p>I am the tenant at The Myrke allotment site belonging to Slough Borough Council and wish to raise concerns over the proposed Smart Motorway works on the M4 between Junctions 5/6. Firstly may I make complaint that the letters sent by the Highways Agency made no mention of these plans affecting the allotment site - most of us assumed we had received the letter because we live within the vicinity of the M4. Many of my fellow allotment holders are seemingly still unaware of the affect your plans may have, especially as in many cases, English is not their first language! My plot backs onto the M4 boundary fence and is within the red line area designated for the 'water main subway lengthening'. Even temporary use of my plot would destroy years of work improving the quality of my soil, would remove my shed where I store my tools and would take down my fence, purpose built compost bins, my raised beds and my pathway. It has cost me several hundred Pounds to set my plot up, not to mention the fruit bushes and other permanent plantings - all that aside from the many hours labour! My plot is an essential part of my life and what I grow is an important food source for my family. Taking over my plot even for the shortest time will be devastating, it will take years of work to return the soil back to condition fit for growing. I have invested 6 years in this plot already and plan for it to keep me active in my retirement. I understand that during the proposed construction works access to the allotment site and use of the central road on the site will still be possible. Please could this be confirmed. I am concerned that if the adjacent field is used as a works compound, as is proposed, together with the works traffic for widening the bridge, although our actual access gate may be unaffected, the very narrow road would become very congested and unworkable. Please confirm that an alternative access would be made for the allotment sites if this becomes the case.</p>	<p>The Agency issued the tenants with a notice of the proposed application for a development consent order in November 2014. This notice was issued to all statutory consultees and those with an interest in land affected. It provided details of where further information about the Scheme could be found and a web address and links to the Scheme proposals on the Agency website. Although the consultation material was not provided in other languages, the documents were clear, used plain English and avoided the use of acronyms and abbreviations. Disruption will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, it cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process. The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No
Site Compounds				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	<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. This will minimise the amount of 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	<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 mitigation (including initiatives for the specifications for site traffic).</p>	No
23/12/2014	094	<p>Detrimental impact on The Myrke</p> <p>As residents of The Myrke, we are very concerned as to the impact the various elements of the proposed scheme and its construction will have on the neighbourhood and day-to-day life.</p> <p>Construction compound 8 - Proposed construction compound 8 is only 35 metres from some homes on The Myrke and, according to the scheme's assessment, there may be significant night time noise impacts and potential adverse effects from construction, dust, and therefore air quality, on homes in The Myrke (ref 14.10.23 Main Text). There are alternative sites that are further away from residential property (e.g. construction compound 7) with noise impacts "unlikely to be significant" so we strongly urge the project team to remove compound 8 from consideration to reduce the impact on local residents in the event that the scheme goes ahead.</p>	<p>The use of construction compound 8 has been proposed on the basis of its position between the bridge replacement sites at Datchet Road and Recreation Road both of which require working space in this area.</p> <p>Although a contractor to construct the Scheme has not yet been appointed by the Agency, when planning the construction compound and the work in the area the Agency and/or the contractor will aim to keep disruption, noise impacts and air quality impacts to a minimum wherever possible. This will be via mitigation measures provided in the CEMP. However, such impacts cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	102	<p>RE Compound 1, Wigmore Lane</p> <p>The land which has been highlighted as a contractor's compound forms part of the Company's leasehold interest. We wish to object to the inclusion of the land at Theale Depot as a contractor's compound.</p> <p>As part of the Company's planning permission/associated planning conditions, which required the construction, planting and on-going maintenance of a landscape embankment. It was planted with an approved scheme of both broadleaf and evergreen trees. As well as screening the large building within the depot, significantly reducing the visual impact, the landscaping embankment also provides noise attenuation for the nearby residential properties along Wigmore Lane.</p> <p>It is this landscaping embankment which has been highlighted as a potential contractor's compound for the M4 Junction 3 to 12 Smart Motorway project. It is assumed that it is proposed to remove the woodland and the landscape embankment to form a level surface.</p> <p>It is thought that excavated material was placed in engineered cells within the landscaping embankment, and that a large proportion of the material comprised of ash, clinker, coke and other railway waste, and capped with limestone material.</p> <p>Waste acceptance criteria has since changed. Due to the construction method employed, which included the capping of the excavated material, there is no risk of pollution from the in-situ landscape embankment. However, if the material within the embankment was now removed, based on the Company's knowledge</p> <p>of remediating other sites with a similar history, it would need to be disposed of to landfill, or subsequently treated before it could be reused.</p> <p>In summary, Aggregate Industries UK Limited strongly objects to the proposal for a contractor's compound at this location for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It incorporates United Asphalt Limited's Head Office, car park and its maintenance facilities for the Theale operation. The removal of these would seriously jeopardise the whole business, and could put at risk the employment of over 30 direct employees plus other associated positions such as HGV drivers, material supplies and the like. 2) The embankment forms part of an approved scheme under an existing planning permission to reduce the visual and noise impact on Wigmore Lane. Its removal would have implications in the meeting of these conditions and hence the use of the depot as a rail import terminal and 	<p>Following further consideration of the suitability of this area and consideration of a number of consultation responses, including this response, it is no longer proposed to take this location forward as a potential construction compound (i.e. construction compound 1) for the Scheme.</p>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		<p>asphalt production facility would be compromised.</p> <p>3) The depot is a safeguarded rail head.</p> <p>4) The embankment forms a now well established landscaping feature which would take years to reinstate in its present condition if it were to be removed.</p> <p>We would therefore hope that a more suitable site would be found for a contractor's compound which would allow continued operations at the site and maintain the current attenuation measures. It is also worth noting that the specific site operations of an aggregate rail terminal a coupled with asphalt production may well have significant operational and environmental benefits when it comes to the actual construction of the said scheme. To put these operations at risk and negate any possible benefits at this stage would not seem to be a sensible course of action.</p>		
16/12/2014	239	<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

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	<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.</p> <p>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</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>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	245	<p>The proposed construction compound on the Colnbrook branch appears to cover the rail-connected businesses adjacent to the branch. Is a change in use proposed for the facilities?</p> <p>One of Network Rail's tenants, Aggregate Industries, has written to the Highways Agency to object to the proposed acquisition of its freight sidings at Theale. For the record, Network Rail also objects to that proposed acquisition, as it does to any acquisition without Network Rail's consent.</p>	<p>Following further consideration of the suitability of this area and consideration of a number of consultation responses, including this response, it is no longer proposed to take this location forward as a potential construction compound (i.e. construction compound 1) for the Scheme.</p>	Yes
10/12/2014	252	<p>The land which has been highlighted as a contractor's compound forms part of the Company's leasehold interest at West Theale Industrial Estate. The area with the proposed site for a contractor's compound incorporates the Head Office, its Car park and the maintenance facilities for the Theale operation.</p> <p>Within our planning permission there are certain planning conditions which required the construction, planting and on-going maintenance of a landscape embankment. This has been constructed and is now well established with broadleaf and evergreen trees of over 30 years in age. This embankment acts to significantly reduce the visual impact of the operation and provides noise attenuation for the nearby properties on Wigmore Lane. The meeting of these conditions is a planning requirement for our operation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the embankment in question has slopes of between 25% and 40% and would, I assume, require levelling to form a contractor compound. This would require the destruction of all the now historic woodland and the removal of thousands of tonnes of old fill materials. If removed it would take years to replace the current construction to give the same visual and noise attenuation.</p> <p>The proposed area also includes the internal roadway along the southern side of the site. Its removal would seriously affect operations and would lead to health and Safety issues with the re-routing of traffic flows.</p> <p>In summary, United Asphalt Limited strongly object to the proposal for a contractor's compound at this location for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) It incorporates United Asphalt Limited's Head Office, car park and its maintenance facilities for the Theale operation. The removal of these would seriously jeopardise the whole business, and could put at risk the employment of over 30 direct employees plus other associated positions such as HGV drivers,</p>	<p>Following further consideration of the suitability of this area and consideration of a number of consultation responses, including this response, it is no longer proposed to take this location forward as a potential construction compound (i.e. construction compound 1) for the Scheme.</p>	Yes

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/01/2015	255	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).	The Agency has noted that this site is currently under construction as a park and ride facility. As this location is still identified as a potential construction compound, the Agency will liaise with the respondent in order to investigate the possibility of gaining its agreement to the use of part of the area identified.	No
11/12/2014	288	Other important concerns Vibration - I am very concerned that we have not been informed of any plans for pre-work (and post-work) surveys to ascertain the possibility of the effect, on these 100 year old homes with shallow foundations, of the inevitable increase in the level of vibrations once demolition and construction work is in progress. These houses are very close indeed to proposed construction sites. These surveys are essential if severe, irreparable damage to our homes is to be prevented. Plans for this pre-work survey must be put in place now, for us to have a clear picture before work starts.	Impacts on properties from vibration has been assessed as part of the EIA for the Scheme and reported fully in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. The ground borne vibrations from the general construction plant and activities are not predicted to be significant for the Scheme. The appointed contractor will develop a detailed schedule of works and associated methods for all of the works along the Scheme. Receptors which may be affected by specific activities (e.g. ground compaction) will be identified and appropriate steps taken to mitigate the effects, where necessary. This is provided for in the Outline CEMP. The levels of ground borne vibration required to result in even cosmetic damage to properties (e.g. minor cracks in plaster) are unlikely to be reached. Whilst the chosen methods should avoid damage, discussions would be held with any concerned residents very close to the works.	No
21/12/2014	326	Need to consider impact on land to north east of junction 8/9 and use of land for scheme compound	A contractor to construct the Scheme has not yet been appointed by the Agency. Once appointed, the impact of using this location for a construction compound will be fully considered, including the potential effects on local residents when planning the compound layout, working practices and access arrangements.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	426	<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. 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 site as a potential construction compound. 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				
10/12/2014	445	<p>Disruption due to closures will majorly effect the continued operation of Tesco Reading Distribution Centre due to regular routes along the M4. Any information with regards to road closures and disruption to journey times along this section of road should be made clear with substantial notice in order to provide alternative planning and routes in advance of works.</p>	<p>During construction, the Agency will maintain three lanes of traffic on the M4 during peak times in order to keep the traffic flowing. The Agency will use established traffic management techniques. Details of the traffic management will be developed once a contractor has been appointed, but could involve narrow lanes and contraflow, which have been used on other schemes.</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.</p>	No
Structures				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	038	<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: 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, 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>	Yes

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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	<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>The Agency can confirm that no works are planned for A308 Windsor Road underbridge as part of the Scheme.</p>	No
19/12/2014	245	<p>Impact on Network Rail's proposed schemes.</p> <p>Network Rail's Western Access to Heathrow (WRAt Heathrow) have commence topographical surveys in the area of the M4/M25 junction as preparatory surveys in anticipation of a proposed DCO.</p> <p>Network Rail is undertaking electrification works of many lines. The Great Western mainline will be electrified to Reading by the Crossrail Project and we expect that all the wires will be in place by 2016. The additional Thames Valley Branch Lines, Slough to Windsor, Maidenhead to Bourne End, and Twyford to Henley are currently at a relatively early stage of development (GRIP 3). The target date for delivery is 2017 although this delivery date is subject to change.</p>	<p>The Agency has noted this response. The proposed widening of Windsor Railway underbridge will not prejudice the planned electrification of the Slough to Windsor line. The Agency welcomes continued dialogue with Network Rail to ensure that project delivery is coordinated to the mutual benefit of each party as far as practically possible. The Agency engaged with the project team for WRAtH in meetings in June 2014.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
23/12/2014	489	<p>Road Bridges: 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				

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	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>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				
05/12/2014	009	<p>I am writing to state concerns regarding the proposed Smart Motorway development of the M4 J3-12 with regard to how it will impact Slough Borough Council allotment tenants. Whilst I agree that the Motorway improvement is very important, I hope that we can reduce the impact these works will have on allotment tenants in the Slough area.</p> <p>We have 2 sites where the proposed works will have an impact on tenants, Westpoint near Junction 7 where I understand from Slough Borough Council that the impact will be minimal</p>	<p>Disruption, noise impacts and air-quality impacts will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, these cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p> <p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process.</p> <p>The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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.</p> <p>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				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	123	2. The accommodation works as how it is impacting on new allotments and current residents.	<p>No allotments are being permanently acquired or destroyed as a result of the Scheme, and the effects of the temporary use of the allotments have been considered as part of the EIA process.</p> <p>The Agency recognises that the Scheme potentially affects around 20 allotment plots at the Myrke and that this is a significant concern to tenants. The works at this location are required to lengthen an existing water main subway containing apparatus maintained by Thames Water. The Agency is working with Thames Water to find an alternative design that will reduce or remove the requirement for works in this location in order to reduce the effect on the allotment tenants.</p> <p>An area of allotment land at Junction 7 is also required temporarily for access and working space to construct the realigned Huntercombe Spur and new Huntercombe Spur overbridge.</p> <p>Disruption, noise impacts and air-quality impacts will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, via mitigation measures to be provided in the CEMP. However, these cannot be removed completely. The Agency will work with the local authorities to minimise the disruption to the local community.</p>	No
16/12/2014	243	<p>Dorney Lakes's Activities</p> <p>Dorney Lake was the venue for 2012 Olympic Rowing and Canoe/Kayak and the Paralympic Rowing. The site operates all year round, has a total of circa 250,000 visitors annually. These range from casual recreational visits, to significant events where there will be up to 4,000 people accessing and the leaving the site on any one day all using cars or coaches. In 2015, there are 80 days of high activity booked and this will grow by 10% each year in the following 5 years through till 2020. Your project team said these bridge works are planned to take place in 2018. Any significant disruption to access and egress from our site will cause significant disruption and will inevitably affect our ability to host events with the consequential financial loss. This will also potentially stop our ability to host two International regattas that are planned to be held between 2017 and 2020.</p> <p>Our understanding of current plans</p> <p>We attended one of your Public Exhibitions and spoke with members of your project team who explained the current scheme proposals as follows. We understand that at present it is planned that each of the bridges would be closed at different times during the works, so that one bridge would remain open for the diverted traffic whilst the other is being demolished and then rebuilt. The closure of the Marsh Lane bridge is not such a</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 during public consultation.</p> <p>The Scheme 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 limits the options for reconstruction. Therefore, 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

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
		<p>problem since lake End Road is well able to handle the diverted traffic. However, when the Lake End Road is bridge is shut, Marsh Lane does not have the traffic carrying capacity to be able to deal with the diverted traffic. There are a number of operational issues with traffic accessing Marsh Lane including that of access from the A4. There is also a 200 metre stretch of this road approaching the access to our site, where there is only enough room for cars to pass slowly due to the width of the road. There is also an added problem where there is an extreme right angle bend in the road opposite the entrance to the Lake. This restriction in road width and the acute bend will make access and egress from the Lake entrance unsafe as it is almost impossible for any heavy vehicle, boat trailer and towing vehicle, plus coaches many used by the visiting schools. This will inevitably channel all such traffic through Eton, also an area of restricted road width.</p>		
OB Oldway Lane				
19/12/2014	066	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	No
OB Recreation Ground				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	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 together with the Application.	No
OB Riding Court Road				
13/01/2015	267	On behalf the landowners we have been reviewing the drawings that have now been sent out for the consultation .It seems that you are proposing an offline construction, with a new wider span bridge built offline on our site side of the existing bridge. The bridge will be 1.4 higher although the tie in point still appears to be north of the existing access. It would need to be demonstrated that the proposed bridge approach works don't prejudice the formation of an access to our site. They indicate that the access track to the mast will be kept open at all times. Although the red line encroaches into our site we think you have shown a retaining wall at the foot of embankment which appears to leave the existing track where it currently is, nonetheless, it still enquires land from our site although the extent is not evident from the attached plans. In the absence of more detailed information about the impact of the design and the land take we wish to register a holding objection .	Riding Court Road overbridge is being replaced with a new bridge to the west of the existing bridge, including widening and raising of earthworks, and demolition of the existing bridge. Some of the respondent's land will be required temporarily during construction for access and working space to construct the realigned Riding Court Road and new Riding Court Road overbridge but will not be affected by permanent land take. The Statement of Reasons submitted with the Application addresses the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of the Scheme. The land-take for the purposes of the Scheme (both permanent and temporary land-take) has been reduced from the level originally proposed and is no more than is necessary for the delivery of the Scheme.	No
Old Slade Lane Overbridge				
18/12/2014	493	Your proposals do not appear to compromise our project's objectives; however care should be taken to ensure that your final submission documentation does not prejudice the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. In particular, the design and methodology for the Old Slade Lane overbridge should make clear that it has made allowance for a potential future extension to accommodate the intended railway infrastructure link. We would welcome a more detailed discussion with you on this point.	The Agency understands that the proposed rail freight interchange will include a substantial screening embankment running parallel to the M4 at the point where Old Slade Lane (and hence the replacement overbridge) crosses the M4 corridor. The Agency considers that there will be sufficient space for the respondent's proposed structure crossing the new rail lines to be constructed independently of the (by then, extant) Old Slade Lane overbridge. The Agency would be happy to discuss its and the respondent's proposals in more detail.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
Sipson Road Subway				
09/02/2015	241	No 'over' bridges are scheduled for demolition and re-build within LBH. There is a proposal to widen the Sipson Road subway / 'under' bridge, at the southern end only (Fig. 22, p. 29) - this will necessitate vegetation removal to the south of the houses in Vine Close and Keats Way. Appropriate mitigation will be required.	Land west of the southern and northern approaches to the Sipson Road Subway has been identified, as required for temporary use for construction of the Scheme. The design illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan aims to retain as much existing vegetation as possible and reinstatement works will be carried out on completion of the works.	No
15/12/2014	265	I have read the S140566_M4_junction3_to_12_consultation_brochure and would like to make the following comments; 1. J3-4 - No impact on bridges or underpasses and LCN+ 88/88a unaffected 2. J4 to 4b widened to 5 lanes; pp29 of consultation document, Diagram 22 - Sipson Road Subway on LCN+89/93 - this would be closed for widening and a diversion proposed; If this is via say Harmondsworth Road/Holloway Lane providing interests of School cyclists are taken into account [eg by providing shared use of footpaths as appropriate], it ought to be acceptable. I do not think this is a major route, the area to the south being underpopulated on account of the airport. 3. J4b to 9, pp22-28 of consultation document, diagrams regarding 11 bridges 9-21; demolitions/rebuilding of bridges to cope with discontinuities in the current hard shoulder ; As this is beyond the M25 junction this is out of scope for comment by London office, other offices will no doubt be feeding back anyway, however in general the proposal where closures do take place the plan is to consult local communities on diversions at the time of closure, and it would be difficult for us to comment.	The Agency has noted this response.	No
UB Windsor Branch Railway				
19/12/2014	245	Impact on Network Rail's proposed schemes. The proposed widening of the overbridge spanning the Windsor Branch will need to allow the full width of the formation to be retained, should doubling of that section of line be required in the future.	Consultation has been ongoing with Network Rail on the Scheme proposals to widen Windsor Rail underbridge since 2012. This has included the recent submission of drawings and Approval in Principle design submissions for review by a Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. The proposed bridge widening will match the span arrangements of the existing clearances to the track, which will not be reduced by the Scheme.	No
Wood Lane Overbridge				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
27/11/2014	244	I'm sure the Wood Lane residents are also concerned that during the building of the new bridge and demolition of the old one that there will be no serious restrictions to vehicular traffic bearing in mind there is only one out of Wood Lane.	The proposals at Wood Lane are for the new structure to be constructed offline to the east of the existing structure. This allows the existing structure to remain open for the entire duration of the construction of the new structure. Therefore there will be only very limited restrictions on access to both the residential area and the nearby water treatment works. These restrictions will be short-term and associated with the provision of a safety zone during demolition of the existing structure.	No
17/12/2014	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a curved bridge replacing the Wood Lane bridge, Slough does not seem like a particularly good option with possible implications for safety. - The proposed bridge is East of the current bridge. It would be better on the West side to join up with the old works road. - Disruption and potential lack of road access during installation of the new bridge which is planned to be East of the current bridge. 	<p>The Preliminary Design for the replacement bridge at Wood Lane is not a curved bridge. Current proposals have the bridge at a slight (approximately 8 degree) skew to the line of the M4.</p> <p>The suggestion to move the bridge to the west of the existing bridge is not feasible as this would require the structure to be significantly longer and at a significantly greater skew to the M4 to meet with the old works road, while still providing a suitable turning circle into the water treatment works. It would also make the alignment of Wood Lane to the north of the M4 corridor less desirable than it is currently. By moving to the east, the alignment to the north and across the structure is straighter, providing better visibility. It also allows the improvement of the route to the south of the structure with an improved turning circle for heavy vehicles at the junction of the works' access and the Wood Lane cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Provision of the new structure to the east of the existing rather than the west has no effect on the level of disruption or provision of road access during construction - the existing bridge will remain open for the entire period until the route is ready to be transferred to the replacement structure. For safety reasons, there will likely be some short-term closures of the route associated with lifting operations for the construction of the replacement structure and demolition of the existing structure. These periods will be notified to affected stakeholders in advance by the Contractor.</p>	No
Traffic and Economics				
Impact on local roads				

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
19/12/2014	066	<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 effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.</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
12/12/2014	106	<p>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.</p>	<p>The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.</p>	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	224	Our clients have an interest in land at Matthews Green Farm, which is adjacent to the A329(M) Motorway in Berkshire. The land has been allocated for residential development in the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy of the North Wokingham Strategic Development Location. Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Matthews Green Farm could result in increased traffic congestion on local roads. We therefore request a copy of your transport assessments and information regarding the likely changes to traffic flows at the following locations: 1) the M4 motorway, between junctions 10 and 11; 2) the A329(M) motorway between Junction 10 and the Coppid Beach junction.	The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network. The modelling has also taken into account relevant proposed development in vicinity of the Scheme.	No
16/12/2014	239	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 effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.	No
19/12/2014	255	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. 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.	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. 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. The Agency will continue to work with the Council as the Scheme progresses.	No

HIGHWAYS AGENCY – M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 SMART MOTORWAY

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
Traffic Modelling/Forecasting				
19/12/2014	106	<p>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.</p> <p>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 lead 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 Gyrotory 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</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 it had modelled the M4 Scheme effects on its network and was satisfied that the impacts were not significant.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
08/12/2014	225	<p>Our clients have an interest in land that has the benefit of planning consent for up to 433 new dwellings, a Primary School and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Our Clients are concerned that changes to traffic flows on the M4 motorway, and the impact of any release of "suppressed demand" and therefore increased traffic flows on roads adjacent to Hatch Farm Dairies could result in increased traffic congestion on local roads.</p> <p>We therefore request a copy of your transport assessments and information regarding the likely changes to traffic flows at the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the M4 motorway, between junctions 10 and 11; 2) the A329 Reading Road, between the Showcase roundabout junction and the junction with King Street Lane; 3) Lower Early Way between the Showcase roundabout and the junction with Rushey Way. 	<p>The effects of the Scheme on local roads are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. The smart motorway will smooth traffic flows on the Scheme and, although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads. The traffic modelling has shown that the Scheme will result in a reduction in congestion on the M4 and in a net positive impact on traffic flows on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>Information from the traffic model in respect of points 1 to 3 has been made available to the respondent, as requested.</p>	No

Date Received	Representor No.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
09/02/2015	241	<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 are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, Effects on All Travellers. The Agency uses a computer forecasting model for traffic modelling, which is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads. As part of this work the Agency contacted all the of the local authorities' planning teams along the length of the Scheme in order to obtain their list of committed developments. From the list provided, the Southall Gas Works and Slough Freight Interchange have been included in the assessment of cumulative developments.</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.	Representation	Highways Agency Response	Proposed Change
12/12/2014	426	The Council wishes to see any modelling work that the HA have undertaken in relation to scheme especially for the area of West Berkshire. The Council is interested in any forecasts for the future growth and whether or not the scheme is expected to draw in greater traffic (over and above the predicted growth that would happen anyway without the scheme) as the capacity of the M4 increases. The interface between any models the HA have been using and local models held by the Council.	The Agency uses a computer forecasting model to undertake its traffic modelling. This model is used on all Highways Agency schemes. The traffic model is able to assess changes in overall demand arising from proposed schemes and takes account of the impact of the Scheme on surrounding roads, as reported in Chapter 13 of the ES. In the case of the Scheme, there is forecast to be an increase of less than 1% in traffic across the modelled highway network. The Smart Motorway, All Lane Running scheme will smooth traffic flows on the M4 and although additional capacity is created on the mainline, it is not anticipated that this will cause any significant issues on surrounding roads.	No
18/12/2014	493	It should also be noted that the traffic generation associated with the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (including the effect on M4 J5 and extent of S278 works in its vicinity) has been previously agreed with the Highways Agency, which has not objected to the planning application in respect of the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.	This has been noted by the Agency.	No