

Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway (Case ref. TR010019)

Agenda for issue specific hearing dealing with matters relating to road safety

On 23 October 2015 interested parties and others were notified that an issue specific hearing dealing with matters relating to road safety would take place on **Wednesday 18 November 2015** at the **Radisson Blu Edwardian Heathrow Hotel, 140 Bath Road, Hayes, Middlesex, UB3 5AW**. The hearing room will be available from 1.30am and the hearing will commence at 2.00pm. It is expected to close by about 5.00pm. In order to ensure that those attending the hearing can make the best use of the time, we have prepared an agenda as attached.

Administrative arrangements

If you did not do so by the pre-notified deadline, it is vital for parties intending to attend to now give prior notice to the case team of who will attend, who will speak and which points they wish to address. In accordance with Rule 14(3) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended), any oral representations should be based on representations previously made in writing by the particular participant.

Please provide your interested party reference number in any communication and mark it for the attention of the M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway case team.

Agenda for issue specific hearing dealing with road safety

2.00pm, 18 November 2015

- 1.** In answer to our first round of questions REP2-002 TS6.4, the applicant provides a table to compare the risk of different operating systems. The actual performance of the M42 Active Traffic Management (ATM) pilot is indicated as having the lowest level of risk at 40% of the baseline¹. The predicted risk for the M4 All Lane Running (ALR) scheme is 82%. Can the applicant explain why the higher level of risk is acceptable for the M4 scheme?
- 2.** In the event that there is evidence that an alternative proposal for the M4 Smart Motorway would offer a greater level of safety, can the applicant explain what led to the selection of the proposed scheme?
- 3.** Would the level of risk be reduced if the national speed limit was not in force in off peak times with ALR? What experience is there of all lane running with the national speed limit?
- 4.** When can the applicant produce the traffic safety monitoring data for the M25 J23-27 ALR scheme and compare its performance to the traffic safety performance before ALR was introduced?
- 5.** What is the applicant's view of the RAC's experience of the all lane running and dynamic hard shoulder configurations, reported in its written representation at Deadline II REP2-029 – in particular, the alleged proven safety record of the dynamic hard shoulder configuration versus the alleged unproven safety record of the all lane running configuration?
- 6.** When the scheme is operational, would the applicant explain why it is considered that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes would be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder? REP1-003, response no. 20
- 7.** In the event of live lane stoppages as a result of a breakdown, can the applicant explain how quickly a response would be given to put control measures in place to prevent a collision, in both peak and off peak times?
- 8.** What are the road safety implications, of the emergency refuge areas being spaced at an average of 1.85 km intervals, compared with closer spacing intervals, especially if the spacing was such that at least one emergency refuge area was always visible to road users?
- 9.** Do interested parties wish to highlight any other aspects of road safety, not already covered above?

¹ A dual three lane motorway without motorway incident detection and automatic signalling (MIDAS)