



The Planning Inspectorate

Application by Highways England

M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway

The Examining Authority's first written questions and requests for information

Issued on 11 September 2015

The following document comprises the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions and requests for information.

Each question has a **unique reference number** which combines a section number and a question number. **When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.**

Each question makes explicit **which party it is directed at**. The ExA would be grateful if all parties named could answer all questions directed at them, providing either a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. **It is expected that answers will be given by each party unless an agreed position on relevant matters is to be included in a Statement of Common Ground, or for local authorities the matter is covered in the Local Impact Report.** The direction of questions in this way does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Questions concerning the draft Development Consent Order and those dealing with the proposed compulsory acquisition/temporary possession of land and rights are provided in table form.

Unless otherwise stated, the applicant and other interested parties should provide any new or amended documentation prepared in support of the answers to these questions for submission to **Deadline II** in the examination timetable. All document references (provided in subscript) have been attributed by the Planning Inspectorate and are taken from the live Examination Library which is available on our website, here:

<http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/3401379>

If you are answering a limited number of questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table which incorporates the referencing conventions used in the questions.

1. **National Policy Statement for National Networks (NN NPS)**

For the applicant; West Berkshire Council (WBerksC); Wokingham Borough Council (WokBC); Reading Borough Council (RBC); Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM); Bracknell Forest Council (BFC); Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC); South Bucks District Council (SBDC); Slough Borough Council (SBC); London Borough of Hillingdon (LBHill); London Borough of Hounslow (LBHouns); Greater London Authority (GLA).

- 1.1 **Having regard to the criteria listed in para 1.2 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NNNPS), is there any reason why the application should not be determined in accordance with the NPS?**
- 1.2 **To what extent would the project deliver the objectives of NNNPS to increase the capacity and improve the performance of the Strategic Road Network?**
- 1.3 **Would the project deliver appropriate environmental and social benefits as required by NNNPS para 3.3?**
- 1.4 **Are the local authorities satisfied that the traffic forecasts and economic case for the project have been adequately tested through the use of the M3/M4 variable demand transport model, and that the requirements of paras 4.5 and 4.6 of NNNPS have been met?**
- 1.5 **Does the Thames Valley Multi Modal Study (TVMMS) provide an adequate assessment of options to comply with the requirement in NNNPS para 4.27?**
- 1.6 **Are the local authorities satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated good design as required by NNNPS paras 4.32 to 4.34?**

2. **Local Development Plans**

For the applicant; WBerksC; WokBC; RBC; RBWM; BFC; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA.

- 2.1 **Does the applicant accurately identify the Development Plans and Transport Plans currently in place for each of the 11 local authorities Table 1, APP-089 against which the application falls to be assessed?**

- 2.2 **Do the local authorities agree the applicant's assessment of the project against the relevant policies of each Council? If not, please identify any areas of conflict and explain the reasons why the project would be in conflict.**
- 2.3 **Are there any developments which are either proposed in or in accordance with Local Plans which might be affected by the project? If so, please identify and explain what the effects would be.**
- 2.4 **Is the scheme compatible with regional and local strategies to increase uptake and mode share for public transport, walking and cycling?**

3. **Green Belt**

For the applicant; RBWM; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA.

- 3.1 The scheme includes the widening of the M4 at junctions of the motorway to alter sliproads; the construction of new overbridges; and the widening of underbridges. **To what extent would these works have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and constitute inappropriate development? To what extent would these operations have an impact on the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt?**
- 3.2 In respect of proposed new gantries, **to what extent would their construction have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and constitute inappropriate development? To what extent would they have an impact on the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt?**
- 3.3 Six potential construction compounds are proposed. **To what extent would they have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and constitute inappropriate development? To what extent would these operations have an impact on the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt?**
- 3.4 **Are there any other aspects of the development which might have an effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt?**

4. **Environment**

For the applicant; Environmental Agency (EA); Natural England (NE); WBerksC; WokBC; RBC; RBWM; BFC; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA; Transport for London (TfL); Friends of the Earch (FoE).

4.1 Environmental Statement

- 4.1.1 Chapter 5 Section 5.5 ^{APP-145} sets out the methodology for establishing the baseline for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). **Are consultees and interested parties satisfied with the approach as adopted?**
- 4.1.2 Chapter 5 Section 5.7 ^{APP-145} describes how “significance” has been defined in the Environmental Statement (ES), but para 5.7.5 explains that not all topics use the same approach. For example, for landscape and visual impact, in Chapter 8 ^{APP-148}, the approach seems to imply that effects of moderate or above may be considered as ‘significant’ but this is by no means clear. For cultural heritage, Appendix 7.2 ^{APP-311} of Chapter 7 sets out the magnitude of impact, value of receptor and resulting significance, however the table does not show the resultant significance level and it appears that the resulting significance has been missed out. In Chapter 12 ^{APP-152} Table 12.9 sets out the criteria used to define significance of effect in the assessment of noise and vibration. The criteria identified are: neutral; slight; moderate; large and very large but there is no indication of what level of impact is significant in EIA terms. Assessments in the ES should make it clear what level of significance is considered to be ‘significant’ in EIA terms. This would assist the ExA to understand whether a predicted effect requires measures in order to avoid, reduce and, if possible, remedy significant adverse effects, in accordance with the EIA Regulations. **Can the applicant please clarify what is regarded as being a ‘significant’ effect in EIA terms as applied in each of the technical assessments which have been presented in the ES?**
- 4.1.3 Annex A of the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) ^{APP-027} contains a ‘Table of Mitigation’ which sets out mitigation measures based on the various chapters in the ES and how these mitigation measures will be delivered ie either by requirements in the DCO or through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). A reference to the EM is included within para 1.3.2 of Chapter 1 ^{APP-141}. However there is no cross reference from within the ES to the Table of Mitigation in Annex A. **Can the applicant please provide a table which sets out the mitigation measures which are identified as required in each technical chapter of the ES, and provide a cross reference to that part of the draft DCO through which the mitigation measure would be delivered. In particular the table should clarify which mitigation measures identified as necessary in the ES should be secured through the CEMP.**

- 4.1.4 An outline of the CEMP_{APP-293} is provided. The approval and implementation of the CEMP is secured through Requirement 8 of the draft DCO_{APP-026}. The outline CEMP sets out a series of proposed measures and standards applied by the Highways Agency (as was) and its contractor throughout the construction period. The final CEMP will be certified to BS EN ISO 14001. **Do any interested parties have any comments on the sufficiency of the outline CEMP for securing mitigation? The ExA would be interested in particular in comments from NE, the EA and the LPAs who would be responsible for approving the CEMP under requirement 8 of the DCO.**
- 4.1.5 Requirement 8 allows the undertaker to modify the CEMP at any time after the authorised development has commenced without the requirement to seek the agreement of the LPA and without any reference to what has been assessed within the ES. There is also no requirement for the CEMP to deliver the mitigation measures identified in the ES, where the ES is relying on the CEMP as the mechanism to deliver the mitigation. **Therefore, please explain how the EIA can rely on this mitigation when concluding on the residual significance of the development?**
- 4.1.6 Works 1a (n) of the draft DCO_{APP-026} states that there would be five police observation platforms on the eastbound carriageway and Works No1b (o) states there would be four police observation platforms on the westbound carriageway but these numbers are not assessed in the ES. **Can the applicant provide evidence to show that these have been assessed in the ES?**
- 4.1.7 The ES states that there will be approximately 130 closed circuit television cameras but the draft DCO_{APP-026} states there will be 124. **Can the applicant please clarify the number of CCTV cameras which will be used in the proposed development, and demonstrate that a worst case scenario has been assessed in the ES.**
- 4.1.8 The locations of the gantries have been determined by design standards and these standards take into account need for maintenance, safety and visibility for road users. **Can the applicant confirm what the design standards are which are referred to in para 8.2.13_{APP-148} of the ES?**
- 4.2 Landscape and visual impact
- 4.2.1 A Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) has been used to identify the study area and this is shown on sheets 1 to 16 of Drawing 8.1_{APP-215 to APP-217} and sheets 1 to 16 of Drawing 8.2_{APP-219 to APP-221}. The ES does not provide details regarding the dimensions of the gantries and therefore it is unclear how the ZVI was identified. **Can the applicant confirm the parameters of the gantries and whether there is any flexibility in the dimensions of the gantries sought in**

the description of the authorised development? Can the applicant confirm that the ZVI has been identified based on worst case dimensions?

- 4.2.2 **Has the baseline information for the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) been agreed with relevant stakeholders?**
- 4.2.3 Vegetation Clearance, Annex A, sheets 1 to 16 APP-098 to APP-099 shows locations for areas of vegetation removal, although notes provided on the plans state that the areas are indicative and will be subject to amendment in line with the design development of road alignment. **Can the applicant confirm that the worst case scenario regarding vegetation removal has been assessed?**
- 4.2.4 The spatial scope of the assessment is identified as the ZVI which is shown on Drawing 8.2 Sheets 1 to 16 APP-219 to APP-221. The ES does not provide details regarding the colours or the dimensions of the proposed gantries and therefore it is unclear how the ZVI was identified in relation to the gantries. Details of the types of gantries, together with 3D imaging, are provided in 'Gantry General Arrangements' APP-024, though this document is not referenced in the ES. **Can a reference to this document be provided in the ES? Can the applicant also confirm the maximum dimensions of the proposed gantries, and confirm that this dimension was used in the identification of the ZVI, and would be secured through the DCO?**
- 4.2.5 Para 8.2.8 APP-148 states that viewpoints were selected for the LVIA to give an indication of the range of views available. **Can the applicant confirm that the viewpoints were agreed with stakeholders?**
- 4.2.6 Para 8.2.11 APP-148 states that no further assessment work (since a survey in November 2014) has been carried out in relation to impacts on the night time landscape from lighting, as the replacement lighting will be retained at its current locations. However, it is uncertain whether the lighting columns will be replaced and if so their design; para 4.2.4 of Chapter 4 APP-144 states "lighting columns will be mounted on top of the new concrete barrier". Details are not provided regarding the existing and proposed light spill. **Can the applicant confirm the design of the new lighting and how it compares with the existing lighting and provide details of the how the proposed light spill compares with the existing?**
- 4.2.7 Chapter 8 APP-148 does not assess the impacts of lighting for night time construction works or of the construction compounds. This was an issue previously raised in the PINS Scoping Report. **Can the applicant explain why**

impacts from night time lighting for construction works and from lighting of construction compounds have not been assessed?

- 4.2.8 Drawing 4.1 APP-182 to APP-186 shows a number of new 'post mounted signs', and Chapter 4 APP-144 states that there will be approximately 130 pan, tilt and zoom closed circuit television cameras installed on 15m masts. **Can the applicant provide details regarding the post mounted signs and CCTV cameras and confirm whether or not these have been included within the landscape assessment?**
- 4.2.9 There appears to be no reference in Chapter 8 APP-148 as to the visual appearance of the new or replacement environmental (noise) barriers. **Can the applicant provide clarification regarding the location and visual appearance of the environmental (noise) barriers ie dimensions, materials, colour, locations, and provide confirmation whether these have been taken into account as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and if so how? (see also Q4.7.18)**
- 4.2.10 Table 8.2 APP-148 provides a summary of landscape and visual impacts with the significance of residual effects identified. The table shows temporary and permanent impacts arising from construction and cumulative impacts. For the majority of the impacts which are identified as moderate adverse during operation, they reduce over time to a slight adverse impact. There are two instances where the residual effects from the operational impacts are identified as moderate adverse. One is for Junction 6 to 5 – one residential receptor at Winvale (Chalvey) and the second for visual receptors between Junction 5 to 4b. The ES does not state whether these impacts are capable of being mitigated. **Can the applicant please clarify whether the impacts to these residential properties are incapable of being mitigated? Since the LVIA does not clarify which effects are determined to be significant in terms of EIA, can these ongoing impacts be considered as significant (in terms of EIA)?**
- 4.2.11 Although Cumulative effects are discussed APP-148, **can the applicant confirm that the scope of the cumulative assessment has been agreed with relevant stakeholders?**

4.3 Flooding

- 4.3.1 **Is the EA satisfied with the adequacy of the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) APP-077 and with its conclusions?**

4.4 Ecology and Nature Conservation

- 4.4.1 Para 9.4.19 Chapter 9 ^{APP-149} states that all national and international designated sites (which include Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and the South West London Waterbodies SPA/Ramsar) are outside the zone of influence as they are sufficient distance from the scheme and not hydrologically connected. **Does NE or any other party have evidence to challenge this statement?**
- 4.4.2 The survey of dormice between junctions 8/9 and 3 has not been updated since 2010. **Is NE satisfied with this position? Is NE satisfied that adequate surveys have been carried out for all species?**
- 4.4.3 Table 9.5 ^{APP-149} sets out the significance of the residual effect of the scheme on ecology and nature conservation. **Is there any evidence to challenge the conclusions set out in this Table?**
- 4.5 Geology and Soils
- 4.5.1 Chapter 10 ^{APP-150} identifies no significant residual impact from the project on groundwater resources during either construction or operation. **Are the conclusions agreed with statutory consultees?**
- 4.6 Air Quality
- 4.6.1 Chapter 6 Section 6.3 ^{APP-146} sets out the air quality regulatory/policy framework. The NNNPS para 5.13 states: "The Secretary of State should refuse consent where, after taking into account mitigation, the air quality impacts of the scheme will affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance within the most recent timescales reported to the European Commission at the time of the decision." **Having regard to the final judgement of the Supreme Court in the "ClientEarth" case, does the assessment of air quality impacts set out in the ES indicate that the scheme would comply with this requirement of the NNNPS?**
- 4.6.2 **To what extent have the local authority Environmental Health Officers and Air Quality Officers been consulted on the assessment set out in Chapter 6?** ^{APP-146} **Can the applicant, local authorities and other interested parties identify areas of agreement and disagreement with regard to the assessment of air quality impact set out in the ES?**
- 4.6.3 In a response to consultation ^{RR-296}, WokBC states that air quality impacts from the construction works require further analysis and that air quality impacts from the project on the existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) needs further analysis. This should include justification of the locations where no mitigation is to be provided in areas of

decreased air quality and clarification of the wider benefits of the scheme. **Can WokBC clarify the further analysis which is considered to be required and can the applicant respond to these comments?**

- 4.6.4 **Has the study area for the assessment of construction effects and for the assessment of operational effects been agreed with the local authorities?**
- 4.6.5 The assessment of construction phase traffic effects and operational phase traffic effects uses a study area of 200m around road sections likely to be affected by the scheme (para 6.2.31 APP-146). **Can the applicant confirm where the 200m mark begins for the construction phase assessment?**
- 4.6.6 Paras 6.2.7 to 6.2.14 of Chapter 6 APP-146 sets out details of sensitive receptors that may be affected by changes in air quality as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme. Some 3,275 sensitive receptors are identified. **To what extent has the definition and identification of sensitive receptors been agreed with local authorities and any other relevant stakeholders?**
- 4.6.7 Whilst the regional air quality assessment set out under para 6.15.11 APP-146 provides results for both the opening year (2022) and the design year (2037) of the scheme, the detailed level assessment, as described in paras 6.2.55 to 6.2.64 APP-146 limits predictions to the baseline year (2013) and the opening year. **Can an assessment of local air quality effects be provided for the design year with and without the scheme?**
- 4.6.8 Chapter 6 Section 6.16 APP-146 deals with cumulative impacts. **Have the key statutory bodies agreed the scope of the cumulative assessment? Are there any additional developments which should be included in the assessment?**
- 4.7 Noise and Vibration
 - 4.7.1 **Do the local authorities agree that the locations of sensitive receptors and the areas most exposed to noise from major roads have been correctly identified (Figure 12.1 APP-253 to APP-256)?**
 - 4.7.2 **Has the baseline for the assessment of noise and vibration including the spatial scope (study area) for both construction and operational phases of the scheme together with the identification of the 21 monitoring locations been agreed with local authorities?**

- 4.7.3 The study area in Figure 12.1^{APP-253 to APP-256}, identifies that apart from that area identified for the proposed construction compound no. 3 (shown on sheet 3 of 16, Figure 12.1^{APP-254}), all elements of the proposed development are located within the 1km study area. Figure 12.1^{APP-253 to APP-256} identifies the location of some of the construction compounds (2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 11). It is not clear from the noise and vibration assessment whether the applicant is proposing to require construction compounds 1, 4, 7, 8 and 10 and if so, where these are located. **Please can the applicant clarify whether the only construction compounds that have been included in the description of the development and assessed in the ES are compounds 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 11? Please can the applicant clarify whether construction compounds 1, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are required for the proposed development?**
- 4.7.4 The assessment states that within the 1km study area, a 600m zone is subject to detailed modelling. The extent of the 600m zone in relation to the proposed development is shown on Figure 12.2^{APP-257 to APP-260}. This identifies that all elements of the proposed development, apart from the whole of the proposed construction compound no.6, are located within the 600m detailed modelling study area. Figure 12.2 (sheet 3 of 16^{APP-258}) shows that the entire area of the proposed construction compound no.6 is located outside the 600m study area. It is not clear how construction compound no.6 has been assessed given that it is outside the 600m modelled study area. **Please can the applicant explain the assessment of noise and vibration arising from construction compound no.6, given that the site is located outside the 600m zone subject to detailed modelling?**
- 4.7.5 Construction of the scheme would require the establishment of a main office compound (c.5ha). However, the ES states that the construction compound proposed as the main compound has not yet been identified. Instead, para 12.4.81^{APP-152} states that all proposed construction compounds have been treated as the potential main compound. **Please can the applicant clarify the size of each construction compound and which construction compounds are suitable for the requirements of the main office compound?**
- 4.7.6 It is not clear what hours of construction have been assumed for the noise assessment. **Please can the applicant clarify what hours of construction have been used in the noise and vibration assessment in the ES? Where night-time working is required for certain activities, please can the applicant identify what activities these are, the anticipated duration of these activities and how the night-time working has been assessed in the ES? Where differing noise limits are proposed for 'day', 'evening' and 'night' construction activities, please can the applicant clarify what timeframes have been assumed for 'day', 'evening' and 'night' activities?**

Please can the applicant explain how activities and the construction hours will be controlled through the DCO?

- 4.7.7 Limits on noise and vibration during construction would need to be agreed with the relevant local authorities (para 12.4.43 APP-152). **Please can the applicant clarify what noise and vibration limits are proposed during construction, having regard to the levels that have been assessed within the ES and how these will be controlled through the requirements of the DCO?**
- 4.7.8 Appendix 12.3 APP-349 shows the magnitude of the change from the baseline level during construction on residential and non-residential receptors. Para 12.4.54 APP-152 notes that night-time mainline works are restricted to resurfacing, traffic management and gantry installation. However, it is unclear how certain night-time activities would be controlled through the draft DCO APP-026. **Please can the applicant clarify how it intends to control night-time mainline works, through the requirements in the draft DCO, limiting these to resurfacing, traffic management and gantry installation, as assessed in the ES? Please can the applicant identify the specific requirements relied upon in the draft DCO to control night-time working for these activities?**
- 4.7.9 The results from the change in baseline conditions between the Do Minimum opening year scenario (2022) to the future assessment year (2037) are presented as noise difference contour plots in Drawing 12.3 APP-261 to APP-264. It is noted that no key has been provided on Drawing 12.3 to clarify what the different colours (noise contours) represent. **Please can the applicant revise Drawing 12.3 to identify what the different noise difference contour plots represent?**
- 4.7.10 The assessment does not refer to the Rochdale envelope approach being applied. The description of the authorised development in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO APP-026 does not include maximum parameters for the structures included in the proposed development, for example, gantries and noise acoustic barriers. It is unclear what flexibility in terms of the location and dimensions of these structures is being sought. **Please can the applicant clarify what are the parameters required for all structures, having regard to the parameters assessed in the ES? Can the applicant identify whether flexibility in the dimension of these structures is sought in the description of authorised development?**

4.7.11 The authorised development (Schedule 1 of the draft DCO APP-026) does not identify as a specific work number: the provision of low-noise surfacing; the addition of new noise barriers; or the removal or reinstatement of existing noise barriers. **Please can the applicant confirm that the following elements of the proposed development fall within a work number in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO and identify the specific work number:**

- the provision of low-noise surfacing;
- the addition of new noise barriers; and
- the removal or reinstatement of existing noise barriers?

Please can the applicant identify on which works plans these works are shown, and clarify what the parameters are of these works, as assessed in the ES?

4.7.12 The ExA notes that the representations made by interested parties, in particular, Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council RR-304, Buckinghamshire County Council RR-241 and South Buck District Council RR-282, have identified the following developments as omitted from the cumulative assessment in the ES: the potential third runway at Heathrow (as considered in the Airports Commission's Final Report (July 2015)); Construction of the Western Rail link to Heathrow (2017); S.I.F.E Slough International Freight Exchange; and HS2 Heathrow Express Sidings. **Please can the applicant explain why these developments have been omitted from the applicant's cumulative impact assessment? Please can the applicant undertake a cumulative impact assessment for these developments to identify whether the inclusion of these projects would change any of the conclusions reached in the applicant's ES or require any additional mitigation measures in order to avoid, reduce and, if possible, remedy significant adverse effects.**

4.7.13 **Please can the applicant confirm that 'chainage', which has been used to describe the length of the existing and proposed noise barriers, is a standard of measurement and explain what this equates to in other measurements i.e. meters?**

4.7.14 **Please can the applicant clarify the dimensions (length and height) of the existing noise barriers, having regard to the representations made by interested parties, in particular, Dorney Parish Council RR-046r, challenging the dimensions of the existing barriers, as stated in the ES?**

4.7.15 **Please can the applicant clarify the dimensions of the new noise barriers and confirm that these have been assessed in the noise and vibration assessment? It is noted that the location and heights of the additional**

new barriers differs between Tables A12.5.1 APP-351 and A12.2.1 APP-348 and Diagram 12.2 APP-257 to APP-260 in the noise and vibration assessment.

- 4.7.16 Table A12.5.2 APP-351 identifies the locations of existing barriers which would be replaced, presumably on a like for like basis, in accordance with the statement made in para 1.1.1 of Appendix 12.5 APP-351. However, Table A12.5.2 APP-351 states that there would be an increase in barrier height at the locations where the barrier would be replaced. The proposed increase in barrier height is not stated. **Please can the applicant clarify what the increase in height would be and how this has been assessed in the ES?**
- 4.7.17 Where the applicant has only identified the need for placement of new barriers along a single side of the M4, rather than both sides, **please can the applicant clarify why a barrier is not required on the opposite, non-protected, side? Please can the applicant explain how the noise and vibration assessment has considered noise reflection, where noise is reflected by a barrier onto receptors opposite, having regard to the concerns raised by interested parties in their relevant representations, in particular, Aborfield and Newland Parish Council RR-056, regarding noise reflection from the existing barriers?**
- 4.7.18 **Please can the applicant provide a revised plan showing the location of existing and proposed barriers and identify where the existing barrier would need to be removed and reinstated? The height dimensions of the barriers should also be provided, including AOD, on the plan.**
- 4.7.19 **Please explain how the replacement of barriers in poor condition is secured through the description of associated development in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO APP-026 submitted with the application?**
- 4.8 Cultural Assets
- 4.8.1 Chapter 7 Table 7.3 APP-147 concludes that there would be no more than moderate adverse impacts on cultural heritage assets or their setting during the construction phase of the scheme, and no more than slight adverse impacts on the setting of cultural heritage assets during operation of the scheme. **Does any party have evidence to challenge this conclusion?**
- 4.9 Effects on all travellers

- 4.9.1 The assessments have been undertaken in accordance with the general principles and structure of assessment methodology contained within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)¹ Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5 HA 205/08 'Assessment and Management of Environmental Effects' APP-352, which has been applied, as appropriate, and tailored to the context of the proposed development. **Has the approach to the assessment used, and its results, been agreed with relevant stakeholders?**
- 4.9.2 Paragraph 13.7.31 APP-153 states that 133 additional gantries and associated signs are proposed as part of the scheme, as described in detail in the Engineering and Design Report (EDR). However when cross referenced a disparity has been identified. The DCO APP-026 only includes reference to 130 gantries with the demolition of 37 of the existing gantries, while para 7.11.3 of the EDR APP-096 indicates that there would be 162 gantries, with 33 existing gantries. **Can the applicant confirm the correct numbers of proposed gantries and explain the disparity?**

5. **Engineering and Design**

For the applicant; WBerksC; WokBC; RBC; RBWM; BFC; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA; RAC; AA; EA.

- 5.1 **To what extent have the local authorities and road user bodies been involved in the engineering and design of the project?**
- 5.2 **What measures (Intelligent Transport Systems [ITS] or Integrated Demand Management [IDM]) are currently in place on M4 J3 to 12 to improve journey time reliability, reduce congestion and increase highway capacity as recommended by the TVMMS in 2003?**
- 5.3 **Does Table 2 of the applicant's EDR APP-096 take into account the use of any ITS and/or IDM?**
- 5.4 **Why was the Controlled All Lane Running (ALR) design chosen in preference to a Managed Motorway (MM) with use of the hard shoulder restricted to periods of congestion?**
- 5.5 The EDR APP-096 identifies a requirement for further detailed design. The possible changes include online solutions changing to offline solutions. Section 7 of the EDR provides a link by link description and different options for certain

¹ <http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/>

works are included². **The applicant is requested to produce a schedule of those works for which options have not been decided. The schedule should indicate whether all the options are shown on the relevant works plan and provide the works plan reference; provide references to the ES where the options have been considered; and indicate the implications for land take, referring to the land plans/Book of Reference (BoR) for each option.**

- 5.6 Para 6.1.6 of the EDR APP-096 states that any changes to the detailed design would be within previously assessed parameters, and that this will be secured through the wording of the draft DCO APP-026. **Please provide the references for those parts of the draft DCO which provide this security.**
- 5.7 **Are the local authorities satisfied that the solution chosen for each of the overbridges or underbridges in their Council area are appropriate?**
- 5.8 **Has the drainage strategy for the project been agreed with the EA?**
- 5.9 **Is the EA satisfied that adequate compensation for any loss of floodplain can be provided?**
- 5.10 **Have discussions been held with the Police regarding the positioning of Police Observation Platforms?**
- 5.11 EDR para 7.6.21e) APP-096 states both new bridges at Huntercombe Spur will have two lanes of traffic in each direction. **Please clarify whether this means one bridge will carry two lanes southbound and one will carry two lanes northbound.**
- 5.12 EDR para 7.8.7 APP-096 **please confirm there will not be ALR westwards from J4b to J5?**
- 5.13 EDR para 7.8.8 APP-096 refers to retention of hard shoulder and existing ERA. **Is this correct?**
6. **Traffic Safety**
For the applicant; WBerksC; WokBC; RBC; RBWM; BFC; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA; RAC; AA.

² No works plan references are provided in the EDR to aid the understanding of the options in relation to the parameters of the draft DCO.

- 6.1 The Road Safety Audit (RSA) ^{APP-096} is based on the terms of reference of the DMRB document HD/03. That document has now been replaced by HD/15. **To what extent does the RSA require updating to meet the terms of reference of the latest advice? Can such an update be provided?**
- 6.2 In Annex E of the EDR ^{APP-113} a status box appears at para 1.2. **Is there any update of this Annex?**
- 6.3 The baseline comparator is identified in the Hazard Log as “no motorway incident detection or automatic signalling queue protection”. **Is that the current position for this section of the M4?**
- 6.4 **Can the applicant please provide a table to represent a comparison of hazards in the following scenarios: the application project; the current operation of the M4; the M4 as a Managed Motorway (as in M42 MM); and generic ALR?**
- 6.5 The safety baseline for the scheme is set out at para 2.3 Annex E ^{APP-113}. **Can the applicant please explain the derivation of the safety baseline, in particular why the rate of FWIs is set at 110%?**
- 6.6 The highest scoring hazards identified in the Hazard Log are: i) a vehicle stops in running lane off peak; ii) a vehicle drifts off carriageway. There is currently ALR on parts of the M1 and M25. **Is there any evidence of an event which illustrates hazards i) or ii)? If there is, please provide details and outcome.**
- 6.7 Evidence is used from the M42 pilot to assess safety issues. However the hard shoulder is only used during peak traffic times and together with the variable mandatory speed limit on the M42. **Can any evidence be produced from experience of the M42 in respect of hazard ii)?**
- 6.8 **To what extent can the experience of ALR on the M1 and M25 help inform the assessment for off peak times when the national speed limit is in force?**
- 6.9 **Is there any evidence available from the operation of ALR on the M1 or M25 un relation to road safety issues?**
- 6.10 The change score for Hazard H11 has altered as a result of monitoring of the M25 ALR sections, and the risk is considered no different from the baseline risk or that in the generic ALR. **However, has the failure of drivers to follow the lane closed X marking been the cause of any accidents and are there any modifications which could be made to reduce the risk?**

- 6.11 **With the application project in place, would CCTV monitoring operate at the same level during normal motorway operation (off-peak) as it would when variable speed limits apply?**
- 6.12 **How long does it take for a vehicle which breaks down in a live running lane to be detected on the M4 as currently operating, and with the application project in place?**
- 6.13 **Is there any new evidence which has emerged since April 2014 which could impact on the hazard scores in the hazard log?**
- 6.14 **What feedback has been received from operators of motorway rescue services such as the AA or RAC and the emergency services on the implications of having no hard shoulder?**

7. **Socio-economic impacts**

For the applicant; WBerksC; WokBC; RBC; RBWM; BFC; BCC; SBDC; SBC; LBHill; LBHouns; GLA; RAC; AA; FOE.

- 7.1 **Does the scheme comply with the need to be designed to minimise social and environmental impacts and improve quality of life in accordance with para 3.2 of the NNNPS?**
- 7.2 **Appendix B to the Socio-economic Report APP-090 sets out the applicant's WebTAG appraisal of the scheme. **To what extent are the summaries of key economic and social impacts agreed? Can evidence be produced to support any disagreement with the conclusions set out in App B?****

8 Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)

All questions relating to the draft DCO are principally addressed to the applicant

Question Number	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Text	Question(s)
8.1	General	Where relevant	<p>Can the applicant please apply the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) All references to the Highways Agency should be amended to Highways England. ii) Provide contact details for Highways England (registered office address) in the Explanatory Note on the final page of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) ^{APP-026}. iii) Please correct typographical drafting errors and ensure all formatting is consistent with the statutory instrument template. iv) Correct use of future tense "shall" or "will" to present tense or "must" where appropriate. v) Correct use of capitals in heading above A44. vi) Each requirement must be checked to ensure that an implementation clause has been added e.g. R19 requires such a clause in order to ensure that lighting is installed in accordance with approved details.
8.2	Preamble	<i>"The application is for development which constitutes a nationally significant infrastructure project within sections 14(1)(h) and 22 of the Planning Act 2008, being the alteration and improvement of a highway which is wholly within England, in</i>	In setting out the definition of highway related development which is within s14(1)(h) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008), s22 separately lists the alteration of a highway and the improvement of a highway. This application is described as the alteration and improvement of a highway. In the Statement of Reasons (SoR) ^{APP-030} , para 5.1.8 states that the proposed development is an alteration, and para 5.1.9 states that the

		<i>relation to which the Secretary of State is the highway authority, and the area of development of which is greater than 15 hectares."</i>	development is also an improvement. Whilst the application would fall within the definition of a nationally significant infrastructure project, whichever it is considered to be, and has been accepted by the Secretary of State (SoS) as such, can the applicant clarify what is meant by paras 5.1.8 and 5.1.9? Furthermore, can the applicant clearly state which definition is being applied to which work?
8.3	A2	<i>"commence" means ...development other than operations consisting of site clearance, demolition work, archaeological investigations, investigations for the purpose of assessing ground conditions, remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions, diversion and laying of services, habitat creation and species translocation, establishment of site offices and the laying of services, erection of any temporary means of enclosure, the temporary display of site notices or advertisements</i>	The SoS was reluctant <i>"to permit significant elements of the development to commence before relevant approvals have been obtained from the planning authority under the requirements as appears to be intended by the definition of "commence""</i> in the decision letter for the Daventry International Rail Freight Interchange Alteration Order (see para 44 of the decision letter), and deleted the corresponding definition from the final Order. With this in mind, can each of these exclusions be fully justified?
8.4	A2	<i>"environmental statement" means the environmental statement submitted with the application for the Order, and certified as the environmental statement by the Secretary of State for the purposes of this Order</i>	The environmental statement (ES) may be updated or amended before any decision is taken on the dDCO. To accommodate any such changes, can the applicant re-word as follows: <i>"the environmental statement" means the document certified as the environmental statement by the decision-maker for the purposes of this Order.?</i>
8.5	A2	<i>"maintain" in relation to the authorised development includes to inspect, repair, adjust, alter, remove, clear, refurbish, reconstruct, decommission,</i>	This is a broad definition of maintain. Can it be justified and what guarantee can be given that, for example, "reconstruct" would not fall outside the parameters of the description of the authorised project in Schedule 1, and would not be such as to

		<i>replace and improve and any derivative of "maintain" is to be construed accordingly.</i>	give rise to any significant environmental effects which have not been assessed in the ES? Please see the definition of maintain adopted by the SoS in the Whitemoss Landfill Western Extension DCO.
8.6	A2	<i>"relevant planning authority" means the local planning authority for the land in question.</i>	Can this definition be amended to reflect that there is more than one relevant planning authority?
8.7	A2	<i>"Secretary of State" means the Secretary of State for Transport</i>	In the Norwich Northern Distributor Road DCO, the SoS for Transport deleted the definition of SoS to allow for any future changes in the machinery of government. A generic SoS should be assumed. Can the applicant delete this definition?
8.8	A3(2)	<i>For the purposes of the authorised development, development consent granted by this Order is to include and permit the alteration, removal, clearance, refurbishment, reconstruction, decommissioning and demolition of any buildings or other structures within the Order limits to the extent that they relate to, are required by or are incidental to the carrying out of the authorised development.</i>	This is a very general power, with little limitation on its scope. What is the purpose of this power and how can it be justified?
8.9	A3(4)	<i>The numbered works comprised in the authorised development are to be constructed within the limits specified in article 6 (power to deviate).</i>	Does this clause duplicate the provision made in A3(3)?
8.10	A6	<i>...these maximum limits do not apply where it is demonstrated to the Secretary of State's satisfaction that a deviation in excess of these limits would not give rise to any materially new or</i>	This wording is not present in the equivalent article included in the A556 (Knutsford to Bowden Improvement) DCO, referred to in the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) APP-027. This would seem to provide little clarity as to the extent of the

		<i>materially worse adverse environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement</i>	development. If it is anticipated that the Order limits (together with the deviation limits in this article) will be the maximum extent, why is this wording required? Alternatively, should the order limits be amended to reflect the proposed limits?
8.11	A14(6)	<i>If a street authority which receives an application for consent under paragraph 14(5) fails to notify the undertaker of its decision before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application was made, it is deemed to have granted consent.</i>	This is an addition to the model provision. Is it appropriate for the consent of the street authority to be deemed to have been given after 28 days in this way?
8.12	A15	<i>The undertaker may for the purposes of the authorised development form and lay out means of access, or improve existing means of access at such locations within the Order limits as the undertaker reasonably requires for the purposes of the authorised development.</i>	Would this provision grant adequate protection for adverse impacts as a result of the formation of a means of access? Would there be circumstances where the prior approval of the local planning authority should be sought?
8.13	A16	<i>Powers in relation to relevant navigations or watercourses</i>	The powers provided by this article could have significant impacts on the navigation or watercourse and on its users. With that in mind, can each of the powers be justified? Have the Environment Agency or any other relevant bodies commented on this approach?
8.14	A17(9)	<i>If a person under paragraph (3) receives an application for consent and fails to notify the undertaker of its decision before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application was made, the person is deemed to have granted</i>	This is an addition to the model provision, which is not explained or justified in the EM _{APP-027} . Is it appropriate for the consent of the relevant person to be deemed to have been given after 28 days in this way?

		<i>consent</i>	
8.15	A19(6)	<i>If a highway authority under paragraph (4)(a) or a street authority under (4)(b) receives an application for consent and fails to notify the undertaker of its decision before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application was made, the highway authority or street authority, as relevant, is deemed to have granted consent.</i>	This is an addition to the model provision, which is not explained or justified in the EM _{APP-027} . Is it appropriate for the consent of the relevant authority to be deemed to have been given after 28 days in this way?
8.16	A41	<i>Operational land for purposes of the 1990 Act</i>	Why is it necessary for the Order land to be treated as operational land? Which powers or rights does the undertaker seek to rely on based on this definition?
8.17	A42	<i>...in relation to a nuisance falling within paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (fb), (g), (ga) and (h) of section 79(1) (statutory nuisances and inspections therefor)</i>	The list of nuisances has been extended from that provided for in the model provision. How will these nuisances be controlled in relation to the development?
8.18	A45	<i>Certification of plans etc</i>	There are a number of sheets which comprise the Land Plans _{APP-008 to APP-012} and the Works Plans _{APP-013 to APP-017} . Would it be more precise to provide the referencing/numbering of those sheets to ensure that all are taken into account?
8.19	A49(2)	<i>Schedule 11 (procedure for discharge of requirements) shall have effect in relation to all agreements or approvals granted, refused or withheld in relation to requirements.</i>	Why is it considered necessary to have a bespoke approval procedure for this development? Why should the existing procedure in relation to planning conditions not be used instead, as provided for by A4(1) of the Brechfa Forest West Wind Farm DCO 2013?
8.20	General	All drafting in Schedule 2	In requirements which include provision for details to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, should it be made explicit that such approvals should be made

			<p>in writing?</p> <p>A number of requirements include tailpieces such as “unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority”. Such a provision allows scope for the PA2008 procedures to be circumvented and runs the risk of enabling the final scheme to go beyond the envelope of the ES. Is there any reason why such a provision would be justified in any of the requirements to the proposed DCO?</p>
8.21	R3	<p><i>3 Except where the authorised development is carried out in accordance with the plans listed in requirement 4, no authorised development may commence until details of the layout, scale, siting, design, dimensions and external appearance of Works No. 7a, 8c, 9b, 10c, 11c, 12e, 13c, 14c, 17, 19c, 20c, 22c, 24g, 24j and 25, earthworks and retaining structures comprised in the authorised development so far as they do not accord with the development shown in the plans listed in requirement 6 have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the details shown in the plans listed in requirement 6 or approved under this requirement.</i></p>	<p>This requirement would appear to seek to enable the applicant to amend aspects of the scheme with the approval of the relevant planning authority. Such a provision could circumvent the provisions of PA2008 and enable the construction of a modified scheme which goes beyond the scope of the ES. Can the applicant please review this requirement and provide justification for its inclusion?</p>

8.22	R6(2)	<p><i>6(1) The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved plans submitted with the application (unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority and provided that the altered development accords with the principles of the engineering and design report and falls within the Order limits) as follows:</i></p> <p><i>6(2)Where any alternative details are approved pursuant to this requirement or requirements 3 or 20, those details are to be deemed to be substituted for the corresponding approved details set out above.</i></p>	<p>The query raised in question 1.22 also applies to the provision in R6 for alterations to the development to be approved by the relevant planning authority. Can the applicant please review this requirement and provide justification for its inclusion?</p>
8.23	R5	<p><i>5 Where any carriageway comprised in Work No. 1a and 1b, or any slip road is to be resurfaced as part of the authorised works, thin surface course is to be provided, unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority.</i></p>	<p>Can the applicant confirm that this requirement is intended to secure the low noise surface proposed in the ES? If so, can the applicant reconsider the wording of the requirement to make this explicit, and to specify that any material "<i>otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority</i>" would provide a low noise surface?</p>
8.24	R7	<p><i>7.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to be carried out..</i></p>	<p>Would "<i>commenced</i>" be more consistent than "<i>carried out</i>"?</p>

8.25	R8	<p>8.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to be carried out..</p> <p>8.—(3) The undertaker may modify the CEMP at any time--</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Would “commenced” be more consistent than “carried out”?</p> <p>Apart from where there is the potential for an impact on protected species or protected sites, this provision appears to give the undertaker unlimited powers to change the CEMP after it has been approved by the relevant planning authority. Is this a requirement which should make provision for any modifications to the CEMP to be agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority? (see Q4.1.5)</p>
8.26	R13	<p>(5)(b) no activities requiring a protected species licence are to continue until a scheme of protection and mitigation measures for the protected species has been submitted to, and approved by, Natural England and the relevant planning authority.</p>	<p>Would this provision be more precise if a protective distance from any protected species within which works could not take place was to be included in 5(b) and would such a definition within the requirement be feasible?</p>

9 Compulsory acquisition and other land matters

Question Number	Question to	Question(s)
General		
9.1	Applicant	<p>With reference to para 8 of DCLG’s <i>Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) How can the ExA be assured that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored? ii) Can the applicant set out in summary form what assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests

		therein in each case?
9.2	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.1.34 of the SoR <small>APP-030</small> states that <i>"The land identified to be subject to compulsory acquisition is no more than is reasonably required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Scheme"</i>.</p> <p>i) In connection with all nine temporary construction compounds shown on the Works Plan <small>APP-13 to APP-17</small>, and to assist with the consideration of whether the land to be temporarily possessed is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development to which the development consent will relate, can the applicant explain how it has calculated the size of each of these compounds in relation to the works that they are required to facilitate?</p> <p>ii) Can the applicant explain why there is no Construction Compound 1 or Construction Compound 10 shown on the Works Plan?</p>
9.3	Applicant	<p>Para 7.1.43 of the SoR <small>APP-030</small> states that the proposed powers of compulsory acquisition in the dDCO are necessary and proportionate for five reasons.</p> <p>i) How has the proportionality test been undertaken?</p> <p>ii) In relation to each plot, can the applicant explain the proportionate approach which has been taken?</p>
9.4	Applicant	<p>The table provided at page 35 through 59 of the SoR <small>APP-030</small>, entitled <i>Table 2: Purposes for land to be compulsorily acquired</i>, includes in column 2 a number of entries which refer to the 'possible' purpose for which land is required. These entries include the possible refurbishment of bridges and culverts, and a possible temporary access or route diversion.</p> <p>Can the applicant explain how it envisages that the relevant statutory tests might be satisfied for the compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land or rights which may not be required for the development, or required to facilitate or are incidental to the development?</p>

9.5	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.1.11 of the SoR _{APP-030} states that "<i>The Agency [now Highways England] will seek to acquire the necessary interests in the Order land by private agreement in order to ensure completion of the Scheme</i>".</p> <p>Can the applicant please provide a schedule to identify those interests with whom private agreements are in place, which makes explicit each party's interest(s) (including plot numbers) and the general scope of any agreement? The schedule should also make clear in relation to which lands private agreements remain outstanding, and anticipated timeframes for their achievement.</p>
9.6	Applicant	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, can the applicant confirm the total number of plots falling within each of the classes listed in paragraph 2.1.7 of the SoR _{APP-030} under which land or rights may be acquired permanently or land possessed temporarily?</p>
9.7	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.3.35 of the SoR _{APP-030} states that "<i>the areas of land proposed to be acquired are very modest</i>", and in para 9.1.5 that "<i>The Agency [now Highways England] has concluded that the significant public benefits [of the scheme] outweigh its effects upon persons who have existing rights in the Order land</i>".</p> <p>Can the applicant explain what assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual affected persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers in each case?</p>
9.8	Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 8.1.47 through 8.1.48 of the SoR _{APP-030} refer to other consent that will be required in order to deliver and operate the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="891 1126 2051 1230">i) Can the applicant explain what progress has been made with each of the relevant bodies referred to in both the SoR and the application document entitled <i>Details of other consents and licences</i> _{APP-083}? <li data-bbox="891 1251 2051 1355">ii) How can the Examining Authority be confident that the need for these other consents does not present any obstacle to the implementation of the M4 scheme?

Special lands, Crown land and statutory undertakers' land

9.9	Applicant	<p>Since the application was submitted, the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 have caused the Highways Agency to be replaced by Highways England; a strategic road company. It is the ExA's understanding that subsequent to these provisions land formerly vested in the Secretary of State for Transport (SST) has now transferred to Highways England. It is therefore no longer Crown land, and not subject to the tests in s135 of the PA2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Can the applicant confirm the ExA's understanding, as set out above?ii) Can the applicant provide an itemised schedule of the plots that have transferred from SST to Highways England?iii) Can the applicant provide Land Registry evidence of the transfer of each of the plots itemised in the schedule requested above?iv) Where former Crown land has transferred to Highways England, can the applicant please reflect the effects of this change in a revised dDCO and EM; an updated Land Plan; an updated Crown land Plan; an updated SoR; and an updated Book of Reference (BoR)? Updated versioning of these documents should be provided to the examination as soon as practicable, and no later than Deadline III in the examination timetable.
9.10	Applicant	<p>Paras 8.1.5 through 8.1.9 of the SoR <small>APP-030</small> describe plots within the Order lands which are subject to the interest of the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SoSEFRA) and the Treasury Solicitor's Department (TSoL).</p> <p>Can the applicant provide an update in relation to its pursuit of associated Crown land consent from SoSEFRA and TSoL?</p>
9.11	Applicant	<p>Paras 8.1.33 and 8.1.34 of the SoR <small>APP-030</small> state that plot 21.12a is incorrectly identified in the BoR <small>APP-038</small> as open space that is proposed to be compulsorily acquired.</p> <p>Can the applicant ensure that the correction described in these paragraphs is</p>

		provided in the updated BoR requested to Deadline III ?
9.12	Applicant	<p>Paras 8.1.15 through 8.1.23 of the SoR _{APP-030} describe the status of plots 10-01a and 10-01b as registered common land at the point of application. In the eventuality that Wokingham Borough Council are unwilling or unable to correct the commons register in advance of the expiry of the examination, the compulsory acquisition of the plots in question will be subject to the tests in s131 and s132 of the PA2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can the applicant provide any update about its progress in seeking to have the lands comprising plots 10-01a and 10-01b deregistered as common land? ii) Can the applicant remove the Replacement Land Plan provided as an appendix to the SoR _{APP-030} and secure it separately through Article 45 in the dDCO? iii) Can the applicant include plot 10-01c (shown on the Replacement Land Plan) in an updated Land Plan and updated BoR request to Deadline III? iv) Can the applicant provide an annotated map showing the relationship of the proposed replacement common land with other land subject to rights of common in the vicinity of the scheme? v) Can the applicant identify in the application documentation where any appraisal of the proposed replacement land is to be found, and with whom consultations about its suitability have been carried out?
9.13	Applicant	Can the applicant provide a position statement identifying all affected statutory undertakers and telecom providers confirming their status for the purposes of s127 and s138 of the PA2008 in relation to each relevant plot in the BoR _{APP-038} ?
<i>The Book of Reference (BoR)</i>		
9.14	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that the BoR _{APP-038} accurately sets out the various plots and interests or provide a schedule of all amendments submitted since the

		application was made on 30 March 2015?
9.15	Applicant	<p>Paras 7.1.16 and 7.1.17 of the SoR_{APP-030} state that diligent inquiry has been made in the applicant's identification of persons with an interest in the Order lands.</p> <p>Can the applicant set out in full the steps that were taken by way of making diligent inquiry to identify those persons with relevant land interests in relation to all the land and interests proposed to be compulsorily acquired or taken possession of temporarily?</p>
9.16	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 1.4.2 of the Book of Reference (BoR)_{APP-038} states that "<i>Part 2 in each section of the BoR is split into Part 2A and Part 2B. Where a person has an identified easement or other private right within the Order land (and therefore within a plot) the person is included against the relevant plot number in Part 2A. Where a person has an interest outside the Order land but, it is the Agency's opinion that they should be included in Part 2 (as potentially being entitled to make relevant claim as above), the person is listed in Part 2B</i>".</p> <p>Can the applicant explain why the BoR does not appear to follow the format asserted in this introductory paragraph?</p>
9.17	Applicant	<p>The heading to Part 2 of the BoR refers to "<i>Potential claims under S10 Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 or Part 1 Land Compensation Act 1973</i>". As set out in para 1.4.1, there is a third potential category of claim, under s152(3) of the PA2008. Should the heading be amended to include this third category?</p>
9.18	Applicant	<p>Para 2.1.7 of the SoR_{APP-038} sets out the powers that would be conferred on the applicant if the dDCO was made. Column 2 of the BoR helpfully distinguishes which plots comprising the Order lands are attributed to the powers in article 20, 22 and 29 of the dDCO. The BoR is silent however on the attribution to plots of the powers provided in draft articles 24, 26, 28 and 30.</p> <p>Can the applicant prepare a schedule identifying which plots are affected by articles 24, 26, 28 and 30?</p>

Matters arising from the relevant representations

9.19	Applicant	<p>Attached to these questions is a schedule of objections to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers. The schedule arises from the ExA's reading of the relevant representations, and comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objections to the compulsory acquisition of land and/or rights.• Objections from those with a potential category 3 interest within the meaning of s44(4) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (PA2008) i.e. those who may be able to make a claim for compensation under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 and/or Section 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973. <p>The applicant is requested to provide a response to the objections listed in Table 1 and to confirm whether the schedule reflects its understanding of all the objections to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession received to date, and if not to explain why.</p> <p>In responding to each of the objections listed, and with reference to the specific plots in question, can the applicant please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain in detail why in its assembly of the proposed Order lands it has been deemed necessary for the dDCO to include provision for the associated land/rights to be compulsorily acquired or for land/rights to be taken possession of temporarily?• With reference to relevant evidence in the ES and any draft environmental management plans, where applicable, explain how it is proposed that any interference with third party land/rights would be mitigated or compensated for?• With reference to the ES, explain what consideration has been given to the socio-economic consequences of any interference with land/rights?• Explain what degree of importance has been attributed to the existing use of
------	-----------	--

		<p>the land proposed to be compulsorily acquired or temporarily possessed, and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, provide an update on the progress of discussions with the affected interest; in particular where any agreement has been reached, or where disagreement remains, in relation to the compatibility/safeguarding of future development proposals in the vicinity of the scheme? <p>In relation to Table 2, can the applicant confirm that consideration has been given as to whether or not each party listed would have a category 3 interest?</p>
9.20	South East Water Ltd (SEW)	<p>SEW express concern that the development impinges on source protection zones (SPZ) for public water supply <small>RR-149</small>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can SEW provide an update on any progress in terms of the applicant's engagement in response to the concerns raised in SEW's letter dated 18 December 2014? ii) Can SEW provide a map(s) identifying the SPZs referred to in its RR? iii) Are any changes to the dDCO sought by SEW in order to protect the SPZs referred to in its RR?
9.21	National Grid (NG), Affinity Water Ltd (AW) and the British Pipeline Agency (BPA)	<p>NG, AW and BPA are statutory undertakers and all confirm the presence of apparatus within the Order lands <small>REP-303, REP-208 and REP-044</small>.</p> <p>Can NG, AW and BPA explain whether the protective provisions provided at Schedule 9 to the dDCO are adequate in their current form? If they are not, what precise protective provisions do the interests seek to be included in the dDCO, and why?</p>
9.22	Goodman Colnbrook (Jersey) Ltd (GCL)	<p>GCL express concern about the potential for the M4 scheme to prejudice the interest's promotion of infrastructure to serve a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI) <small>RR-232</small>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can GCL provide an annotated map showing how it envisages the plans for the proposed SRFI could interact or overlap with the Highways England

		scheme?
9.23	RBS	<p>RBS express concern in relation to the impact of the proposed scheme on its interests <small>RR-239</small>.</p> <p>Can RBS clarify where any concerns remain residual from those raised in its RR dated 2 July 2015?</p>
9.24	CEMEX UK Operations Ltd	<p>CEMEX UK Operations Ltd express concern in relation to land in which it is interested at the proposed Riding Court Bridge, and its associated ability to implement planning permission 13/01667/FUL <small>RR-277</small>.</p> <p>Can CEMEX provide an annotated map showing how it envisages the working of minerals associated with PP 13/01667/FUL could interact or overlap with the M4 scheme?</p>
9.25	Persimmon Homes Ltd and Bovis Homes Ltd (PHBH)	<p>PHBH express concern in relation to an overlap in land subject to extant outline planning permission O/2006/8687 with the Order lands proposed in the M4 dDCO <small>REP-283</small>.</p> <p>Can PHBH provide an annotated map to show where the land in question overlaps with the Order lands proposed in the M4 dDCO?</p>
9.26	Lesley Rose Rieseberg	<p>Can Ms Rieseberg present or summarise to the examination any dialogue between the interest and Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council in relation to the re-zoning of the land in question?</p>

Annex 1

Table 1: List of objections to compulsory acquisition/temporary possession powers arising from the relevant representations (RR)

RR no.	Name/Organisation	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
18	Slough MotoX Parc (Neil Morgan)	Slough BC	Part 1	1	Temporary	23-32	No	
			Part 2 (rights of access)	3	Temporary	23-33	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access)	n/a	Temporary	23-33	No	
25	The Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance	South Bucks DC	Part 1	1	Temporary	19-61, 19-62	No	
34	Dorney Village Hall Management Committee	South Bucks DC	Part 2	3	n/a	19-56	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access)	n/a	Temporary	19-56	No	
38	Manpartap Singh	RBWM	Part 1 (subsoil)	1	Permanent	18-15	Yes	
60	South Bucks DC	South Bucks DC	Part 1	1	Temporary	19-45, 19-49	No	
			Part 2	3	Temporary	19-56	No	
			Part 3	n/a	Temporary	19-56	No	
84	Lesley Rose Rieseberg	RBWM	Part 1	1	Temporary	24-13	No	
130	Teresa McGuinness	South Bucks DC	Part 1	1	Temporary	19-58	No	
149	South East Water	RBWM	Part 1	1	Temporary	19-11, 19-11a, 19-14, 19-14a	No	
			Part 1	1	Permanent	19-12, 19-12a	Yes	
			Part 2	3	n/a	19-04, 19-04a, 19-04b, 19-07, 19-09, 19-09a, 19-09b, 19-10b	No	
			Part 3 (rights of drainage)	n/a	Permanent	19-04, 19-04a, 19-04b, 19-07, 19-09, 19-09a, 19-09b, 19-10b	Yes	
			Part 3 (rights of water extraction)	n/a	Temporary	19-06	No	
			Part 2	3	n/a	19-06	No	
190	National Foundation for Educational Research	Slough BC	Part 1 (subsoil)	1	Permanent	23-05	Yes	
			Part 1	1	Temporary	23-08	No	
			Part 2	3	n/a	23-07	No	

RR no.	Name/Organisation	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
199	Tim Hancock for BP Oil Ltd	West Berks DC	Part 1	1	Temporary	03-07, 03-12	No	
			Part 2	3	n/a	03-04, 03-05, 03-08, 03-13	No	
			Part 3 (rights relating to transfer dated 13 January 1998)	n/a	Permanent	03-04, 03-05, 03-08, 03-13	Yes	
216	Moto Hospitality Ltd	West Berks DC	Part 1 (land and works to streets)	1	Temporary	03-07, 03-12	No	
220	Dunelm (Soft Furnishings) Ltd and Dunelm Estates Ltd	West Berks DC	Part 2	3	n/a	02-01, 02-02	No	
			Part 3 (right to drain water)	n/a	Permanent	02-01, 02-02	Yes	
232	Graham Wrigglesworth for Goodman Colnbrook (Jersey) Ltd	South Bucks DC	Part 2	3	n/a	26-17	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access)	n/a	Permanent	26-17	Yes	
			Part 1	1	Temporary	26-06, 26-10, 26-10a, 27-09	No	
			Part 2	3	n/a	26-04, 26-04a	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access)	n/a	Permanent	26-04, 26-04a	Yes	
234	The Animal Sanctuary UK	South Bucks DC	Part 1	1	Temporary	20-02	No	
			Part 1	1	Permanent	20-02a	Yes	
			Part 2	3	n/a	20-05	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access)	n/a	Permanent	20-05	Yes	
235	Louisa Maxwell-Watters	South Bucks DC	Part 2	3	n/a	19-53, 19-54	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access to The Other House)	n/a	Temporary	19-53, 19-54	No	
237	Satinder Jaswal for Mohinder Jaswal	South Bucks DC	Part 1 (subsoil)	1	Permanent	20-14	Yes	
238	John Buttanshaw for Stockley Park Consortium Ltd	LB of Hillingdon	Part 1	1	Temporary	29-01, 29-03	No	
239	Virginia Blackman for RBS (BoR listing as National Westminster Bank plc)	South Bucks DC	Part 1 (mortgagee for William Roy Groom and Dawn Groom)	2	Permanent	19-66, 19-69	Yes	
		Slough BC	Part 1 (mortgagee for The National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales)	2	Temporary	23-08	No	
		LB of Hillingdon	Part 1	1	Temporary	28-11	No	
267	Lynn Adams for M T Adams	RBWM	Part 1	1	Temporary	24-09	No	
277	CEMEX UK Operations Ltd	RBWM	Part 1	1	Permanent	24-28, 24-29	Yes	

RR no.	Name/Organisation	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
		RBWM	Part 1	1	Temporary	24-32	No	
		South Bucks DC	Part 1 (option agreement)	2	Temporary	20-12, 20-20, 20-22	No	
		South Bucks DC	Part 1 (option agreement)	2	Permanent	20-12a, 20-23	Yes	
279	James Luntz for Iris Software Group Ltd	RBWM	Part 2	3	n/a	24-30	No	
			Part 2	3	n/a	24-31	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access in respect of Riding Court House and Unit B and C)	n/a	Temporary	24-30, 24-31	No	
283	David Hutchison for Persimmon Homes Ltd and Bovis Homes Ltd	Wokingham BC	Part 1 (subsoil)	1	Permanent	09-07	Yes	
			Part 1	2	Permanent	10-22	Yes	
			Part 1	1	Temporary	07-05	No	
			Part 1	1	Permanent	07-07	Yes	
294	Douglas Bond for Anita Thomas	RBWM	Part 1	1	Permanent	17-11	Yes	
			Part 1	1	Temporary	17-12, 18-02	No	
297	Clarke Vallance for Railway Pension Nominees Ltd	RBWM	Part 1	1	Temporary	18-07, 18-08	No	
300	Douglas Bond for Bloor Homes Southern	RBWM	Part 1	2	Temporary	18-02	No	
301	Michael R Knowles for University of Reading	Wokingham BC	Part 1	1	Permanent	07-03	Yes	
			Part 2	3	n/a	08-01, 08-04	No	
			Part 3 (rights of drainage)	n/a	Permanent	08-01, 08-04	Yes	
307	Katie Scuoler for A1 Grab Hire Ltd (assumed A1 South Ltd (trading as A1 Recycling) in BoR)	South Bucks DC	Part 1 <i>purported</i>	1	Temporary	20-02	No	
			Part 1 <i>purported</i>	1	Permanent	20-02a, 20-05	Yes	
313	John Watters	South Bucks DC	Part 2	3	n/a	19-53, 19-54	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access to The Other House)	n/a	Temporary	19-53, 19-54	No	
323	Beverley Hakesley	South Bucks DC	Part 1 (as partner in Amerden Caravan and Camping Park)	1	Temporary	19-41, 19-47	No	
			Part 1 (as partner in Amerden Caravan and Camping Park)	1	Permanent	19-42, 19-48	Yes	
			Part 2	3	n/a	19-53, 19-54	No	
			Part 3 (rights of access in respect of Amerden Caravan and Camping Park)	n/a	Temporary	19-53, 19-54	No	

Table 2: List of potential Category 3 claimants arising from the RRs

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
2	Dr Norman Jorgensen	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
3	Stephanie Robinson	Powys CC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
4	Samantha Breakwell	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
6	Tom Killick	LB Merton	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
7	David Allen	Sevenoaks DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
8	Elaine Marie Evans	Mendip DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
11	Giles Gooding	Winchester City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
14	Grace Hall	New Forest DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
21	Mr B Kinane	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
30	David Baker	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
31	Susan Francis	Colchester BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
32	Mr Andrew K Monks	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
33	Noel Jennion	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
35	Mark Matthews	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
36	Chris Todd	Brighton & Hove City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
37	Irene Baumhardt	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
39	Pete Abel	Trafford MBC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
41	Celia Roberts	LB Ealing	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
42	A Nicolson	Wiltshire Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
43	Rupert Emerson	Chichester DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
47	Tim Holton	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
48	John Prior	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
50	Jessica Peace	LB Lambeth	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
52	Deeba Khawar	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
53	Mike Tyzack	LB Ealing	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
55	Peter Burt	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
57	Adam Semenenko	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
58	Susan Murray	Lewes DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
63	David Callow	Braintree DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
66	Derek Bodey	High Peak BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
67	Dr Jeremy Bartlett	Norwich City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
70	Tony James	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
71	Andrew Sherwood	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
72	Corinna Smart	LB Hounslow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
73	Edwina Blakewill	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
74	Andrew Cole	Newcastle upon Tyne City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
76	Kevin Fallon	LB Waltham Forest	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
78	Pam Huntley Blecken	Surrey Heath BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
79	Michael Brice	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
80	Robert Palgrave	Herefordshire Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
82	Sandra Ludgate	South Oxfordshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
83	David Greeno	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
89	Michael Bull	LB Hounslow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
85	J Langrish	LB Richmond upon Thames	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
86	Heather Marshall	South Lakeland DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
87	Jane Chaplin	East Hertfordshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
90	Stephen Mandel	West Berkshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
91	Stephen Tames	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
92	Barbara Lawrence	LB Hounslow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
94	Christine Honeywill	Rushmoor BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
96	Steven Edwards	LB Camden	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
97	Malcolm Hunt	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
98	Carolyn Forsyth	LB Richmond upon Thames	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
102	John Orbell	Wealden DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
104	Kay Snowdon	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
106	Elizabeth Jenkins	Spelthorne BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
107	Leon Spence	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
108	L Warren	LB Hounslow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
109	Alison Johnston	LB Haringey	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
110	Andrew Martin	Nottingham City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
112	Laura Goody	Surrey Heath BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
113	Julian Bogajski	LB Ealing	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
114	D Brown	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
116	Hannah Wakley	Leicester City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
117	Lee Clements	LB Havering	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
118	Parvesh Kumar Roda	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
119	Julian Holt	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
121	Angus McCallum	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
124	Simon Palmer	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
127	Alban Thurston	LB Merton	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
131	Mike Birkin	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
132	Simon Barber	LB Richmond upon Thames	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
134	Mike Croker	Horsham DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
135	Mary Ntmark	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
137	David Bailey	Teignbridge DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
139	Dr A J Pretlove	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
141	Morag Carmichael	LB Hammersmith & Fulham	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
142	David Crawford	Mole Valley DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
143	Jasper Selwyn	Wiltshire Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
144	Tim Davis	West Berkshire Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
145	Felix Brunner	West Berkshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
148	Giselle Hulme	West Devon BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
150	Peter C Stone	South Oxfordshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
151	Adrian Windisch	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
153	Gary Cowan	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
154	Frank McElroy	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
155	Linda Ellard	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
156	Darrel Archbold	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
157	John Hill	Brighton & Hove City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
158	Diane Harker	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
159	Christine McMillan	Portsmouth City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
160	Susan Walsh	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
162	E Tomalin	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
163	Louise Green	Mid Sussex DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
164	Andrea Needham	Hastings BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
165	Andrew Durling	Wealden DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
166	H Singh	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
167	Jonathan Say	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
169	Mr Simon Zev Kendler	LB Harrow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
173	Karen Apperley	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
174	Kate Nickels	Central Beds Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
177	Ralph Brown	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
178	Jane Richardson	Hastings BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
181	Steven Goodman	West Berkshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
182	Barbara Wharton	Oxford City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
185	Stanley Knill	LB Haringey	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
186	Mr R Abbott	Hart DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
188	Michael Bunn	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
191	Christine Eborall	LB Ealing	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
193	Rachel Cook	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
194	Rebecca Emerton	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
196	Kathryn Tytler	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
197	Thomas Haiden	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
200	Edward Keating	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
202	Peter Corley	LB Haringey	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
203	R Hogg	St Albans City & DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
205	Sarah Lunnon	Stroud DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
206	Asma Chaudhry	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
207	Barbara Jerome	Bracknell Forest Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
211	Dr Liaf Maxey	South Hams DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
214	Zav Bowden	South Hams DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
215	Alasdair Cameron	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
217	Joseph Nicholas	LB Haringey	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
218	Tony Bosworth	Bradford MBC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
221	Tom Franklin	LB Camden	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
222	Roger Geffen	LB Southwark	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
223	Justin Nailard	Wycombe DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
224	Rajdeep Kaur	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
225	Chris Gillham	Winchester City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
226	Mark Drukker	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
227	John MacKenzie	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
228	Amanda Leon	Bath & NE Somerset	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
231	Chris Jarvis	LB Lambeth	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
248	Christina Viola	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
253	Margaret Cocks	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
254	Jenny Nicholson	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
257	Zoe Qureshi	LB Havering	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
258	Sarah Clayton	Epsom & Ewell BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
259	Helen Hansen-Hjul	Surrey Heath BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
261	Steve Brassington	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
263	Sarah Docherty	Bracknell Forest Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
264	Mr Jones	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
265	Tim Henderson	LB Hounslow	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
266	Mr Giles Chester	Spelthorne BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
268	Belinda Raven	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
269	Ted Plenty	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
270	Sheila Cooksey	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
271	Jackie Oversby	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
272	Dan Williams	Bracknell Forest Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
273	Alison Crampin	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
278	Sarah Daly	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
281	Gillian Smith	Warwick DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
284	Diane Blagg	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
285	Denis Walker	Southend on Sea BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
286	Samantha McCann	RBWM	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
287	Nicola Packham	Mid Suffolk DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
288	Peggy Fincham	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
290	Nick Anderson	Wealden DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
299	Matthew Ball	South Buckinghamshire DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
309	Jon Mullett	Southend on Sea BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
311	Anne Booth	Wokingham BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
314	Lisa Austen	Bracknell Forest Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
315	Neil Talbot	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
316	Paul Maxey	Northampton BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
317	Jennifer Collins	Bristol City	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
318	Peter Edward	LB Richmond upon Thames	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	

RR no.	Name	Local authority	Interest	Category	Temporary/ Permanent	Plot(s)	Compulsory Acquisition?	Applicant's comments/ExA's amendments
320	Miriam Stenning	South Hams DC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
321	David Newland	Cardiff Council	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
322	G S Sandhu	LB Hillingdon	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
324	Ulrike von Strombeck	Reading BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
326	Jeannine Cooper	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
327	Keith Ronald James	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	
328	J A Harris	Slough BC	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Cat 3</i>	n/a	n/a	No	