J A HARRIS

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

HIGHWAYS ENGLAND'S RESPONSE

M4 JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12 "WIDENING" OF THE M4 - INCLUDING SMART MOTORWAY

1. ATTENDANCE OP SITE INSPECTORATE (DEADLINE 02.10.15)

1.1 1 feel that it will be necessary for you to make provision for a small number of Myrke residents to be in attendance to raise individual concerns. The Myrke is a small community with a high proportion of elderly residents who reel that their living environment is under considerable threat from this scheme! I should be glad if you would advise me of the date of the Myrke inspection.

Highways England Comment

1.1.1 The dates of the site inspection visits were posted on the PINS website on Friday 23rd October 2105. The date for inspection of the Myrke is Thursday 12th November.

2. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS (DEADLINE 08.10.15)

2.1 The main points that I considered required special consideration at The Myrke were represented to you in the accompanying sheet to the Registration Form returned to Planning Inspectorate on 25.06.15. A further copy of this note (amended to cover the neglected area of compensation) is attached - all aspects remain currently relevant.

Highways England Comment

2.1.1 A response to the relevant representation referred to was provided at Deadline I. All issues raised are addressed again below with updated text where relevant.

2.2 I do not support the application because the sheer scale or infrastructure and local environmental consequences (including the envisaged considerable displacement of M4 traffic onto local roads) implicit in the HA Scheme should be avoided in any way possible. A simpler. speedier and more economic solution should be looked for to avoid the enormous financial cost, social distress, and risk of dislocation of main services - which would be

caused by the huge and long-time-scale task of dismantling and then re.-building bridges in the midst of long established housing communities and local activities.

Highways England Comment

2.2.1 In relation to the representation made above regarding infrastructure. Paragraph 4.1.1 of the Engineering and Design Report ("EDR") (Application Document reference Number 7-3) explains why the smart motorway scheme, and the resulting infrastructure, is required in order to manage traffic flow on the M4. It says *"At peak times, traffic flows in many links are close to or exceed the total flow that the link is capable of handling, i.e. its capacity. Therefore, the motorway suffers from heavy congestion, which leads to unpredictable journey times."* Over recent years several forms of technology have been introduced on the M4 between junctions 3 and 12 to help manage traffic on this congested section. This includes Ramp Metering, CCTV, MIDAS and message signs. However, even with these measures in place, the forecast traffic flow during peak periods in substantial areas of the Scheme will approach or exceed the available capacity without the M4 J3-12 Smart Motorways Scheme ("Scheme") (see Table 2, Paragraph 4.3.3 of the EDR). Therefore, Highways England considers that the Scheme is required to deliver capacity improvements.

2.2.2 A smart motorway scheme became the preferred solution because it provides cost effective congestion relief with the minimal amount of infrastructure and environmental impact. The Scheme aims to make maximum re-use of the existing infrastructure in order to provide the additional capacity needed to manage forecasted traffic flows by permanently converting the hard shoulder of the M4 to a running lane supplemented by the use of new technology to manage traffic flow. Alternative options which would not require replacing existing bridges with new structures have been considered but Highways England considers that these would not provide a suitable alternative solution because they would not provide the additional capacity created by converting the hard shoulder into a permanent fourth lane. The alternative options considered would also take a longer period of time to construct and would also result in higher costs. Highways England considers that the Scheme is the most effective solution in terms of costs, disruption and environmental effects.

2.2.3 Regarding the financial cost of the scheme, the Scheme will provide value for money and will not result in 'enormous' costs compared to other alternative options as suggested in the comment. With regards to finding a more economical solution, the assessment for the Scheme covers travel-related benefits (principally travel time and reliability), safety, regeneration, and a range of environmental impacts (air quality, noise, greenhouse gases, land and townscape, heritage, biodiversity and water), physical activity and journey quality. Where possible, these effects are monetised, otherwise they are considered qualitatively. These potential benefits are compared against the costs of the Scheme (capital, construction impacts and operating), together with the change in indirect tax revenues to central government (principally fuel duties). The results of this assessment are brought together in an Appraisal Summary Table (AST), a copy of which is provided in Appendix B of the Socio-Economic Report for the Scheme (Application Document Reference 7.2). A Value for Money (VfM) assessment was also undertaken. The metric used to define the VfM for the Scheme (or any other investment) is the ratio of the total net benefits divided by the total net costs, called the Benefit Cost Ratio or BCR. Taking account of all the costs and benefits, the Scheme has been assessed as having a BCR of 2.2, which affords the Scheme a rating of high value for money.

2.2.4 The approach of Highways England is to minimise disruption caused by the construction of the Scheme. Details of the outline construction programme sequence are detailed in section 8.3 of the EDR (Application Document Reference 7.3). The construction of the scheme is not expected to result in any significant degree of social stress or dislocation of main services. The impact on local communities will be kept to a minimum as many of the structures will be built off-line. The construction of the offline new bridge at Datchet Road will minimise traffic disruption during construction for local residents. Table 23 of the EDR provides an indicative programme for the overbridge at Datchet Road from July 2018 to July 2020. Highways England is working closely with local residents and stakeholders to ensure that any concerns regarding social stress and impact on local services are considered appropriately. Highways England will manage the impact on local residents through the use of good communications. Table 3.1 of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Appendix 4.2A of the Environmental Statement ("ES") (Application Document Reference 6-3)) outlines the responsibilities of the Public Liaison Officer, who will work with

local communities and residents to keep them informed on activities that may inconvenience them and to feedback any concerns they have to the contractor. This will provide residents with the opportunity to highlight any issues relating to their properties that have arisen from the construction works.

2.2.5 With regard to the impact on the local environment, the impact on air quality and noise has been assessed and it was concluded that the impact will not be significant. The short term changes in noise levels resulting from the operation of the Scheme are provided in Sheet 12 of Drawing 12.4. There are negligible / minor noise reductions in the Myrke area with the Scheme in operation.

2.2.6 Regarding the representation referring to the envisaged considerable displacement of M4 traffic onto local roads, the impacts of the Scheme on traffic flows both on the M4 and on the local road network has been modelled as part of the Application for the Scheme. The local roads potentially affected by the Scheme were identified and assessed in the ES, paragraph 6.1.13 of Chapter 13, Effects on All Travellers (Application Document Reference 6-1). In particular, Tables 13.4 and 13.5 identify local roads in the vicinity of the M4. The results of the assessment on these roads is set out in Tables 13.27 to 13.29 and summarised in paragraphs 13.8.6 to 13.8.9, which conclude overall that the impact is neutral.

2.2.7 With regard to local roads in the vicinity of the Myrke, there will be no direct impact arising from the scheme. However, there will be some construction traffic using Datchet Road during the reconstruction of Datchet Road overbridge. The effects of the proposed traffic management regime and phasing of the works during the construction of the Scheme on road users is described in paragraphs 8.3.1 to 8.3.6 of the EDR (Application Document Reference 7.3). Assessments undertaken have suggested that in the first phase of the works only during the Friday PM peak in the westbound direction do journey extensions exceed 10 minutes and queues occur and therefore it is not expected that there would be a considerable displacement of traffic on to the local roads. .

2.3 However, on the basis that current proposals are to be progressed I would like to raise the following local concerns, as there are many issues where there is a real lack of clarity regarding the impact on people and their homes:

Highways England Comment

2.3.1 Highways England have developed an outline design and conducted a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the Scheme. Highways England considers that the information provided in the ES (which was accompanied by the Non-Technical Summary) detailed the impacts of the Scheme in a clear manner. Further, Highways England have responded to each of your specific points below.

LAND TAKE FOR OPERATIONAL PURPOSES

2.4 I am registering as an interested party because on 25.4.2014 I was advised that I needed to Register my land interest i.e. a small house and garden, which is approximately 100 yards'- from Datchet Road overbridge. This instruction, complete with questionnaire, came completely by surprise and out of the blue from 'Mouchell', as there had been no prior advice or consultation by Highways Agency. Requests to HA for information on the envisaged land take for operational use at the rear of homes at The Myrke have been fruitless. I must therefore ask if you will obtain clarification as there is a distinct and long overdue need for clarity - we need to know:

(a) The land area involved - sketch map-please;

(b) The nature of operations;

(c) For how long

(d) Compensation arrangements

Highways England Comment

2.4.1 As part of the Land Referencing exercise, the Respondent was sent a Land Interest Questionnaire in April 2014 in order to request land information to inform the development of the Scheme design. Following the receipt of this Land Interest Questionnaire, the Respondent raised a concern that no prior consultation material had been received and requested details on how the Respondent's property would be affected.

2.4.2 Highways England can confirm that the Respondent's land is not required for the Scheme. This was communicated to the Respondent on 13 May 2014 in a letter that stated "The M4 Junctions 3 to12 Smart Motorway Scheme does not require the demolition of any properties. Also, we do not require any land from the residential properties in The Myrke as our proposal is to build a new bridge away from The Myrke, to the East of the existing bridge."

2.4.3 As noted in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference 5-1) at paragraph 5.8, once it been identified that the residents of The Myrke were omitted from receiving letters with an invitation to attend the public information exhibitions in March 2014 prior to the issue of the Land Interest Questionnaire, Highways England undertook a further, targeted information exercise with the local residents of The Myrke in July 2014. The Respondent was invited to this targeted information exercise, and was further included in statutory consultation under section 47 in November 2014. The Respondent provided a response to this consultation in December 2014. Highways England responded to consultation responses in the Consultation Report, and the Respondent was advised of this in a letter dated 6 May 2015. The Respondent raised a Relevant Representation (no. 328), to which Highways England responded in their Comments on Relevant Representations submitted for Deadline I on 2 October 2015.

2.4.4 Details of the land required temporarily and permanently for the Scheme at Datchet Road are shown on the Land Plans (Application Document Reference 2-2), with sheet 23 being the relevant sheet for the area of Datchet Road. As stated, no land within the ownership of the Respondent is required by the Scheme. The Land Plan can be used to inform the land area involved in place of the "sketch map" requested. Details of why acquisition of land at Datchet Road and the nature of operations is required was provided in the Statement of Reasons submitted with the application (Application Document Reference 4-1) and the owners of the land (and those with interests) are detailed in the Book of Reference (Application Document Reference 4-3). The EDR (Application Document Reference 7-3) notes the construction works for Datchet Road will take 22 months to complete. This allows five months allowance to divert existing underground services from the old bridge to the new bridge.

2.4.5 As no land within the ownership of the Respondent is required for the Scheme and further to the responses given at 2.2.4-2.2.7 above, Highways England do not

consider that compensation arrangements are required in relation to the Respondent.

3. DATCHET ROAD OVERBRIDGE

3.1 *The Datchet Road embankment and associated vegetation affords considerable - and very necessary - noise and air pollution protection for much of The Myrke, particularly when the prevailing wind is from an easterly direction. It is therefore vital to The Myrke community that tile embankment and associated established vegetation is preserved when the Datchet Road is re-configured, and to this end HA have been requested to provide a sketch illustrating the re-contouring and landscaping arrangements together with the revised footpath changes. We would be grateful for anything you can do to speed the availability of this sketch - which again is long overdue.*

Highways England Comment

3.1.1 Contrary to the suggestion in the representation, Highways England's policy is to retain trees wherever possible. Locating the replacement for Datchet Road bridge to the east of the existing bridge supports the protection of the existing vegetation between the Myrke and the Datchet Road. The earth bank referred to in the representation will also remain in its present location as shown on Annex A2 (Sheet 23), Vegetation Clearance and Annex A1 (Sheet 23) of the EDR (Application Document Reference 7-4). Where the removal of trees is necessary, it is not predicted to result in a material change in the air quality and noise climate in this area,

3.1.2 The landscape and visual impact assessment for the Scheme is provided in Chapter 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6.1), along with Appendices 8.1 to 8.4 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3) and Figures 8.1 to 8.4 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-2).

3.1.3 The landscape mitigation strategy for the Scheme comprises the provision of planting to replace the existing vegetation lost during construction. The vegetation clearance and mitigation proposals at Datchet Road Overbridge are provided in the EDR, Annex A2, Vegetation Clearance Sheet 23 and Annex A1, Environmental Masterplan Sheet 23. Whilst vegetation clearance will be required on the east embankment of Datchet Road overbridge, vegetation will be retained at the western embankment, except for the area required to widen the carriageway

of the M4 to provide the width required for four lane all lane running, and replacement planting is proposed where vegetation has been cleared. As set out in Appendix 8.3 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3), the visual effects on properties at the Myrke during, and immediately following, construction are assessed to be slight adverse, reducing to neutral by Design Year (15 years after construction) due to establishment of planting.

3.1.4 The existing footpath and embankment will be retained in its current position as detailed on sheet 10 of Drawing 4.2 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-2) a copy of which is attached. The existing Datchet Road and its footways on top of the embankment will be broken out and a new link will be provided from the new Datchet Road embankment to the existing public right of way. Highways England recognises that there is an error on Sheet 23 which indicates vegetation clearance across the area which is presently occupied by the existing Datchet Road on the approach to the overbridge. The detailed design will be developed in consultation with Slough Borough Council and new woodland planting across the area which is presently occupied by the existing Datchet Road and its footways will be provided following construction (see Annex A1 (Sheet 23) Environmental Masterplan of the EDR (Application Document Reference 7-4)).

4. CONSTRUCTION COMPOUND

4.1 There is a need to seriously consider placement of this compound further away from housing and provide effective Screening against noise and dust.

Highways England Comment

4.1.1 Construction compound 8, is located in a triangle of land on the opposite side of the B376 Datchet Road to the homes on The Myrke. The boundary of the land for the Construction Compound 8, at its closest point, is approximately 50m to houses and 35m to residential gardens. At this location, a substantial screen of trees and shrubs exists between the west-side of the B376 and the properties of The Myrke. The construction of the new bridge and the compound should not require these trees and shrubs to be removed at this location, as shown in the EDR (Application Document Reference 7.3), Annex A1, Environmental Masterplan Sheet 23.

4.1.2 This construction compound is required to support the demolition and construction of Datchet Road, Recreation Road and Riding Court Road bridges. Datchet Road and Recreation Road bridges are immediately adjacent to the north east and south east boundaries of Construction Compound 8. The immediate proximity of the proposed compound to the structures is essential for the construction of these bridges.

4.1.3 Between the east-side of the B376 and the compound there are also trees and shrubs. Where necessary for the construction of the new Datchet Road Bridge and new road alignment, site clearance will be carried out, as outlined in the Vegetation Clearance drawings in Annex A2 to the EDR (Application Document Reference 7.3). Where possible (subject to detailed survey) existing trees and vegetation on the boundary will be retained and protection fencing will be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.3.2. e) of the Outline CEMP, Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3) to avoid accidental damage during the operation of the area as a compound.

4.1.4 Proposals for minimising any adverse effect from dust, noise and vibration during the works are explained below in line with the requirements in Section 6 of the Outline CEMP (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)) which details the management of air quality, whilst Section 12 of the Outline CEMP details the management of noise and vibration.

4.1.5 The contractor will employ best practicable means to minimise noise and vibration levels during the works. There will be close liaison between the contractor and Local Authority Environmental Health Officers, affected residents and commercial operations, to ensure that noise and vibration during construction is effectively managed. The contractor will enter into Section 61 Agreements (under the Control of Pollution Act 1974) with relevant Local Authorities.

4.1.6 The construction noise and vibration assessment in Chapter 12 of the ES (paragraphs 12.4.32 to 12.4.87) (Application Document 6.1) and Appendix 12.3 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3) is based on an indicative likely construction schedule and plant roster, and identifies reasonable worst-case noise and vibration effects along the Scheme corridor. For the Myrke area, the assessment concludes that construction noise and vibration effects would generally be slight adverse for daytime, evening and night-time works. Where

more significant effects are identified for particular activities, it is noted that these activities would be dynamic in nature, as the works move along the Scheme, and that these higher noise levels would prevail for only a short period of time, resulting in a slight adverse effect overall.

4.1.7 The procedures for managing noise and vibration during construction, including a protocol for compliance monitoring, will be documented in the CEMP (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)) and secured under Requirement 8, Schedule 2 of the DCO. An Outline CEMP was submitted in the supported of the Application and this will be finalised by the contractor, and agreed with relevant Local Authorities, prior to commencement of construction works.

4.1.8 An assessment of construction dust has also been undertaken for the Scheme and is presented in Chapter 6 of the ES (Application Document 6.1), specifically in paragraphs 6.10.6 and 6.5.8 to 6.5.16 for the area between junctions 5 and 6. A wide range of air quality mitigation measures for the construction phase, including both demolition and construction, have been identified, as described in Appendix 6.1 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-1) and in Chapter 6 of the Outline CEMP (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)). These measures are based on Institute of Air Quality Management ("IAQM") guidance.

4.1.9 The mitigation measures include standard mitigation measures (see Section 6.2 of the Outline CEMP) (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)) and additional mitigation measures (see Section 6.3 of the Outline CEMP) where residential properties are close to construction compounds, as is the case for Construction Compound 8 and bridge works at the Myrke. Section 5.6 of the Outline CEMP also includes measures on site construction layout to control dust, mud and spoil.

4.1.10 Areas of the compound that would be heavily trafficked will be surfaced with tarmacadam to minimise dust. Dust suppression via water spraying will be carried out to un-surfaced areas to minimise airborne dust. The screen of trees and shrubs between the compound and residential properties will assist in the prevention of dust nuisance.

4.1.11 A preliminary assessment of construction compounds is provided in paragraphs 12.4.80 to 12.4.87 (and associated Table 12.15) of the ES (Application Document 6.1). For the Construction Compound 8, a slight adverse effect is predicted, which is not considered to be significant. Measures will be implemented to mitigate the effects of use of Construction Compound 8. These are outlined in sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the CEMP (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)), and include the provision of acoustic enclosures and barriers, minimisation of reversing alarm use and the integration of noise control measures into the preparation of all method statements for works

4.1.12 Once the contractor has developed the detailed construction programme and associated plant schedule, the noise and vibration effects will be revisited in detail, including those from operation of the construction compounds. This will include an assessment of necessary night-time working and the associated noise and vibration effects.

4.2 NB Northern Myrke residents could be adversely affected by noise and [air borne contaminants] during operations due to their close proximity.

Highways England Comment

4.2.1 A construction noise and vibration assessment was provided in chapter 12 of the ES (paragraphs 12.4.32 to 12.4.87 and Appendix 12.3) (Application Document Reference 6.1 and 6.3) which was submitted with the Application for a Development Consent Order ("DCO"). For the Myrke area the assessment concluded that construction noise and vibration effects were generally slight adverse for daytime, evening and night-time works (paragraph 12.10.13 of Chapter 12 of the ES (Application Document reference 6-1)). Where more significant effects were identified for particular activities, it was noted that these activities were dynamic in nature and that these higher noise levels would prevail for only a short period of time, resulting in a slight adverse effect overall.

4.2.2 As noted above in 4.1.11 a preliminary assessment of the noise impact of the construction compounds is provided in paragraphs 12.4.80 to 12.4.87 (and associated Table 12.15) in the ES (Application Document Reference 6.1). For

Construction Compound 8, a slight adverse effect is predicted. This is assessed as not significant.

4.2.3 An assessment of construction dust has also been undertaken for the Scheme and is presented in Chapter 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6.1), specifically in paragraphs 6.10.6 and 6.5.8 to 6.5.16 for the area between junction 5 and junction 6. A wide range of air quality mitigation measures for the construction phase, including both demolition and construction of the road bridges, have been identified, as described in Appendix 6.1 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-1) and in Chapter 6 of the Outline CEMP (Appendix 4-2A of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)). These measures are based on Institute of Air Quality Management ("IAQM") guidance. The mitigation measures include standard mitigation measures (Section 6.2 of the Outline CEMP) and additional mitigation measures (Section 6.3 of the Outline CEMP) where residential properties are close to construction compounds, as is the case for Construction Compound 8 and bridge works at the Myrke. Section 5.6 of the Outline CEMP also includes measures on site construction layout to control dust, mud and spoil. Highways England considers that the mitigation measures to be implemented in relation to air quality will mean that the Northern Myrke residents will not be adversely affected by air borne contaminants.

5. MOTORWAY NOISE

5.1 The noise protection barriers proposed for the northern end of The Myrke extremity are welcomed but it is strongly felt that Acoustic Noise Barrier protection needs to be applied throughout the whole of the Motorways curvature around The Myrke.

Highways England Comment

5.1.1 The Scheme is not expected to result in an increase in noise with the mitigation as currently proposed. The forecast impacts of the mitigated Scheme are mostly beneficial.

5.1.2 The locations and extents of existing noise barriers and the new noise barriers proposed as part of the Scheme are provided in Drawing 12.2 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-2). This includes a 2.4 metre high noise barrier which is proposed to the westbound carriageway of the Scheme to provide noise mitigation to the Myrke, as shown in Sheet 12 of Drawing 12.2 of the ES.

5.1.3 The short term changes in noise levels resulting from the operation of the Scheme are provided in Sheet 12 of Drawing 12.4 of the ES. There are negligible / minor noise reductions in the Myrke area with the Scheme in operation.

5.1.4 The long term changes in noise levels resulting from the operation of the Scheme are provided in Sheet 12 of Drawing 12.5 of the ES. There are negligible / minor noise reductions in the Myrke area with the Scheme in operation.

5.1.5 Given the estimated reductions in noise levels to the Myrke, it is considered that further mitigation over and above the 2.4m barrier proposed, as described above, is not required to mitigate the effects of the Scheme.

5.2 Quiet surface treatments as proposed soften noise for a limited period only until wear and tear takes place, and there is unquestionable need for more barrier noise protection. This needs to be seriously considered, especially in view of the additional traffic which will be generated by the M4 widening implicit in this scheme.

Highways England Comment

5.2.1 The DCO Application is for a smart, 4-lane motorway rather than conventional widening which would have had far greater land take and environmental impact. However, it is correct that all road surface types degrade over time, with consequent increases in tyre/road noise.

5.2.2 Research has indicated that, when new, low noise surfaces provided on average between 4 and 6 decibels (A-weighted) ("dB(A)") benefit over tested hot road asphalt ("HRA") surfaces. In spite of the better acoustic durability of the HRA surfaces, low noise surfaces still outperformed the HRA surfaces by 1 to 3 dB(A) after 10 years. The -3.5 decibels ("dB") correction for a low noise surface, as prescribed in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges ("DMRB"), is a reasonable average over the life of the surface for calculation and assessment purposes.

5.2.3 Low noise surfacing, like any surfacing, is replaced periodically with the life expectancy determined by the specific constituents, quality of construction and amount of traffic and environmental conditions. The typical life expectancy is between 10 and 15 years (ref paragraph 6.20 of HD37/99 amendment 1). The pavement is regularly monitored following installation using a variety of tests and its replacement scheduled once its performance is no longer satisfactory.

5.2.4 It is assumed in the noise assessment for the Scheme that, if the Scheme did not go ahead, the M4 motorway between Junction 3 and Junction 12 would be provided with a low noise surface at some time after 2022 and before 2037 (2022 and 2037 being the assessment years for the noise assessment).

5.2.5 There is the potential to improve further the noise climate within the Scheme corridor through enhanced mitigation, as noted in paragraph 12.4.112 of the ES.

5.2.6 A quantitative assessment of this enhanced mitigation strategy is currently being carried out (the Myrke / Datchet area forms part of this enhanced mitigation strategy). The quantitative assessment is based on a detailed cost / benefit analysis, the outcome of which will determine whether additional barriers (or replacement barriers) are provided to specific areas along the Scheme. The results of that assessment, and the results of the assessment of the landscape and visual impact of any additional noise barriers proposed, will be provided to the Examination in due course.

6. LAND TAKE, CONSTRUCTION, ROAD POLLUTION & NOISE

6.1 Compensation arrangements to finance household insulation, double glazing, and ultimately house purchase & disturbance allowance need to be clearly and separately communicated to those whose properties are said to be affected by the works of this "widening"' scheme and resultant added traffic levels.

Highways England Comment

6.1.1 As noted above in 5.2.1 the Scheme is not a traditional road widening scheme. The Scheme proposes the permanent conversion of the hard shoulder to a running lane and other associated works. Further, the daily traffic levels as a result of the Scheme are only anticipated to increase between junctions 5 and 6 by 13% in the opening year 2022 and 17% by 2037.

6.1.2 In relation to traffic noise, the noise and vibration assessment, as reported in Chapter 12 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6.1), concluded that the magnitude of impact for the Scheme is minor beneficial in the short term and negligible in the long term. It also concluded that the significance of effect during the operation of the Scheme is slight beneficial in the short term and neutral in the long term, with the vast majority of the Scheme corridor experiencing negligible

or minor reductions in noise levels with the Scheme in operation (see paragraph 12.4.110 of the ES). On this basis no properties would qualify for noise insulation due to the operation of the Scheme.

6.1.3 As confirmed in the above response to paragraph 2.1, compensation arrangements for land take will not be required in relation to the Respondent's property, as it is not subject to compulsory acquisition as part of the Scheme.

6.1.4 Highways England does not anticipate that compensation will be payable under the Compensation Code in relation to the impacts from the Scheme as no properties are anticipated to be injuriously affected, blighted or subject to depreciation in value as a result of the Scheme, given the conclusions of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Scheme, as set out below.

6.1.5 During the construction of the Scheme the Highways England contractor will be required to maintain three narrow lanes during peak periods to minimise traffic diversions and to minimise use of the local road network. The effects of the proposed traffic management regime and phasing of the works during the construction of the Scheme on road users is described in paragraphs 8.3.1 to 8.3.6 of the EDR (Application Document Reference 7-3). Therefore, Highways England considers that there will not be significant disturbance to local residents and as such compensation arrangements for disturbance allowance will not be required.

6.1.6 Access routes for construction traffic will predominantly be via the M4 motorway and main roads on the local road network unless it is necessary for other local roads to be used. Where the local road network is to be utilised, for example to access proposed construction compounds and for bridge construction sites, this will be kept to a minimum and access routes will be defined in each local authority area. Details of the traffic management proposals and construction traffic routing for the Scheme will be provided in the Construction Traffic Management Plan ("CTMP"), an outline version of which was provided with the Application in Annex E of CEMP. The final CTMP will be developed in consultation with local authorities to ensure impact to the local network is minimised. This is secured by Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 of the Development Consent Order ("DCO") (Application Document Reference 3-1). Therefore, Highways England considers that there will not be significant disturbance to local

residents and as such compensation arrangements for disturbance allowance will not be required.

6.1.7 In relation to noise and vibration from construction, the construction noise and vibration assessment, as reported in Chapter 12 of the ES ((paragraphs 12.4.32 to 12.4.87) (Application Document Reference 6-1) and Appendix 12.3 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3)), assessed that for the Myrke area construction noise and vibration effects will generally be slight adverse for daytime, evening and night-time works. In addition, procedures for managing noise and vibration during construction, including a protocol for compliance monitoring, will be documented in the CEMP and secured under Requirement 8, Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order ("DCO") (Application Document Reference 3-1). An outline CEMP was submitted in the supported of the DCO Application (Appendix 4.2A of the ES) (Application Document Reference 6-3) and this will be finalised by the contractor, and agreed with relevant Local Authorities, prior to commencement of construction works.

6.1.8 In relation to vegetation clearance and visual impact, the landscape and visual impact assessment for the Scheme (provided in Chapter 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-1), along with Appendices 8.1 to 8.4 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-3) and Drawings 8.1 to 8.4 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-2)) concluded that the residual visual effects of the Scheme would initially at worst be moderate adverse, reducing over time to slight adverse by Design Year 2037 (fifteen years after opening) as the landscape planting becomes more established.

6.1.9 With regards to air quality, the Scheme is assessed to result in no significant increase on air quality during operation, as summarised in Table 6.23 of the ES (Application Document Reference 6-1). The Air Quality assessment for the Scheme is provided in Chapter 6 of the ES and took into account increases in traffic along the motorway network, such as the Scheme route and local roads. Construction impacts could adversely affect air quality through elevated dust concentrations, and therefore proposals to control dust generation are set out in the outline CEMP and secured under Requirement 8, Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order ("DCO") (Application Document Reference 3-1). The mitigation measures included in the CEMP, which will be implemented by

the contractor,, will minimise adverse dust impacts to a level where they are not anticipated to be significant.