

From: janaheard [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 February 2016 20:26
To: M4 Junction 3-12 Smart Motorway
Subject: Advice on behalf of the Mid & West Berks Local Access Forum

Further comments from the M&WBLAF

On Weds 10th Feb I appeared at the Hearing to represent the M&WBLAF. A reference was given to me by Highways England where it was said I would find responses to my previous submissions, but this reference did not relate to anything that could be found by Kate Mignano of the Inspectorate, who I telephoned for help. Ms Mignano was very helpful and eventually found HE's responses in a huge zip file, which my Personal Computer failed to open, so I therefore did not have access to these comments ahead of the Hearing, and there is no way that I could have been aware of them.

The 23rd Feb is the next meeting of the Forum, and there maybe further comments to forward after this meeting, now that I have been able to see the response.

Had I been in a position to present my comments to the Inspector last weds the following paragraph is what I had intended to say;

At a previous Hearing for proposed work on a section of the M4 to the west of this site, advice initially rejected by the Inspector as irrelevant to that Hearing was actually instigated when it transpired that a bridge thought at the planning stage not to require replacement was actually in need of change. An up-grade from footpath to bridleway was implemented allowing local riders and cyclists access to nearby areas previously denied them by the existence of the motorway. Should a similar situation arise during construction of the Smartmotorway, we ask that LAF advice will be actioned where possible to include consideration of upgrading bridges plus additional screening of byways **should unforeseen changes to the plans be required.**