

Hearing Day 2; Issue Specific Hearing; Road Safety

ExA Question	Written response (provided at Hearing)	Additional comments/information as requested by ExA
A. PRELIMINARY MATTERS		
<p>1. In answer to our first round of questions REP2-002 TS6.4, the applicant provides a table to compare the risk of different operating systems. The actual performance of the M42 Active Traffic Management (ATM) pilot is indicated as having the lowest level of risk at 40% of the baseline 1. The predicted risk for the M4 All Lane Running (ALR) scheme is 82%. Can the applicant explain why the higher level of risk is acceptable for the M4 scheme?</p>	<p>LBH - no comment</p>	
<p>2. In the event that there is evidence that an alternative proposal for the M4 Smart Motorway would offer a</p>	<p>LBH- no comment</p>	

greater level of safety, can the applicant explain what led to the selection of the proposed scheme?		
3. Would the level of risk be reduced if the national speed limit was not in force in off peak times with ALR? What experience is there of all lane running with the national speed limit?	LBH- no comment	
4. When can the applicant produce the traffic safety monitoring data for the M25 J23-27 ALR scheme and compare its performance to the traffic safety performance before ALR was introduced?	<p>HE advised that the traffic safety monitoring data for the M25 will not be available to present to the ExA until January 2016.</p> <p>LB Hillingdon have asked the applicants to review the initial documentation submitted with the M25 project to understand what the expected improvements to road safety had been predicted to be. These should then be compared to the actual findings following the first year of operation on the project. This would provide some comfort of whether the predictions provided are realistic and achievable.</p> <p>The ExA also suggested that in the event that the risk reduction which was predicted, is not achieved, a further DCO requirement should be included in the draft DCO to look at mechanisms to ensure this is rectified after annual reviews. The Council support this proposal to ensure adequate road safety following implementation of the scheme.</p>	
5. What is the applicant's	LBH- no comment	

<p>view of the RAC’s experience of the all lane running and dynamic hard shoulder configurations, reported in its written representation at Deadline II REP2-029 – in particular, the alleged proven safety record of the dynamic hard shoulder configuration versus the alleged unproven safety record of the all lane running configuration?</p>		
<p>6. When the scheme is operational, would the applicant explain why it is considered that the frequency of breakdowns in live lanes would be substantially less than the existing frequency of breakdowns on the hard shoulder? REP1-003, response no. 20</p>	<p>LBH queried why the applicants definition of 'breakdowns' currently included illegal stoppages on the hard shoulder. This was specifically raised because an illegal stoppage on the hard shoulder does not in itself lead to congestion and tailbacks on the road network which result from an accident or vehicular failure.</p> <p>The applicants current statement claims that ALR would generate substantially less breakdowns in live lanes than the current arrangement. Based on the applicants definition of 'breakdowns', it is not considered to be a like for like comparison and therefore the applicants assumption that the scheme will generate 'significantly less' breakdowns is not considered to be accurate.</p> <p>LBH requested that the current data on breakdowns was reviewed to remove illegal stoppages and should only relate to actual vehicle failures and accidents in order to provide a adequate comparison of the existing and proposed situation.</p>	

<p>7. In the event of live lane stoppages as a result of a breakdown, can the applicant explain how quickly a response would be given to put control measures in place to prevent a collision, in both peak and off peak times?</p>	<p>LBH queried what percentage of the motorway is currently covered by CCTV at present to understand how the proposed level of coverage could be an improvement to the scheme.</p> <p>The applicants were unaware at the hearing of the existing level of CCTV coverage, but did advise that it is restricted to main motorway junctions.</p> <p>The applicant explained that the proposed CCTV will not be monitored at all times and is not therefore being installed as a precautionary tool. Motorists will still be required to call emergency services to report an incident which will allow the CCTV to more quickly locate the breakdown, in a reactionary manner. In peak times when there are more motorists on the road, it is expected by HE that reports of an incident will come through to HE quickly, however at off-peak times, when there are less motorists on the road, it can often take longer for an incident to be reported by a motorist and therefore the response times can be much longer.</p> <p>LBH queried whether other options, such as motion detection on the roads could be employed on the road, which would indicate when a lane/lanes had not been in use for a length of time to indicate that there may be a problem on the road. HE advised that no such system exists at present.</p>	
<p>8. What are the road safety implications, of the emergency refuge areas being spaced at an average of 1.85 km intervals, compared with closer spacing intervals, especially if the spacing was such that</p>	<p>LBH- no comment</p>	

<p>at least one emergency refuge area was always visible to road users?</p>		
<p>9. Do interested parties wish to highlight any other aspects of road safety, not already covered above?</p>	<p>LBH queried whether there was adequate distance in the ERAs to allow for a vehicle to accelerate back onto the motorway without causing disruption to the existing traffic flows. This is principally because the current hard shoulder allows a significant distance for motorists to pick up speed and not impede the existing flow on the motorway.</p>	