



















## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 15:13  
**To:** Clare Lawrence; Jacqui DuGard; Andrew Chugg; John Kaiser(private)  
**Subject:** FW: M4 Submissions

Clare

Here is another submission made to the Planning Inspectorate.

Best wishes

Norman Jorgensen

**From:** Tim Holton \_\_\_\_\_  
**Sent:** 19 November 2015 17:40  
**To:** 'M4Junction3to12@pins.gsi.gov.uk' <M4Junction3to12@pins.gsi.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** 'Norman Jorgensen' \_\_\_\_\_  
**Subject:** M4 Submissions

Talking with my fellow Wokingham Borough Councillor Norman Jorgensen I have been informed you are requesting additional information as to areas which suffer from the excessive noise that the M4 currently produces. So as a further submission I would like to mention

Cutbush Lane  
Red house Close  
Manea Close  
Wimblington Drive  
Bottisham Close  
Wild Close  
Harlton Close  
Gregory  
Bassett Close  
Whitcham

Paddick Drive  
Chesterment Way  
Swanmore Close  
Edenham Close

I personally live on Toseland Way which has numerous roads between us and the M4. During the summer it can be a tough call between the continual drone of the cars on the motorway and the heat if the window remains closed.

Regards

Tim Holton  
23 Toseland Way  
Lower Earley  
RG6 7YA

**Representation No. 153**  
**Cllr Gary Cowan**  
**1 Barker Close Arborfield RG2 9NQ**

**Dated 26th November 2015**

My initial comments remain but I would like to add some additional points which I would like the Inspector to consider. They are as follows. The M4 Motorway was constructed a very long time ago and it would not meet the modern criteria for motorway construction if applied today.

The environmental impact on residents is a key consideration and need to be considered along with my previous comments which state that the additional traffic generated noise and increased air pollution levels need to be addressed initially with a low noise surface, air quality monitoring and ideally a low emission zone so keeping vehicles that lead to increased pollution are not permitted on the motorway.

Noise can be affected by wind direction, funnel effect, rebounding and echo and for this reason barriers must extend along both sides of the motorway to minimise this as if not the noise depending on environmental conditions that would protect some residents will be doing so at the expense of others.

In addition bunds and tree planting along with noise barriers which are very common practices on continental motorways should be considered as well as noise barriers as they have the added advantage of muffling noise and significantly reducing pollution while providing some respite for local wildlife. Where at all possible a combination of all these along with a low noise surface must be the best environmental option available.

I note and support the comments from representations numbers 2, 47 and 56 which raise very similar concerns to me mainly centering on the most important need to protect existing residents from the environmental impacts the Smart Motorway will bring.

To that I would add those of the Mid West Berkshire Local Access Forum (representation number 209) which are very comprehensive and I would ask the inspector to take them into consideration.

For the record my previous comments were "The motorway must use low noise surfaces and have proper noise suppression barriers along both sides of the section in question. Increased traffic will increase noise levels to which all residents must be protected against. In addition air quality monitors must be in place to guard against rises in pollution as a direct result of increased traffic plus consideration given to establishing a low emission zone".

**Councillor Gary Cowan. Wokingham Borough Council Member for Arborfield**

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 12:53  
**To:** Clare Lawrence; Jacqui DuGard; Andrew Chugg; John Kaiser(private)  
**Subject:** FW: M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway - 151106\_TR010019\_NormanJorgensen re North Wokingham

Clare

Here is another additional submission I made to the Examination.

Best wishes

Norman

**From:** Norman  
**Sent:** 24 November 2015 13:43  
**To:** M4 Junction 3-12 Smart Motorway  
**Subject:** M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway - 151106\_TR010019\_NormanJorgensen re North Wokingham

Dear Richard and James

At the Issue Specific Hearing on Environment on 18 November I was asked by the Inspectors to submit details of roads in parts of Wokingham Borough in addition to Earley that would benefit from further noise reduction measures. I have therefore consulted the Borough Councillors for other Wards alongside the motorway including those for the Emmbrook Ward covering the area of North Wokingham just South of the M4 and near the intersection with the A329M. One of the Councillors UllaKarin Clark has provided the following list of properties she believes are the most adversely affected by noise.

Old Forest Road RG41 1JA  
Ashton Road RG41 1HL  
Bredon Road RG41 1HW  
Beckford Close RG41 1HN  
Summerfield Close RG41 1PH  
Toutley Road RG41 1QN  
Lowther Road RG41 1JB  
Commons Road RG41 1JG  
Simons Lane RG41 3HH

My Borough Councillor colleague Tim Holton, also registered as an Interested Party, and representing the Hawkedon Ward of Earley last week submitted a list of streets he feels are most affected and I provided a list of what I believe are the worst affected in Earley.

I believe you are already aware of the houses in Sindlesham near the motorway, however for completeness I will mention these again. This is an area where the plan in the scheme is to upgrade the existing barriers.

I am also expecting two other Borough Councillors who are registered Interested Parties to submit lists of properties in their areas. These are Philip Houldsworth Member for Winnersh and Gary Cowan Member for Arborfield.

Best wishes

Dr Norman Jorgensen  
Member for Hillside Ward, Earley

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 12:51  
**To:** Clare Lawrence; Jacqui DuGard; Andrew Chugg; John Kaiser(private)  
**Subject:** FW: 151106\_TR010019\_Norman Jorgensen

Dear Clare

This is an additional submission I made to the M4 Smart Motorway Planning Inspectorate Examination.

Best wishes

Norman Jorgensen  
WBC Member for Hillside Ward, Earley

**From:** Norman  
**Sent:** 20 November 2015  
**To:** M4 Junction 3-12 Smart Motorway  
**Subject:** RE: 151106\_TR010019\_Norman Jorgensen

Dear James and Richard

I would like to make the following additional submission in relation to the Highways England Application for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway (Case ref TR010019).

"During the Accompanied Site Visit in Earley on Tuesday 10 November and at Open Floor Hearing 1 on Monday 16 November I was asked by the Planning Inspector to provide a list of the properties in Earley that I felt are most badly affected by noise.

There are many properties in Earley affected by noise because of the topography of the area. Earley is a Town of population approximately 30,000 people and approximately 13,000 dwellings. Around a third of the Town is close to and on a slope rising from the motorway hence there are people some way from the motorway that experience high levels of noise if they are not screened by other houses or natural features.

The level of noise is also very dependant on ambient weather conditions. It is worse when the wind is blowing from the motorway across Earley, ie from the South West, the prevailing wind direction, and when the road is wet.

I live more than half a mile from the motorway and have hundreds of houses between there and the motorway and still have to close my door at times to keep out noise from the M4.

The houses closest to the motorway with little or no protection from noise are in the housing estates off Ryhill Way and off Bradmore Way. More specifically I believe the worst affected houses are those at 28-34 Finbeck Way (RG6 4AH) and 30 to 40 Notton Way (RG6 4AJ). Standing in front of these properties there is direct line of sight to the vehicles going by on the motorway.

Other properties in the vicinity are close behind and these include 39-67 Maltby Way, 5-8 Heacham Close, 42-64 Notton Way, 7-12 Tickhill Close, 17 Worrall Way, 23-27 Bradmore Way, 11-25 Rainworth Close, 1-5 Farnsfield Close and properties in Cutbush Close and Redhouse Close.

I will be happy to take the Planning Inspectors and/or Highways England to these locations if that would help.

I welcome the introduction of lower noise surface materials into the scheme but feel more should be done within the scheme to decrease the noise nuisance to residents of Earley and other locations along the proposed scheme. I am encouraged that Highways England is now developing an enhanced noise mitigation strategy and that consideration of noise barriers for the stretch of motorway passing Earley is a priority within that. At the Issue Specific Hearing on the Environment we were told this strategy would be available in three weeks so I look forward to reviewing this. It would be helpful if I can see it prior to Christmas please so I have the opportunity to comment by the January submission deadline."

Best wishes

Norman Jorgensen

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** Andrew Chugg  
**Sent:** 08 December 2015 09:26  
**To:** Andrew Chugg  
**Subject:** FW: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC  
~[OFFICIAL]~

---

**From:** Ullakarin Clark(Private)  
**Sent:** 20 November 2015 18:14  
**To:** Clare Lawrence  
**Cc:** Philip Mirfin; Chris Singleton(private); John Kaiser; John Halsall  
**Subject:** Re: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC ~[OFFICIAL]~

Dear Clare,

I am disappointed that no representation has been made in respect of the residents in Emmbrook living along Old Forest Road, Ashton Road, Commons Road and Lowther Road. We have been trying to get a noise barrier in place for the last 20 years. Some years ago, WBC ringfenced money to put a barrier in place only to be told by the Highways Agency that reinforcement of the embankment was needed and could only be done by themselves when they had the money to do so. That was in 2005 and the last we heard from them.

I therefore would like to reinstate our claim for a noise barrier.

Regards,

UllaKarin

Sent from my iPad  
UllaKarin Clark

On 20 Nov 2015, at 14:29, Jacqui DuGard [REDACTED] wrote:

**Message sent on behalf of Clare Lawrence, Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services**

Dear Members

You may be aware that over the past year, the Council has been working on assessing the proposal for the M4 Smart Motorway and actively involved in assessing the impact of this on the Wokingham Borough. Details of this are available on the Council's website under reference CON/20105/1380. Full details of the proposal are available at <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/?ipcsection=overview>

The Council is not the determining body for this proposal as it is a National Infrastructure Project and as such, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) will determine this application. The Council is a consultee only with responsibility to put forward its observations and conclusions following an assessment of the information within the application. The Council's position will be put forward in a

Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) which will set out those technical issues in the application that the Council does and does not agree with.

When the Council received the formal consultation about the application, we wrote to local residents in the vicinity of the relevant section of the M4. Approximately 300 letters were sent in addition to consultation letters to ward members explaining that the Council is not the decision making body and that representations should be sent to PINS direct. Consequently, the Council received only one letter of comment from local residents in respect of the proposal.

Our technical experts in Highways, Environmental Health, Archaeology and Ecology etc. have been consulted and are still assessing the proposal. There are some outstanding matters that need to be resolved in respect of the traffic modelling to determine if this fully factors in the growth in the Wokingham Area. Therefore, at present the Council is not in a position to finalise the SoCG and has been granted an extension of time until 10 December for its submission. However, I can confirm that throughout the process, officers have sought to address all of the technical issues and in many cases, requested further details to enable them to establish the acceptability of the proposal. In respect of noise, officers expressed concern about the potential effect of the scheme on local residents and have requested that Highways England provide additional noise mitigation. Two new sections of noise barrier are now proposed across the M4 at Mill Lane Underbridge and existing noise barriers will be retained, or replaced with equivalent barriers in terms of height and length, but to modern specification for noise reduction.

If you would like to comment on the proposal, please could you let me have your representations by 4<sup>th</sup> December and we will ensure that these are provided to PINS as part of an additional submission to the SoCG to inform its assessment of the application. In the meantime, if you would like any further information please contact either myself or the case officer Andrew Chugg.

Kind Regards

**Clare Lawrence**

**Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services**

*(Development Management, Planning Enforcement and Compliance,  
Trees and Landscape, Building Control, Shared Service (Environmental Health,  
Licensing and Trading Standards)*

Telephone [REDACTED]

#### **DISCLAIMER**

You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator.

If you are not the addressee any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you received this message in error please return it to the originator and confirm that you have deleted all copies of it.

All messages sent by this organisation are checked for viruses using the latest antivirus products. This does not guarantee a virus has not been transmitted. Please therefore ensure that you take your own precautions for the detection and eradication of viruses.



## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** Clare Lawrence  
**Sent:** 24 November 2015 14:06  
**To:** ; Jacqui DuGard; John Kaiser(private) Andrew Chugg  
**Cc:** RE: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham  
**Subject:** BC~ [OFFICIAL]~ ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~

Thanks Norman

We will collate all members comments and provide these to PINS with a Covering letter from John. Therefore, if you would like to forward your comments and any other comments that you receive from members we will make sure that these are submitted with the technical submission.

Kind Regards

**Clare Lawrence**  
**Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services**  
*(Development Management, Planning Enforcement and Compliance,  
Trees and Landscape, Building Control, Shared Service (Environmental Health,  
Licensing and Trading Standards)*

Telephone [REDACTED]

**From:** Norman.Jorgensen  
**Sent:** 24 November 2015 13:28  
**To:** Jacqui DuGard; Clare Lawrence; John Kaiser(private)  
**Subject:** RE: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC~[OFFICIAL]~

Dear Clare

Thanks for your note below explaining where we are in the process.

As I have indicated in other emails I participated in the Hearing held by the Planning Inspectorate on 16, 17 and 18 November. The Planning Inspectorate appears to have taken on board pleas for more noise abatement than the minimum required to be built into the scheme. It remains to be seen what Highways England offer as part of the enhanced noise mitigation strategy they are preparing. We should keep up the pressure for further noise mitigation while the scheme is at this critical stage of development.

There are four Borough Councillors who made submissions to the Enquiry and are registered Interested Parties. These are Tim Holton, Phillip Houldsworth, Gary Cowan and me. We have or will make additional submissions to PINS before the 26 November deadline detailing properties in the Borough that would benefit from additional noise mitigation. It would be useful to gather our submissions and also include them in the WBC input.

Best wishes

Norman Jorgensen

**From:** Jacqui DuGard

**Sent:** 20 November 2015 14:29

**To:** Abdul Loyes; Alison Swaddle; Alistair Auty; Angus Ross; Anthony Pollock; Barrie Patman; Beth Rowland; Bill Soane; Bob Pitts; Bob Wyatt; Charlotte Haitham Taylor; Chris Bowring; Chris Singleton; Chris Smith; David Chopping; David Lee; David Sleight; Dianne King; Gary Cowan; Guy Grandison; Ian Pittock; John Halsall; John Jarvis; John Kaiser; Julian McGhee-Sumner; Kate Haines; Keith Baker; Ken Miall; Laura Blumenthal; Lindsay Ferris; Malcolm Richards; Mark Ashwell; Michael Firmager; Mike Gore; Mike Haines; Nick Ray; Nicky Jerrome; Norman Jorgensen; Parry Batth; Paul Swaddle; Pauline Helliard-Symons; Pauline Jorgensen; Philip Houldsworth; Philip Mirfin; Prue Bray; Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey; Rob Stanton; Shahid Younis; Simon Weeks; Stuart Munro; Tim Holton; Tom McCann; Ullakarin Clark; Wayne Smith

**Cc:** Clare Lawrence

**Subject:** M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC~[OFFICIAL]~

Message sent on behalf of Clare Lawrence, Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services

Dear Members

You may be aware that over the past year, the Council has been working on assessing the proposal for the M4 Smart Motorway and actively involved in assessing the impact of this on the Wokingham Borough. Details of this are available on the Council's website under reference CON/20105/1380. Full details of the proposal are available at <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/?ipcsection=overview>

The Council is not the determining body for this proposal as it is a National Infrastructure Project and as such, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) will determine this application. The Council is a consultee only with responsibility to put forward its observations and conclusions following an assessment of the information within the application. The Council's position will be put forward in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) which will set out those technical issues in the application that the Council does and does not agree with.

When the Council received the formal consultation about the application, we wrote to local residents in the vicinity of the relevant section of the M4. Approximately 300 letters were sent in addition to consultation letters to ward members explaining that the Council is not the decision making body and that representations should be sent to PINS direct. Consequently, the Council received only one letter of comment from local residents in respect of the proposal.

Our technical experts in Highways, Environmental Health, Archaeology and Ecology etc. have been consulted and are still assessing the proposal. There are some outstanding matters that need to be resolved in respect of the traffic modelling to determine if this fully factors in the growth in the Wokingham Area. Therefore, at present the Council is not in a position to finalise the SoCG and has been granted an extension of time until 10 December for its submission. However, I can confirm that throughout the process, officers have sought to address all of the technical issues and in many cases, requested further details to enable them to establish the acceptability of the proposal. In respect of noise, officers expressed concern about the potential effect of the scheme on local residents and have requested that Highways England provide additional noise mitigation. Two new sections of noise barrier are now proposed across the M4 at Mill Lane Underbridge and existing noise barriers will be retained, or replaced with equivalent barriers in terms of height and length, but to modern specification for noise reduction.

If you would like to comment on the proposal, please could you let me have your representations by 4<sup>th</sup> December and we will ensure that these are provided to PINS as part of an additional submission to the SoCG to inform its assessment of the application. In the meantime, if you would like any further information please contact either myself or the case officer Andrew Chugg.

Kind Regards

Clare Lawrence  
Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** Clare Lawrence  
**Sent:** 24 November 2015 13:57  
**To:** Andrew Chugg  
**Subject:** FW: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC  
~[OFFICIAL]~

Kind Regards

**Clare Lawrence**  
**Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services**  
*(Development Management, Planning Enforcement and Compliance,  
Trees and Landscape, Building Control, Shared Service (Environmental Health,  
Licensing and Trading Standards))*

Telephone [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Robert Stanton  
**Sent:** 23 November 2015 20:16  
**To:** Jacqui DuGard  
**Cc:** Clare Lawrence  
**Subject:** RE: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC ~[OFFICIAL]~

Jacqui/Clare

I assume this is about widening the M4 as well as noise barriers which are welcome.

Not welcome at all by me is the ongoing push to close off emergency lanes (hard Shoulder) on any motorway.

I think that is a very dangerous thing to do and while I understand and support additional lanes on the M4 taking it up to 4 I could never support doing that at the expense of closing the emergency lane.

The emergency lane is one of the best features of the UK road system.

Rob Stanton.

**From:** Jacqui DuGard  
**Sent:** 20 November 2015 14:29  
**To:** Abdul Loyes;Alison Swaddle;Alistair Auty;Angus Ross;Anthony Pollock;Barrie Patman;Beth Rowland;Bill Soane;Bob Pitts;Bob Wyatt;Charlotte Haitham Taylor;Chris Bowring;Chris Singleton;Chris Smith;David Chopping;David Lee;David Sleight;Dianne King;Gary Cowan;Guy Grandison;Ian Pittock;John Halsall;John Jarvis;John Kaiser;Julian McGhee-Sumner;Kate Haines;Keith Baker;Ken Miall;Laura Blumenthal;Lindsay Ferris;Malcolm Richards;Mark Ashwell;Michael Firmager;Mike Gore;Mike Haines;Nick Ray;Nicky Jerrome;Norman Jorgensen;Parry Bath;Paul Swaddle;Pauline Helliard-Symons;Pauline Jorgensen;Philip Houldsworth;Phillip Mirfin;Prue Bray;Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey;Rob Stanton;Shahid Younis;Simon Weeks;Stuart Munro;Tim Holton;Tom McCann;Ullakarin

Clark;Wayne Smith

Cc: Clare Lawrence

Subject: M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway - Issue of draft SoCG with Wokingham BC ~[OFFICIAL]~

Message sent on behalf of Clare Lawrence, Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services

Dear Members

You may be aware that over the past year, the Council has been working on assessing the proposal for the M4 Smart Motorway and actively involved in assessing the impact of this on the Wokingham Borough . Details of this are available on the Council's website under reference CON/20105/1380. Full details of the proposal are available at <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/?ipcsection=overview>

The Council is not the determining body for this proposal as it is a National Infrastructure Project and as such, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) will determine this application. The Council is a consultee only with responsibility to put forward its observations and conclusions following an assessment of the information within the application. The Council's position will be put forward in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) which will set out those technical issues in the application that the Council does and does not agree with.

When the Council received the formal consultation about the application, we wrote to local residents in the vicinity of the relevant section of the M4. Approximately 300 letters were sent in addition to consultation letters to ward members explaining that the Council is not the decision making body and that representations should be sent to PINS direct. Consequently, the Council received only one letter of comment from local residents in respect of the proposal.

Our technical experts in Highways, Environmental Health, Archaeology and Ecology etc. have been consulted and are still assessing the proposal. There are some outstanding matters that need to be resolved in respect of the traffic modelling to determine if this fully factors in the growth in the Wokingham Area. Therefore, at present the Council is not in a position to finalise the SoCG and has been granted an extension of time until 10 December for its submission. However, I can confirm that throughout the process, officers have sought to address all of the technical issues and in many cases, requested further details to enable them to establish the acceptability of the proposal. In respect of noise, officers expressed concern about the potential effect of the scheme on local residents and have requested that Highways England provide additional noise mitigation. Two new sections of noise barrier are now proposed across the M4 at Mill Lane Underbridge and existing noise barriers will be retained, or replaced with equivalent barriers in terms of height and length, but to modern specification for noise reduction.

If you would like to comment on the proposal, please could you let me have your representations by 4<sup>th</sup> December and we will ensure that these are provided to PINS as part of an additional submission to the SoCG to inform its assessment of the application. In the meantime, if you would like any further information please contact either myself or the case officer Andrew Chugg.

Kind Regards

**Clare Lawrence**

**Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services**

*(Development Management, Planning Enforcement and Compliance,  
Trees and Landscape, Building Control, Shared Service (Environmental Health,  
Licensing and Trading Standards)*

Telephone 01189 746444

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** Andrew Chugg  
**Sent:** 08 December 2015 09:36  
**To:** Andrew Chugg  
**Subject:** FW: Smart motorway ~[OFFICIAL]~

**From:** Gary Cowan  
**Sent:** 20 November 2015 16:11  
**To:** Andrew Chugg  
**Cc:** John Kaiser(private); Clare Lawrence; Ian Bailey  
**Subject:** Re: Smart motorway ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~

Andrew, re the submission I do have concerns which I have expressed which cover the need for noise barriers on both sides of the motorway especially the Early/Shinfield section. Noise echo if only one side is fitted is a serious problem which may ease the noise for some at the expense of others.

In addition I have requested low noise surfaces plus a requirement for air pollution monitoring also.

My understanding from Norman Jorgensen is the Senior Inspector recognises that the age of the M4 means it is not compliant with modern motorway standards especially those associated with environmental considerations.

Can I request that your submission takes these considerations into account in your submission plus can I see it prior to its submission to PINS etc.

Finally can you confirm that you have directly consulted with the various Parish Councils whose boundaries are along the affected parts of the M4? Cheers Gary

Sent from my iPad

## Andrew Chugg

---

**From:** Andrew Chugg  
**Sent:** 08 December 2015 10:15  
**To:** Andrew Chugg  
**Subject:** FW: M4 Smart Motorway Inquiry ~[OFFICIAL]~

---

**From:** Gary Cowan  
**Sent:** 19 November 2015 18:27  
**To:** Norman Jorgensen  
**Cc:** John Kaiser(private); Keith Baker Andrew Chugg; Clare Lawrence; Matthew Gould; Matt Davey; Ian Bailey; Chris Easton; Heather Thwaites  
**Subject:** Re: M4 Smart Motorway Inquiry ~[OFFICIAL]~

John, Norman is right environmental conditions go beyond a low noise surface. From what Norman says I would interpret that to mean that the Lead Inspector is mindful of wider environmental issues.

We must recognise as the Inspector alluded to is upgraded motorways should comply to standards that would apply in a new motorway being constructed.

We have fought many battles in the past for noise barriers at various parts of the M4 so the opportunity to make a powerful case in front of a public inquiry is too good an opportunity which must not be missed.

This is the opportunity not to be lost to make the case for lots of noise barriers along with the control of emissions etc. should not be missed.

If the case is not made very positively in our residents interests they will suffer. Cheers Gary

Sent from my iPad

On 19 Nov 2015, at 17:21, Norman Jorgensen wrote:

John

When the Lead Planning Inspector told Highways England during the Hearing that she wished them to consider environmental enhancements I believe she was making reference to Clause 5.153 and maybe also 3.3 in the National Policy Statement for National Networks. If I am correct please will we refer to this in our submission.

She also said the M4 was established when standards were different and that modern motorways and schemes had greater environmental features (noise barriers etc) built in. Just a comment but gives a view of her thinking which we can hook onto.

Best wishes

Norman

**From:** John Kaiser  
**Sent:** 19 November 2015 16:55  
**To:** Gary Cowan

**Cc:**

[norman.lorgensen@btinternet.com](mailto:norman.lorgensen@btinternet.com); [keith@bakersat33.co.uk](mailto:keith@bakersat33.co.uk); [Andrew.Chugg@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Chugg@wokingham.gov.uk); [Clare.Lawrence@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.Lawrence@wokingham.gov.uk); [Matthew.Gould@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Gould@wokingham.gov.uk); [Matt.Davey@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Matt.Davey@wokingham.gov.uk); [Ian.Bailey@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Ian.Bailey@wokingham.gov.uk); [Chris.Easton@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.Easton@wokingham.gov.uk); [heather.thwaites@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:heather.thwaites@wokingham.gov.uk)

**Subject:** Re: M4 Smart Motorway Inquiry ~[OFFICIAL]~

Gary

I agree there are many residents effected by the M4 in one way or another and your point about noise bounce as one residents solution is another's problem, is an important consideration

I am assured the road surface will be of the modern low noise variety and our submission will be in on time

I will be writing to all members before the weekend with regards the officers submission

Regards

John Kaiser

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the O2 network.

Tel: (0118) 974 6126 (Direct Line)  
Email: Andrew.chugg@wokingham.gov.uk  
Date: 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016  
Your ref: M4312-AFP299  
Our ref: CON/2015/1380



# WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Environment Service

Development Management Team

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire RG40 1WR

DX: 33506 - Wokingham

FAO Richard Price (National Infrastructure Case Manager)  
Major Applications & Plans  
Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Dear Mr. Price,

## **APPLICATION BY HIGHWAYS ENGLAND FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE PROPOSED M4 (JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12) SMART MOTORWAY.**

Further to my letters of 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015 and 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016, I wish to take the opportunity to submit the following additional comments as an elected member of the Council and on behalf of my constituents.

It has come to my attention that there would be a significant gap in the 3.5m high noise barrier which is proposed within Embrook (EM9). This would fail to provide adequate noise protection measures for the future Hatch Farm development of 400 new homes (as permitted under Outline planning permission O/2006/8687) which would be sited directly north of the M4 at this point. A copy of the latest reserved matters (152359) Site Layout plan is appended for your information.

In terms of traffic issues, and following consultation with the Council's Highways team, the traffic modelling information provided by Highways England is considered insufficient to determine the impact, or not, on the borough's network taking into account future planning housing growth; and particularly those links that feed onto the M4.

Please consider this information in your assessment of the above Development Consent Order.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor John Kaiser

(Executive Member for Planning and Highways)



Ref: 20220428-NMC-113800

The Chief Executive  
Wokingham Borough Council - Highways  
Department  
Civic Offices  
Shute End  
Wokingham  
RG40 1BN

Lynne Stinson  
Programme Manager  
National Highways  
2 Colmore Square  
Birmingham  
B4 6BN

28 April 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: THE M4 MOTORWAY (JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12) (SMART MOTORWAY) DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER 2016 (S.I. 2016/863)**

**SECTION 153 OF THE PLANNING ACT 2008, REGULATION 7 OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (CHANGES TO, AND REVOCATION OF, DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDERS) REGULATIONS 2011 (AS AMENDED)**

**CONSULTATION ON AN APPLICATION TO MAKE A NON-MATERIAL CHANGE TO THE ABOVE DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

We are writing in accordance with Regulation 7 of the 2011 Regulations to consult you on a proposed non-material change to the above Development Consent Order ('DCO').

In September 2016, the Secretary of State for Transport granted the DCO authorising construction of the M4 Smart Motorway Junctions 3 to 12 ("**the Scheme**"). Since the DCO came into force on 23 September 2016, we have been working to ensure the Scheme is delivered effectively and efficiently. As a result of this process, we are now proposing to seek consent from the Secretary of State for non-material changes to the DCO ("**the Application**").

#### **Non-material change**

The Application seeks a non-material change to the DCO that authorised National Highways to undertake the improvement and alteration of 51 kilometres (32 miles) of the M4 Motorway between Junction 3 (Hayes) and Junction 12 (Theale) to upgrade it to a "smart motorway", with the hard shoulder transformed into a permanent additional running lane and traffic flow moderated by the use of variable speed limits. The Scheme includes the replacement of overbridge structures, the extension of underbridge structures, changes to junctions and slip roads, the provision of new gantries and signs, and other infrastructure such as emergency areas.

The amendment seeks to achieve the following:

- a) No-Through Junction Running (No-TJR) is proposed at Junctions 5, 6, 8/9 and 11 where previously Through Junction Running had been proposed;
- b) To facilitate the detailed design of three bridges where the height of these new bridges (Huntercombe Spur, Oldway Lane and Wood Lane) is outside of the limits of deviation provided for by the DCO;
- c) The asymmetric widening of Sipson Road Subway to the north instead of the previously proposed widening to the south, due to site constraints;
- d) To amend the "principles set out in the engineering and design report" to facilitate the detailed design of the Scheme which are not consistent with the principles previously

approved. This will facilitate changes such as to the number of spans, footway locations and extensions to culverts required; and  
e) Changes to acoustic barriers.

The environmental effects associated with the proposed changes have been considered and there are no new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment which arise from the changed Scheme. There is no need for a Habitats Regulation Assessment, nor is additional third-party land required and the proposed amendments will not have a material impact on businesses and residents. This is explained further in the Application materials available at the website set out below.

I enclose a copy of the Notice, a copy of which can also be seen in

London Gazette 28/4/2022

London Metro 28/4/2022 and 05/5/2022

Reading Chronicle 28/4/2022 and 05/5/2022

Maidenhead Advertiser 28/4/2022 and 05/5/2022

Slough & South Bucks Express 29/4/2022 and 06/5/2022

Windsor Express 29/4/2022 and 06/5/2022

Hounslow Chronicle 28/4/2022 and 05/5/2022

announcing the Application.

If you wish to make a representation to the Planning Inspectorate on the Application, you can do so by writing to them at [M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) quoting 'M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway (TR10019)'.

You can read the full Application on the National Infrastructure Planning at the following webpage

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/>


The Application documents will remain available on the above websites until at least 11.59pm on 03 June 2022.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact:

- **Email:** [M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk)
- **Post:** 2 Colmore Square, Birmingham, B4 6BN
- **Telephone:** 0300 123 5000

**The deadline for receipt of any comments or representations is 11:59pm on 03 June 2022.**

Yours sincerely,



Lynne Stinson  
Programme Manager, M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway  
[M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk)

## **NATIONAL HIGHWAYS**

### **SECTION 153 OF THE PLANNING ACT 2008, REGULATION 6 OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (CHANGES TO, AND REVOCATION OF, DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDERS) REGULATIONS 2011 (AS AMENDED)**

#### **NOTICE OF AN APPLICATION TO MAKE A NON-MATERIAL CHANGE TO THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER:**

#### **THE M4 MOTORWAY (JUNCTIONS 3 TO 12) (SMART MOTORWAY) DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER 2016 (S.I. 2016/863)**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that National Highways of Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, GU1 4LZ, has made an application (“the Application”) to the Secretary of State for Transport, for a non-material change to be made to the M4 Motorway (Junctions 3 to 12) (Smart Motorway) Development Consent Order 2016/863 (“the DCO”).

The Application seeks a non-material change to the DCO that authorised National Highways to undertake the improvement and alteration of 51 kilometres (32 miles) of the M4 Motorway between Junction 3 (Hayes) and Junction 12 (Theale) to upgrade it to a “smart motorway”, with the hard shoulder transformed into a permanent additional running lane and traffic flow moderated by the use of variable speed limits. The scheme includes the replacement of overbridge structures, the extension of underbridge structures, changes to junctions and slip roads, the provision of new gantries and signs, and other infrastructure such as emergency areas. The amendment seeks to achieve the following:

- a) No-Through Junction Running (No-TJR) is proposed at Junctions 5, 6, 8/9 and 11 where previously Through Junction Running had been proposed;
- b) To facilitate the detailed design of three bridges where the height of these new bridges (Huntercombe Spur, Oldway Lane and Wood Lane) is outside of the limits of deviation provided for by the DCO;
- c) The asymmetric widening of Sipson Road Subway to the north instead of the previously proposed widening to the south, due to site constraints;
- d) To amend the “principles set out in the engineering and design report” to facilitate the detailed design of the scheme which are not consistent with the principles previously approved. This will facilitate changes such as to the number of spans, footway locations and extensions to culverts required; and
- e) Changes to acoustic barriers.

#### **How to view the Application documents**

A copy of the Application documents, plans and maps showing the nature and location of the changes are available to be viewed and downloaded for inspection, free of charge, at the National Infrastructure Planning Portal at the following webpage:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/>

Any enquiries on the documents can be sent to National Highways at the following contact details:

**Email:** [M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:M4J3to12SmartMotorways@highwaysengland.co.uk)

**Telephone:** 0300 123 5000

**Post:** 2 Colmore Square, Birmingham, B4 6BN

The Application documents will remain available on the above websites until at least 11.59pm on 03 June 2022.

A paper copy of the application can be obtained but a charge, up to a maximum of £100 (plus VAT at 20%), will be made to cover printing and postage. To request a paper copy of the Application and accompanying documents, or for details regarding payment methods, please contact National Highways using the contact details provided above.

### **Making representations about the Application**

If you wish to respond to this notice or make comments or representations in respect of the Application, these should be sent to the Planning Inspectorate by either:

**Email:**

[M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

**Post:** letters to - National Infrastructure Planning, The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN quoting 'M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway (TR10019)'.

If you have any difficulty in submitting a representation by email, please contact [M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:M4Junction3to12@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) or 0303 444 5000 and a member of the Planning Inspectorate's case team will be able to assist.

Please note that any representations received by the Planning Inspectorate in response to the consultation will be handled in compliance with the United Kingdom's General Data Protection Regulations and published on the relevant page of the Planning Inspectorate's Infrastructure Planning Portal

(<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m4-junctions-3-to-12-smart-motorway/>), with all personal information removed.

**Any comments or representations on the Application must be received no later than 11.59pm on 03 June 2022.**