Catherine-de-Barnes Residents' Association

Catney Residents Association

www.catney.co.uk

Dee Allen
Case Manager
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House,
Temple Quay,
Bristol BS1 6PN .

[redacted]

13th July 2019

Response to written and verbal representations made at Deadline 2

1) **HE Lighting Technical Note Published 27/6/19**

Para2.1.8: No mention is made of any works relating to Catherine de Barnes Lane B4438.

Para 2.1.10: We quote from the document" It is assumed that the alterations to the B4438 Catherine-de-Barnes Lane will not be illuminated, shown in blue in Figure 1. This is to create consistency with the existing local network and to ensure journey quality is not adversely affected for users driving along its length." This is contradicted by the diagram" Road Lighting Sheet 3 of 8 (indicating lighting on the access/exit roads and the roundabout at Barbers Coppice.

The Lighting Assessment: A number of documents detailed by HE has been used in formulating the lighting arrangement for the scheme. It would appear that none of these are relevant to the lighting planned for Barbers Coppice roundabout and the entries/exits off this roundabout. Most of the documents refer to Smart motorways and trunk roads- Catherine de Barnes Lane is neither.

Section 4 para .4.1.3 and Table 1 The data given in this table appears to be conflicting. Total kilometres of the scheme are given as 11.44 but adding the individual stretches together gives a total of 12.23kms. The PIA figure for 1 year is given as 5.83 and should be 6.1, PIA's saved in 1 year is stated as 1.4 whereas the individual totals equate to 1.27 and the 30year PIAs saved figure stated as 33 totals 29 when the individual amounts are totalled. Why is there such a difference in these figures? We also have some doubt in the accuracy of the distance figures given in the table. As an example, the table shows that Barbers Coppice roundabout is 0.74 km. We believe this figure to be nearer 0.4km. Does this mean that the PIA figures for this stretch are incorrect? Are the other distances correct.?

Appendix A Lighting Scheme

We note that it is the intention to light Barbers Coppice Roundabout and the entry/exits off it but Bickenhill Roundabout and Catherine de Barnes Lane North Overbridge are not to be lit largely because of the environmental /social impact – the surrounding lanes are not lit. Currently Catherine de Barnes Lane (where the Barbers Coppice Roundabout (BCRT)is to be sites) is not lit and we challenge the decision to light it as proposed. From our recollection the speeds of traffic at the BCRT is likely to be 40/50mph but that traffic approaching the Bickenhill Roundabout could be at speeds

[redacted]

of 70mph which would suggest that for safety reasons this roundabout should be lit. The lighting of BCRT severely impact the property of Four Winds. There appears to be further contradiction vis a vis the M42 Southbound Diverge Slip for Jct 6. There will be an apparent saving of 0.13PIA's in year 1 (3 PIA's in yr30) and has a BCR of 2.36 which is described in Table 5 Conclusions and Recommendations – page 17 as a "low BCR" and HE recommends that *"although BCR highlights street lighting is not justifiable for the slip road ……"* it is recommended for safety reasons.

In comparison Barbers Coppice roundabout will apparently save 0.09PIA's in year1 (2 PIA's in 30 yrs) both figures lower than the M42 Southbound diverge mentioned above. The Coppice Roundabout has a BCR of 2.2, again lower than the slip road mentioned above, yet HE recommends it being lit. There appears to be a distinct lack of consistency and reasoning in arriving at this Lighting Scheme.

The proposed lighting scheme has not been the subject of or included in any public consultation.

M42 Junction 6 DCO – (scheme TR010027) Document Junction 5A Operational Assessment – published June 2019

The conclusions reached in this document have surprised us. Since 2014/5 HE have formulated this scheme, as presented in the DCO, after in-depth and continual discussions with SMBC and Extra MSA / Pegasus and undertaken significant traffic and other analysis work to arrive at in the DCO scheme.. We now discover that the scheme, with the MSA taken in consideration is, in the long term, not fit for purpose and will require additional works and some form of signalisation and maybe other possible solutions. The extract below taken from the document mentioned, above clearly indicates that the design in the DCO is not fit for purpose on a long-term basis and in this respect fails to comply with the NPPF.

5.1.17 Given that the MSA TA considers an 8% "turn-in" rate is a possibility; it indicated the Western Junction ***will require further investigation to ascertain if a suitable design solution could be achieved to accommodate the additional MSA traffic****. In addition to the segregated left turning lane from the M42 northbound off-slip into the MSA, consideration may be given to signalised options and possible other alternatives.*

We reiterate the point made in our earlier submission that this scheme, which was intended to provide a solution to relieving traffic at junction 6, is now having to perform at least 3 functions maybe more enable to accommodate a potential planning application and future expansion. By having to do so, believe the design is a compromise and NOT the ideal solution to the initial problem. The simple ingress/egress idea that we suggested at the first hearing would fulfil, we suggest, the primary function on a long-term basis. HE has said they considered this option very early on in the preparation of the scheme but as far as we can see this option was never open to

public scrutiny/or consulted on in the manner that the current design has. It was interesting to read the Appelgren's response to Deadline 2 submissions Appendix 1 – Responses to Examining Authority's first written questions 24th June 2019. extract printed below: -

1.0.10 Question: In the absence of an MSA at junction 5a, would a junction designed along the lines indicated by Mr David Cuthbert [AS-018] be more efficient and represent something close to the optimum arrangement?

Response: J5a is, for the purposes of the DCO project, required to perform one function, namely to provide egress from the northbound M42 to the new dual carriageway link road, which runs from J5a to the Clock Interchange; and to provide access from this link road back onto the M42 southbound. In short, the J5a is characterised by one way (south) facing slip roads, connecting to a single road. As described subsequently, all such existing junctions identified in Applegreen's review, have a free flow arrangement of a type similar to that provided by Mr Cuthbert (in AS-018). Such arrangements are demonstrably preferable and more efficient to a dumb-bell configuration (as proposed in the DCO scheme) as: • They do not introduce unnecessary delays whereas, with the dumb-bell arrangement all traffic required to slow down at the point of give way despite there being very little if any circulating traffic. The presence of the roundabouts together with the need to give way is a less efficient arrangement as even without any conflicting traffic movements it will introduce an element of geometric delay. • They avoid negative environmental consequences in terms of impacts upon noise and air quality associated with traffic slowing down and then accelerating away from the give way line. With a free flow arrangements traffic would be more likely to maintain a constant speed when leaving or joining the motorway. • They avoid the junction being used to facilitate 'U' turns on the motorway, with such movements adding an element of delay for other vehicles using the junction. • The junction motorway overbridge need only cater for traffic travelling in a single direction and therefore can be less wide. • Roundabouts, with their requisite land take and lighting requirements etc. are not required. The junction design provided by Mr Cuthbert, whilst demonstrably preferable to the proposed dumbbell arrangement, could be further optimised in that the northbound off slip road radii could be tightened to decrease the impact on the Ancient Woodland at Aspbury's Copse. It could be materially further improved by way of moving the free flow junction further to the north. This would: • Avoid impacts on the Ancient Woodland altogether. • Avoid or reduce the substandard weaving length between J5 and the new J5a. In order to evidence the foregoing, a review has been undertaken of all the "M" roads in England including the M6 Toll Road. Motorway standard "A" roads have not been included in this review. All junctions where a single road connects to a motorway have been identified and categorised on the basis of whether they have one- or two-way facing slip roads and whether they take the form of a free flow junction or an interchange. In this case free flow is defined as when traffic can move between the motorway and the side road without passing through a give way or stop line. The results of this review are set out in the table below and plans of the junctions are shown in Appendix E.

Our comment to SMBC 's response to question 1.0.10

[redacted]

Catherine-de-Barnes Residents' Association

Catney Residents Association

www.catney.co.uk

We challenge the statement in the response made by SMBC to this question.1.0.10 which says *"…….HE do not consider that it(the rough design submitted) would meet their standards and non- motorway vehicles would not be able to exit at the Clock junction."* Rough design we submitted is a common feature of many free flow junctions on the motorway network (we refer to Applegreen's response which outlines numerous examples) and fail to see how it could not be designed to meet HE standards. With regard to the issue of local traffic not being able to exit at The Clock. Our diagram represented simple ingress/egress slips off/on the M42, we are not suggesting removing any of the other infrastructure (Barbers Coppice roundabout for instance) that allows local traffic to reach /exit the Clock interchange . The comment by HE included in the SMBC response is inaccurate and incorrect.

David Cuthbert – Chair

For and on behalf of Catherine de Barnes Residents Association

13th July 2019

[redacted]