

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: M42 Junction 6 Improvement

Deadline 3 submission for Camilla and David Burton residing at the above address

These concerns are in addition to the original Written Representation submitted at deadline 1.

We would like it noted that we are still vehemently opposed to the whole scheme due to the environmental, personal and business impacts previously highlighted in our Written Representation and indicated below.

We are particularly opposed to the siting of the site compound within the confines of Bickenhill which we were only given greater detail of after the elapse of deadline 1. It is now apparent from the plan of the works that this will be a significant site and not the small compound that we were advised it would be earlier in the process and that the related infrastructure required to service the compound will have additional negative effects for whole length of the scheme. In the open hearing of 02/07/19 Highways England were asked to review alternative sites for the main compound for a number of reasons, some of these which are relevant to our situation are listed below:

1. The proposed re-routing of the Catherine-de-Barnes lane will bring the existing traffic closer to our property (from approximately 140m away to 60m away) and, coupled with the removal of our existing boundary (due to compulsory purchase), will open up our property and business to the re-routed road and the subsequent increased traffic noise and pollution. This road will be at ground level so therefore the noise will be significant during the construction and when in use. The closest point to the proposed road is the guest rooms utilised by the business. The Catherine-de-Barnes road is a very busy highway which will back onto the existing paddock where we graze the horses, bringing it approximately 80m closer to my property. Coupled with the all the noise of constructing the bridge and the road itself, it leaves me with very serious concerns as to whether I will be able to continue running my two businesses. Appendix 1 shows a number of views from our guest rooms which will be impacted by the proposed works and also the proximity of our horses to the area of compulsory purchase.
We enquired at the planning meeting, held on the 30/05/19 with Highways England and local residents, what the purpose of the road indicated on the plan that ran behind our boundary was and Jonathan Pizzey advised that this was only a maintenance road to an underground drainage tank - but less than a week later we received a plan showing the re-routed CDB lane and compound access highlighted in this exact space (one of a number of examples where information has been withheld by Highways England).
2. The Removal of the boundary will also have a significant impact on the visual aspect from our property, effecting not only the residential side but also impacting the business aspect. What actions will be put in place to mitigate this?
3. The land where the road will be re-routed through will not be wide enough to allow the inclusion of any effective noise abatement measures e.g. a soil bund (rather than an ineffective wooden fence). How are Highways England suggesting that this will be mitigated?

4. The proposed exit from the compound will join this re-routed road, putting all the compound traffic onto a local road – something that Highways England have advised at numerous meetings would not happen. How are they proposing that the compound traffic will access the new road without travelling down this local road to the new island proposed at Catherine-de-Barnes? This is the exact route residents and guests from our businesses will be travelling on. How can Highways ensure that the construction traffic will not cause disruption to residents and guests travelling in and out of the village?
5. The working hours have been advised on a number of occasions at various meetings but each time we are advised, the hours are different. We need confirmation of what these working hours are and that they will be strictly adhered to. Night work has also been mentioned but without any confirmation of what this exactly entails?
6. The distance between the village and the Clock interchange will be increased significantly. Currently this is approximately a 1km drive to leave the village and the plans supplied show this to be increasing to around 4.5km. The drive into the village will also increase by approximately 1km as you will need to pass the village to then come back on the local road. A key unique selling point of our business is that we are a mile away by road to the NEC, the Airport, the international train station and from the M42 motorway junction. A taxi fare is currently £5-£6 to the train station and this will now increase in cost to between £12 and £14. What features can be added to the road to reduce this distance?
7. The re-routed Catherine-de-Barnes lane will also cut off the existing bridleways and we have consistently asked for consideration to be given to the number of horses in the village as there are 3 livery yards in Bickenhill. We need to maintain where we can ride, especially with all the construction that will be going on as there is a very real chance that my liveries will leave if they cannot ride anywhere. From a personal perspective, my own riding pleasure for myself and my daughter will also be severely impacted. What will be included to ensure constant access to the existing bridleways, for example on Clock lane?
8. We are constantly being advised that the road noise will be minimal due to the road being placed in a cutting. When the road reaches the Clock Interchange, it will be back at ground level and this aspect is visible from our property and will also be audible. Can Highways England explain how this will not increase the traffic noise or impact the views from our property? The proposed re-routed Catherine-de-Barnes Road is also going to be at ground level right behind my property on the land compulsory purchased - how is this going to be hidden from my property when it is even closer?
9. We have only recently been made aware of an additional material stores compound (plot 51a) which will be located at the opposite end of St Peters lane, effectively sandwiching the village between two the compounds. Again, this will lead to construction traffic utilising the local road and an increase in noise and pollution. Again we ask - how will Highways England gain access to this compound without utilising the local roads they promised would not be used?
10. We are already taking bookings for the period when the works is set to commence, and we are risking our high ratings as we may be forced to cancel the bookings as we currently do not have any foresight on a schedule of work. We desperately need this schedule to be able to forewarn our guests at a minimum. We also need to be advised in advance of any works being undertaken outside the scope of the construction.
11. As previously mentioned, access to the NEC, International train Station, etc is a key selling point for our business. The limited access created by the construction phase could be mitigated in a minor way by constructing the footbridge across the A45 prior to the road construction commencing.

In summary, I would like Highways England to move the re-routed CDB road and compound access away from my property. I understand the whole scheme was moved slightly due to a local business after the scheme was initially drawn up, so I need to ask why is my business not being given the same consideration?

This is also not just my business, but our family home and I feel we are suffering disproportionately to the other areas impacted by the project. Not only are we being affected by the road itself, but from the bridge construction, the compound, the access routes from the compound, the additional material stores on St Peter's Lane and now the re-routing the Catherine-de-Barnes Road. The business run from Church Farm is the only income to support my family and this is a very serious concern for our welfare going forward.

Finally, we are severely disappointed with the lack of interaction displayed by Highways England. During the open floor hearing of 21/05/19, Phillip O'Reilly highlighted a lack of effective communication from Highways England and we are also experiencing the same situation.

They have repeatedly failed to supply information requested by email and their representative even neglected to turn up for an important scheduled meeting booked well in advance without any valid reason for not attending.

It is clear that they have little or no regard for the impact they are having on the village or the inhabitants within it and this was evident by the fact that we have already witnessed activity in the fields adjacent to our property on the 11/07/19 without any prior notice - even though the DCO has not yet been granted. The unannounced arrival of a digger to undertake what we are now aware were archaeological excavations has already had a negative impact on our livery business as the equipment spooked the horses who were being ridden in the arena approximately 50 yards away. This resulted in our customer being unable to use the arena and we were forced to refund the charges levied for the booking. We were also advised by Jonathan Pizzey during a meeting on the 30/05/19 that the machinery used in the compound would be fitted with silencers and that they would not be audible from our property. Attached in a separate email and also on the following link <https://photos.app.goo.gl/hYwmxmgPR2esnM3S8> is a short video of the digger we witnessed completing this archaeological dig - the noise from the engine and the caterpillar tracks is clearly audible. This is just 1 unit and the compound will house multiple of this type of vehicle and the propensity to cause noise pollution is very significant and does not need dismissing as it was during the meeting mentioned above.

This reiterates the need for a full schedule of work and the need for notification for any work being undertaken in the fields adjacent to our property. If we are not kept informed we will be unable to forewarn our customers. The works may also result in the need to shut our two businesses so as not to risk bad reviews or any safety issues with the horses. We will need to be compensated accordingly for the loss of earnings let alone the stress and upset on mine and my family's life.

There were concerns from the start that Highways England would carry on regardless of points raised by the local residents and it appears that our concerns are now materialising.

Regards

Camilla and David Burton

Appendix 1

View from Room 6:



View from Room 7:



Proximity of Horses Paddock to compulsory purchase land:

