

From: [REDACTED]
To: [M42 Junction 6](#)
Subject: Heath Cotterill
Date: 02 September 2019 07:39:51

Heath Cotterill

Interested Party Ref: 42J6-S57005

I wish to express my ongoing concerns regarding the construction of the new road (especially the north end of Catherine De Barnes Lane) and site of the proposed compound and the cumulative effects that this will have on myself, family and property.

Firstly I do not in anyway wish for the proposed dual carriageway to be completed in it's proposed location. Given that I will have to suffer the long term detrimental effects following it's completion I would also like to request that the proposed main site compound be relocated further away from my residential property so that we do not have this suffering exasperated due to and during it's construction.

If it is not relocated I feel it would be beneficial to myself, family and the village of Bickenhill if as much machinery and site apparatus could be moved to the alternative satellite compounds (and we be notified of the location of these satellite compounds) and the size of the main compound be reduced and moved as far north as possible. I suggest the proposed site entrance and exit be moved from the south corner of the existing site to it's furthest northern point or preferably via the A45 to reduce/negate the amount of traffic travelling through the fields in close proximity to mine, other properties, businesses and the Conservation Area.

I am also opposed to the proposed working hours of the site compound and feel that those recommended by Solihull MBC of 08.00-18.00 and 08:00-13:00 on a Saturday would be more acceptable but it would be beneficial for them to be 08:00-17:00 Monday to Friday as this would be less intrusive to local residents.

With regards to document 8.41: Assessment of Potential Footpath Connectivity between A45 and Birmingham International Train Station. The current proposed rerouting is far too long for pedestrians and I feel that the rerouting via any of the proposed routes preferably in order of Route A as this is the most direct, followed by Route B, then Route C would be much more beneficial to the village residents. If the only barrier to this is cost this is a small price to pay in comparison to the suffering that will be experienced on a daily basis by the very people who will be most affected by this scheme.

I am further concerned by the disparities in REP2-034 regarding the effect both temporarily and permanently on Bickenhill Conservation Site and my property which is situated within this Conservation Site. I feel that the effects will be much larger than stated by Highways England by new lighting and noise which would be increased further by the elevated section of road. The views both to and from the Conservation Site will be impacted detrimentally both during construction and after completion of the new road. Furthermore Question 2 raises the point regarding further discrepancies on the adverse effects on the Landscape Character and I agree that the loss of established trees and

hedgerows would open up new views (temporarily towards construction compounds and their activities but also permanently) none of which would be an enhancement to the existing area and would change the balance of character forming features. I would have to agree with Solihull council's comments that the M42 is not visible from the Conservation Area whereas the foreground of a rural village landscape is and this will be adversely affected. I am also concerned by their comments and fully agree with them that construction activity stockpiles, compounds, lighting, hoarding and cabins, fences, plant movement and presence, noise and dust would affect both the Conservation Area and my property and families quality of life. The fact that the new road will rise out of cutting and form 3 lanes means it's lighting impacts at Clock Interchange will have permanent detrimental effects on the setting of my property as will the new light spillage and I request that sufficient mitigation/compensation features and landscaping be put in place to negate this. Highways England have previously stated that none would be required but I feel that after reevaluation of these effects they are necessary. Replanting of removed trees and hedgerows would be required to reduce the adverse impacts both during and after construction.

Section 7.6 of Document 8.35 Applicant's Response to Local Impact Report: Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council asked if The Residential Visual Amenity Assessment had been used to which Highways England stated it hadn't as this technical note was not published until March 2019 and that they had previously completed a landscape and visual impact assessment. When asked at the recent DCO meeting on 21/8/19 if one was to be completed I was informed it wasn't but surely given the concerns previously raised and seemingly dismissed it would have been advisable as best practice to complete an RVAA to supplement the LVIA to assist with the identification and mitigation of likely significant effects none of which appear to have been sufficiently covered.

In section 7.10 the Council asked for details of activity together with mitigation measures and predicted noise readings at noise sensitive housing be submitted to them. As Highways England had not responded to this at that time and in the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2) 2.6 Noise and Vibration, the levels Highways England measure noise by seem inconsistent with the WHO guidelines and do not relate to the Government's policy to promote a good health and a good quality of life through effective noise management. These effects of the increased noise levels on the health and quality of life to myself and family are obviously a major concern to us. In the same document the panel have also questioned (2.7.2) the differing sensitivity applied to residential buildings and gardens which amplifies these concerns. Section 2.7.13 states that less than 5 residential properties would be impacted. Could you confirm if mine is one of them and if not how it can not be when taking all of the environmental factors into account. This applies to both post construction and the effects of the site compound and during construction work. Could you also confirm section 2.7.14 why the potential impact on my property as an asset is not considered significant and if as a result of this scheme it is adversely affected what compensation will be given. Section 2.7.17 covering the effect of the proposed development on air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity as a detriment to human health further amplify the concerns I have been raising throughout this consultation period which I do not feel have to date been adequately resolved.

In document 8.20(a) Statement of Common Ground with Birmingham Airport you state on page 14 that you are under discussion regarding the occupiers of 10 residential properties on Clock Lane as their use and enjoyment of these properties will inevitably be affected by the scheme for the duration of the works and that they need to be satisfied that any Development Consent Order for the scheme will include robust, effective conditions and measures to mitigate the adverse impacts and to compensate occupiers for disruption during the works. Can you confirm that as I will equally be affected I will be covered by any mitigation and compensation measures.

I would like to request that the words “Marston Green and Bickenhill Parish Council” be added to schedule 2 section 5 (1) of the Development Consent Order after the wording stating “ following consultation with” to ensure they are consulted appropriately regarding anything to do with landscaping.

I am also concerned by the late submission of the Proposed Change to the Southern Extent of the Limit of Deviation works No 63 (Severn Trent Aqueduct). The rerouting of this will take place in the field directly behind my property (moving from plot 4/4w to plot 4/4K) and I would request that due to it's proximity and the stresses caused in addition to the existing works that this alteration is not completed and it follow it's initial route. If a deviation is required I request that it be rerouted in a northerly followed by a southernly route rather than a southernly followed by a northerly route so as to not have any detrimental effect on residents and their properties. Could you please confirm that this aqueduct will be located underground. As it is also proposed to give permanent access to it by road from this new plot could you confirm if it is therefore proposed to take part of the conservation area permanently for these access purposes. Rerouting the aqueduct in a northerly direction would still enable access to it from the northern access to the proposed site compound.

Sent from my iPhone