

[REDACTED]

From: Heath Cotterill [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 October 2019 12:22
To: M42 Junction 6
Subject: Submission re M42 Junction 6 Scheme

Heath Cotterill

[REDACTED]

Interested Party Ref: 42J6-S57005

As previously stated I wish to express that despite all the findings I have heard throughout this consultation period I remain opposed to the construction of the new link road scheme in its current proposed location.

Further to the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing and Issue Specific Hearing 8 on 22/10/19 and 23/10/19 respectively I would like to submit the following comments:

- in respect of the the removal of trees and hedgerows the removal of any should be restricted to only those that are absolutely necessary and replacements made in the closest possible location at every opportunity. In the Environmental Statement, Appendix 8.2 of the Arboricultural Statement, section 4.1.1.3 states "The tree groups and hedgerow trees to the East along Catherine de Barnes Lane currently provide a screen from the busy road and will actively reduce the noise from the road and the adjacent nearby airport to the village of Bickenhill. The trees and vegetation here also currently provide visual amenity forming an avenue of tree canopy along the road". It also states in section 4.1.1.7 that "It is also recommended that, where possible, trees and tree groups which currently provide screening and which also act as a noise

barrier are retained, or the impact minimised, in order to provide continued benefits to the village.

My understanding is that these trees and hedgerows will be removed. To maximise screening and reduce the visual and noise impacts to the conservation area and my home I would like to see these reinstated/replaced as near to their original location as is possible. The World Health Organisation state that screening will have its major impact at the point nearest to the source rather than the receptor site. Whilst I am aware that Birmingham Airport may say that the replanting of these fall within its safeguarding area I feel that they would offer no increased risk to safety as they would actually be further away from the flight path. I also understand that trees G6, G7, G8 and G60 are located in the Conservation Area but am not sure from current documentation if they are to be removed. Due to the screening they provide and the benefits they give to the historic feel of Bickenhill Village and the Conservation Site I would request that they remain in situ.

- Additionally my property is one of the few located in the Conservation Area that will be directly affected, not only by the issues raised above but also by lighting where the newly proposed Catherine De Barnes Lane rises out of cutting along the west bound filter road/free flow link to the A45, and also at the new Clock Junction/island. I would request that any lighting added is done so at as low a height as possible and with no visual impact on my property or the Conservation Area. We would also be affected by the effects of headlights along the newly rerouted road, traffic queuing at the new junction layout, the main site compound and the satellite compounds situated to the north west side of Catherine De Barnes Lane and at the proposed Catherine De Barnes Lane road bridge, noise, vibration, air quality and the detrimental health effects both physically and mentally that the cumulative effects these will bring.
- Due to the above I would like to thank you for confirming that the Parish Council should be consulted on landscaping matters and therefore feel that to ensure that I/Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council have involvement and input to the landscaping both

during and post construction that the wording "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".

- Due to the numerous benefits to not only myself but also the Conservation Area and village of Bickenhill itself I would also like to thank you for considering relocating the proposed main site compound. If for any reason this is deemed not possible then the proposed new layout, entrance & exit points and removal of the temporary road would be much preferable to those previously submitted. Obviously adequate screening and bunding would be imperative and as per my previous submission I feel that these need to be as tall and close to the source of the noise as possible. Satellite compounds should also be afforded the same consideration for mitigation in the form of screening from visual and noise effects. I would also request that details of the new site location or layout are included in the DCO.
- Construction hours in the Statement of Common Ground with Solihull Council seem somewhat open to interpretation. I feel that no work should be carried out before [8am](#) or [after 6pm Monday - Friday](#) (1pm on a Saturday) that it is audible by local residents as this would be disruptive to sleep/rest and this is also the time that many will be preparing for their school or work day. The Residents I have spoken to feel that if this means that the time span for completion of the project is extended this is a small price to pay for the benefits it would bring. In the case of disputes constituting what is considered to be a noise and noise levels, in contrast to the the levels and figures provided by the Applicants, the World Health Organisation's recommendation in the case of Conservation Areas is that "existing quiet outdoor areas should be preserved and the ratio of intruding noise to natural background sound should be kept low". The WHO also state that noise monitors should be placed close to the receptor site rather than the source of the noise and for accuracy should be placed approximately 2 metres from a wall rather than on it so as to capture any reverberative implications. The absence of a Community Liaison Officer on site

24 hours a day does little to appease residents concerns on how to report and halt noisy operations effectively if being performed outside of any proposed hours. Whilst we realise there will be a dedicated line to report these occurrences to by the time respective action taken is taken to cease operations it will often be too late, Confirmation of proposed working hours and allowable operations in a less ambiguous format in the DCO would therefore be appreciated.

- Any means of eradicating the problems posed by taxi parking and indeed any other nuisance parking of vehicles using the airport or train station would be appreciated. I realise this is difficult given that the painting of lines will negate the ambience of a village feel but implementation of reducing the areas/locations it is possible for this to occur in would be hugely beneficial.
- Your willingness to look at the relocation of the proposed attenuation tank is appreciated. The effects of moving it further south, thus removing it from the rear of Church Farm and therefore removing the access road to it would as well as having positive effects for their Bed and Breakfast business also reduce anti social issues such as unauthorised parking and fly tipping and also reduce security concerns whereby vehicles would not be able to easily gain closer proximity in a secluded area to mine and other residents properties. The land owner would still be able to gain access to their fields for agricultural purposes via a single gate in the same way as they currently do.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Planning Inspectors for listening to my concerns throughout this consultation period and their understanding in what has primarily been a complex process of which I have no previous experience or expertise.

Sent from my iPad