

To: M5 Junction 10 Case Team
Planning Inspectorate
M5Junction10@planning inspectorate.gov.uk

From: Peter F D Badham
[REDACTED]

M5 Junction 10 Improvement Scheme (Ref: TR010063)

ISH4 Submission
[REDACTED]

GL51 9SW

19th September 2024

I am the landowner of [REDACTED] as shown on Sheet 13 of 16 of the Land Plans. The frontage abuts the North side of the A4019 and the property includes an adjoining meadow to the North up to the Leigh Brook of approx 2 acres giving valuable recreational amenity.

My comments relate to the Inspector's 2nd Written Question Q11.0.1 with regard to Acoustic Barriers under the General Heading 'Landscape and Visual' and the Responses of the Applicant and Joint Councils. I note this has been dealt with:

Firstly, as to the Landscape and Visual aspect; and
Secondly, as to the Noise aspect.

As to the Landscape and Visual aspect the Applicant's response appears to assume that the barriers will comprise a 2 metre high barrier of non-specified material that could be a simple timber board design and that a vegetated solution is not required. However, it goes on to say that should a vegetated design be identified as the preferred option from the consultation undertaken at detailed design stage, space for such planting could be then considered.

I have to say I find this very confusing and, indeed, the response of the Joint Councils is that there appears to be some ambiguity in this regard, where they acknowledge that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment assumes an enhancement to a standard plain barrier, but also say at the current preliminary design stage the proposal is for a timber acoustic fence.

With respect, I consider, as the landowner affected, I am entitled to certainty at this stage, by way of an upgraded version of acoustic barrier, because I do not consider the basic version would provide the mitigation expected and to which I am entitled. My view appears to be confirmed by the assessment of 'Slight Adverse' in Year 1 and again 'Slight Adverse' in Year 15, but that the key aspect of this is the proposed lighting columns. My reaction to this is that it is simply not good enough and further I would strongly object to lighting columns being located directly outside the property as I find it difficult to see any reason why they could not be located otherwise.

As to the Noise aspect, in the Applicant's response, I note the reference to the importance of reducing noise impact. Again, my position is that I consider I am

entitled to an upgraded version of acoustic barrier as I have my doubts that the basic version would provide the necessary protection and mitigation. I have to say that I am not clear as to the Meaning of the statement that 'the noise barrier contributes 5dB improvement (Moderate in Future Year), leading to a combined noise reduction of up to 10dB (Major in Future Year) for the Scheme overall'.

As I mentioned at the preliminary meeting I have major concerns that the acoustic barrier, as currently indicated, terminates some distance prior to the Eastern boundary of the [REDACTED] property. I find this unacceptable and inconsiderate. As well as failing to provide any protection for a large part of the garden, noise generated East of the current termination point would inevitably impact on the property. As I also mentioned at the preliminary meeting, road noise generated from a single modest sized vehicle travelling at a modest speed is of itself significant and the extent to which this is compounded by large volumes of vehicles and HGVs of various description is the reality one is faced with. I, therefore, again request that serious consideration is given to the extension of the currently proposed Eastern termination point so that the appropriate and necessary protection and mitigation can be provided. I would appreciate some dialogue and a site meeting with the Applicant's noise specialists involved to address and take this issue forward.

Lastly, I would like to mention that [REDACTED] and the now adjoining property, [REDACTED], is a divided single property built in approx 1820 and being the Vicarage for St. Mary Magdalene Church at Elmstone Hardwicke from 1832 to 1921 after which the division took place and [REDACTED] has been in my family since 1926. The Conservation Officer at Tewkesbury Borough Council has confirmed that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] should be regarded as Non Designated Heritage Assets and also considers that I should apply to Heritage England for full listing as a Designated Heritage Asset.

I, therefore, respectfully request that the actual design, specification and quality of the acoustic barriers, both as to the Landscape and Visual and Noise aspects take my comments into full account.

Thank you very much.

Peter F D Badham.