Report to the First Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Transport

By Neil Taylor BSc, MICE, MIHT

An Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Transport

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372

Date: 10 January 2005

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE M40 MOTORWAY JUNCTION 4 (HANDY CROSS) CONNECTING ROAD SCHEME 200

AND

THE M40 MOTORWAY JUNCTION 4 (HANDY CROSS) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER (No.....) 200

Dates of Inquiry: 30 November, 1st and 2nd December, 2004

Ref: HA 65/19/83

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CASE DETAILS **1**

1 PREAMBLE **1**

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS **2**

3 THE CASE FOR THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY **3**

4 THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS **12**

5 THE CASE FOR THE COUNTER OBJECTORS **18**

6 WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS **18**

7 REBUTTAL BY THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY **19**

8 CONCLUSIONS **24**

9 RECOMMENDATIONS **31**

APPENDIX A **32**

APPENDIX B **34**

CASE DETAILS

- The draft Connecting Road Scheme would be made under Sections 16, 17 and 19 of the Highways Act 1980, and is known as The M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Connecting Road Scheme 200 .
- The draft Scheme was published on 23 April 2004, and there were six non-statutory objections outstanding to it at the commencement of the local inquiries.
- The Scheme would authorise the provision of a special road (a road restricted to use by motorway classes of traffic) to connect the northbound A404 to the westbound M40 at Junction 4 (Handy Cross).

The draft Compulsory Purchase Order would be made under Sections 239, 240 and 246 of the Highways Act 1980 and under Section 2 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and is known as The M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Compulsory Purchase Order (No…..) 200 .

- The draft Order was published on 23 April 2004, and there was one statutory objection outstanding to it at the commencement of the local inquiries.
- The Order would permit the Highways Agency to acquire the land for the scheme, including that required temporarily during construction, and for landscaping.

Summary of Recommendations: I recommend that the Connecting Road Scheme is made and that the Compulsory Purchase Order be made with modifications.

---

1 PREAMBLE

1.1 I have been appointed pursuant to Paragraph 14 of Schedule 1 to the Highways Act 1980 and Section 4(2) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 to hold concurrent public local inquiries into the above draft Scheme and Order, and to report to the First Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Transport. For ease of reference I shall refer to the concurrent inquiries as “the inquiry”.

1.2 I held the inquiry in the Council Chamber, Wycombe District Council, Queen Victoria Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 1BB, on Tuesday, 30th November, Wednesday, 1st December and Thursday, 2nd December, 2004. I made an unaccompanied site inspection on Monday, 29th November, and a formal accompanied site visit on Wednesday, 1st December.

1.3 There were six objections to the draft Connecting Road Scheme, and one

statutory objection to the draft Compulsory Purchase Order, at the start of the inquiry. A further letter of objection was received during the inquiry. The statutory objector and three of the non-statutory objectors were present at the inquiry. There were four letters from individuals or organisations who supported the proposals. There were two counter-objections to alternative proposals put forward by objectors. There was one letter making representations.

1.4 The effect of the Scheme and Order would be to provide for the construction of

- a special road to connect the northbound carriageway of the A404 trunk road with the westbound carriageway of the M40 Motorway at Handy Cross near High Wycombe
- additional lanes to the M40 slip roads entering the roundabout
- an additional lane between the A404 Marlow Hill and the M40 eastbound, and
- a five lane cross link to assist traffic movements between the M40 and the A404 south of the junction.

1.5 The main grounds of objection related to the amount of land proposed to be acquired and to the proposals in respect of non-motorised users.

1.6 At the inquiry, the Highways Agency confirmed that all statutory formalities had been complied with.

1.7 This report contains a brief description of the site of the proposals (the subject of the Scheme and Order) and its surroundings, the gist of the cases presented and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of inquiry appearances, documents, plans and photographs are attached. I have included in the list of documents the proofs and other statements of evidence submitted by the parties, subject, however, to the proviso that these may have been added to or otherwise amended at the inquiry, either during examination-in-chief or cross-examination.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 Junction 4 of the M40 Motorway is located on the southern edge of High Wycombe. The location is most readily seen on drawing number 0164/GD00636/GDD/SK in Appendix A of the Handy Cross Improvements – Scheme Assessment Report (document D80). The junction is in the form of a grade-separated roundabout with four slip roads providing access to and from the Motorway in all directions. On the south side of the roundabout there are connections to the A404 dual carriageway road, which forms the

Marlow Bypass, and the C100 Wycombe Road single carriageway road to Marlow. On the north side, there are connections to the A404 dual carriageway road, and the C100 Marlow Road, both of which connect to High Wycombe, as well as the A4010, John Hall Way, which is located to the west side of High Wycombe. Traffic movements at the junction are controlled by means of signals. There is a footway located around the western side of the roundabout from the A404 north of the roundabout to the C100 to the south. An unclassified road, Winchbottom Lane, passes underneath the A404 Marlow Bypass some ½ kilometre south of the junction.

3 THE CASE FOR THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY

The material points are:

Background

3.1 The scheme is being promoted to provide additional traffic capacity at junction 4 of the M40 Motorway by separating local and long distance traffic, widening of approach roads and providing an additional motorway link road.

3.2 Two large scale schemes to improve the junction were considered in 1997, but were not proceeded with because of the likely environmental impact, particularly on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and of the high cost, around £60m. An Integrated Transport Study commissioned in 1998 recommended short and long term measures following extensive consultation work. Short term measures to the junction were completed in 2001. The recommended long term measures were developed into the current proposal. The scheme was placed in the Government's Targeted Programme of Improvements in August 2002 and an Early Contractor Involvement Contract was awarded for the scheme in June 2003.

Existing conditions

3.3 The existing road layout can be seen on drawing 0163/GD00636/GDD/SK in Appendix A of the Handy Cross Improvements – Scheme Assessment Report (document D80). Current traffic demand exceeds the capacity of the junction in both the morning and evening peak hours and queues form at these times. Queues on the A404 approach from the south can extend for some 2.5 kilometres and extend well beyond the end of the peak period. Queues also occur on the slip roads leading to the roundabout and these can extend on to the main carriageway of the M40, causing a serious safety hazard. The traffic forecast shows that in the proposed opening year, 2006, the time taken to travel through the junction from the western side of the M40 to the southern side of the A404 would exceed seven minutes.

3.4 In its current form, the junction cannot absorb any growth in demand

during the peak periods. The result of any growth would be an extension of the peak periods, leading to an increase in the length of time taken for vehicle queues to dissipate.

3.5 To the north of the junction, the local road network will not allow for any significant growth. However, Buckinghamshire County Council and Wycombe District Council intend to put traffic management measures in place on the local network which will increase its capacity. Traffic demand can therefore be expected to increase on both sides of the junction. In the design year, 2021, traffic on the A404 south of the junction would be expected to be about 55,600 vehicles per day without the scheme, and this would be expected to increase to about 70,900 vehicles per day with the scheme. This additional traffic would be largely made up of traffic re-routing from other routes, or traffic which would change destination as a result of the scheme to fulfil a travel demand. These two effects would account for the majority of the expected increase.

3.6 The junction does not cater well for cyclists and pedestrians. There is no separate provision for cyclists at the junction; they have to use the road network. The existing pedestrian routes are shown on figure 1 of Appendix 1 of the Proof of Evidence of Mr. Doughty (document PA/4/3). On the north side of the roundabout, pedestrian footways are currently located on both sides of John Hall Way and the C100 Marlow Road, and on the north side of the A404 Marlow Hill. To the south of the junction, there is a footway on the west side of the C100 Wycombe Road. There is no pedestrian provision on the A404 Marlow Bypass.

3.7 The existing route for pedestrians across the M40 from John Hall way is via a footway on the west side of the roundabout, crossing the signal controlled M40 eastbound exit slip road and along the footway on the west side of the M40 over bridge. From here, pedestrians cross the uncontrolled M40 westbound entry slip road to join the footway along the west side of the C100 Wycombe Road.

3.8 None of the signal controls at the junction incorporate pedestrian facilities.

The Scheme

3.9 The proposed scheme can be seen on drawing number 0001/GD00636/GDD/PD in Appendix A of the Proof of Evidence of Mr Barnett (document PA/1/3). The objectives of the scheme are: -

- To improve journey times and reliability for trunk road and local traffic using the junction
- To improve safety for all road users
- To provide an environmentally acceptable scheme which

minimises environmental impacts

- To ensure that the scheme is consistent with regional and local planning policy, and

- To improve accessibility for pedestrian and cyclists (non-motorised users).

3.10 The main features of the proposal would be as follows:

3.11 There would be a new, dedicated free flow link road from the A404 south of the junction to the M40 to the west. This would pass under the C100 Wycombe Road, which would be carried over the carriageway on a new bridge. This link would allow northbound traffic on the A404 approaching the junction and wishing to join the M40 westbound to do so without using the roundabout. The link would be constructed to motorway standards with one 3.7 metre wide lane and a 3.3 metre wide hard shoulder. It has been designed to minimum standards, involving an approved departure from desirable minimum standards, consistent with safety, in order to minimise the amount of land which would be required. These departures have been secured through the Highways Agency's Departure Approval Systems. Details of the departures are shown in table 4.1 of the Scheme Assessment Report (document D80). The link would be partly on new embankment and partly in cutting and would require the acquisition of land.

3.12 A new link would be constructed through the northern part of the existing roundabout. This would allow northbound traffic on the A404 approaching the roundabout and wishing to travel eastwards on the M40 to avoid the local road access points on north side of the roundabout. The M40 eastbound exit slip road would be widened to provide a three-lane dedicated slip road into the proposed link. This would be signal controlled and would accommodate traffic travelling eastwards on the M40 wishing to travel south on the A404. The link would therefore separate local and long distance traffic and would increase capacity as well as reducing delays. It would be constructed on embankment through the junction and within the existing highway boundary at a similar level to the existing roundabout.

3.13 The M40 westbound exit slip road and the A404 exit to the south would be widened to provide an additional signal controlled, two-lane, dedicated left turn for traffic leaving the M40 and wishing to travel south on the A404 towards Marlow. This would be constructed within the existing highway boundary and involve the construction of a retaining wall. This would increase the amount of traffic which could enter the junction from the slip road and would reduce queuing and congestion on the slip road. It would also reduce the likelihood of queues extending on to the motorway.

3.14 Traffic approaching the junction from the north along the A404 and wishing to travel eastwards on the M40 would be accommodated by means of a widened carriageway which would be built within the existing highway

boundary and would involve the construction of a retaining wall. This widening would increase the capacity for traffic entering the junction from the A404 and reduce queuing.

3.15 The proposal incorporates new traffic signals to control traffic movements and traffic would be guided through the junction by means of new road markings and overhead sign gantries.

3.16 The scheme would involve new lighting on the proposed new cross link through the roundabout, as well as on the new link and on the A404 southwards. This would extend as far as the southern side of the existing Winchbottom Lane under bridge. The new lighting would be designed to minimise light spillage and existing lighting at the roundabout would be replaced with lighting of the same specification.

Non-motorised users' route

3.17 The proposals for non-motorised users (NMUs) can be seen in figure 1 of Appendix 1 of the Proof of Evidence of Mr. Doughty (document PA/4/3). North of the roundabout, pedestrians would cross John Hall Way using the central island as at present to access the footway on the west side of the roundabout. From there the route would follow the existing footway using a widened footway as far as the junction with the eastbound exit slip road of the M40. The footpath would then cross the slip road by means of a two-stage signal controlled crossing via a traffic island refuge. From here pedestrians and cyclists would cross to the centre of the roundabout using a further signal controlled junction. The route would then cross the M40 along the east side of the roundabout bridge, where a widened footway would be provided. This part of the footway would be 1.8 metres wide. There would be a 1.4 metre high pedestrian fence provided on the outside edge of the bridge, and the footway/cycleway would be separated from the roundabout carriageway by means of a 0.9 metre high safety barrier.

3.18 From the southern end of the bridge cyclists/pedestrians would cross the roundabout carriageway and the C100 Wycombe Road via two signal controlled crossings and thence over the proposed new bridge, which would carry the C100 over the link road, before rejoining the existing path.

3.19 The new scheme would incorporate new traffic signals with pedestrian activated push button controls which would ensure that pedestrians and cyclists could cross safely whilst the traffic was held by a red phase of the signals. The pedestrian green times would be designed to suit the length of the crossing. Traffic detector loops, closed circuit television cameras and a link to a manned control centre would enable the signal phasing to be monitored and adjusted to ensure effective operation of the junction.

3.20 12-hour pedestrian/cyclist surveys carried out between 2002 and 2004 showed that an average daily total of some 48 NMUs used the M40 west over bridge and an average daily total of one used the east bridge. This

amounts to some 4 trips per hour. Over the last five years, there were two slight accidents involving NMUs, one involving a pedal cyclist and one a pedestrian.

Policy

3.21 The Government's Policy for transport is set out in the Integrated Transport White Paper – "A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone" (document D1) and in "A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England" (document D2). The objectives for transport are: -

- To protect and enhance the built and natural environment
- To improve safety for all travellers
- To contribute to an efficient economy, and to support sustainable economic growth in appropriate locations
- To promote accessibility to everyday facilities for all, especially those without a car, and
- To promote the integration of all forms of transport and land use planning, leading to a better, more efficient transport system.

3.22 National Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) set out Government Policy on planning. Of particular relevance is PPG13 - Transport (document D114) which advocates a safe, efficient and integrated transport system and seeks to promote more sustainable transport choices and improve accessibility whilst reducing the need to travel. PPG2 sets out policy in relation to Green Belts, including the control of development within them.

3.23 The scheme has been developed following an Integrated Transport Study (document D86) and would reduce congestion, although it would not contribute to the objective of reducing travel by car. The scheme would comply strongly with national policy because it would deliver large benefits by reducing congestion at modest capital cost and with minimal impact.

3.24 Although not included in the adopted Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) for the South East or the Buckinghamshire Structure Plan (document D109), the Handy Cross scheme is specifically referred to and supported within the emerging replacement Regional Transport Strategy and Deposit County Structure Plan. Regional policy also refers to the possibility of using Handy Cross as a location for a park and ride facility. The proposed scheme would not prejudice the provision of such a facility.

3.25 Local planning and transportation policy is set out in the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan 2004 (document D110). The M40 junction 4 scheme is referred to in paragraphs 7.92 and 7.93 which note the congestion and

pollution problems at the junction and state that the County and District Councils will continue to press for the early implementation of the scheme. The Plan also seeks to prevent development from prejudicing its construction. Local Policies on Green Belt are set out in paragraphs 287 to 297 of the Buckinghamshire County Structure Plan 1991 – 2011 (document D109) and Chapter 9 of the Local Plan (document D110). These largely reflect the National Policy and indicate that there is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Local Plan policy GB2 states that development will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances.

Assessment of the Scheme

3.26 The scheme has been assessed in accordance with the Guidance on the Methodology for Multi Modal Studies (GOMMS) (documents D59 and D60). Details are contained in the Stage 3 Scheme Assessment Report (document D80). The Appraisal Summary Table (AST) summarises the results of the appraisal process and is at Appendix B of the Appendices to Mr Barnett's Proof of Evidence (document PA/1/3). This shows that the scheme would perform well against the five key objectives.

Economics

3.27 Economic analysis has been carried out using the Department for Transport's 'Transport Users' Benefit Appraisal' (TUBA) program. The scheme would have a Net Present Value of £35.66m and a Benefit Cost Ratio of 4.91. The maximum average total queue length on the A404 approach from the south would be of the order of 670 metres from the roundabout compared to 2.5 kilometres at present. The journey time through the junction from the M40 west of the junction to the A404 south of the junction would be less than three minutes compared to seven minutes at present. The queue on the slip road would be reduced, lessening the problem of queuing on to the main carriageway of the motorway.

Environmental Impact

3.28 An Environmental Statement (documents D77, D78 and D79) has been produced for the scheme and was published at the same time as the draft Scheme and Order. The assessment was carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Volume 11, Environmental Assessment (document D48) supplemented by environmental guidance contained in GOMMS. The assessment is summarised as follows: -

Noise

3.29 By the year 2021 (fifteen years after the projected opening year) the scheme would result in noise reductions for some 390 dwellings of which some 241 would experience a perceptible reduction. Although some 591 dwellings would experience an imperceptible noise increase, this increase

would be less than would occur without the scheme. No dwellings would be likely to be eligible for noise insulation under the Noise Insulation Regulations.

3.30 Overall the scheme would be an improvement over the do-minimum (that is, without the scheme).

Air quality

3.31 Wycombe District Council has declared an Air Quality Management Area for annual average NO_2 for the area which includes Handy Cross.

3.32 Although there would be a slight deterioration in the air quality compared to the do-minimum, the scheme would not result in the level of NO_2 exceeding the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objective in either the opening year (2006) or the air quality objective year (2010), and all other pollutants would remain below the AQS objectives.

Landscape and Visual impact

3.33 South of the M40, the landscape character is in the form of plateau with valleys, it lies within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is also designated as Green Belt. The boundary of the Green Belt and AONB in relation to the junction is shown in figure 6 of volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (document D79). The quality of this landscape is very high. North of the M40, the townscape character is urban fringe with a mixture of residential, community and commercial use. The dominance of traffic, highway infrastructure and car parking has resulted in a lack of distinctive local character and the quality of the townscape is moderate to low.

3.34 The scheme would result in the loss of some 1.83 hectares of agricultural land on the edge of the Chilterns AONB and within the Metropolitan Green Belt. It would also result in the loss of some established highway planting. Policies in the Buckinghamshire County Council Structure Plan and Wycombe District Council Local Plan seek to protect the Green Belt by maintaining its openness and by restricting urban sprawl. Retaining walls would be used to retain as much existing planting as possible to mitigate any potential adverse impact. A mound would be provided to the west of the C100 Wycombe Road to provide an immediate screen from the south-west. Other planting and landscaping would be provided to screen the junction from other directions.

3.35 The effect of the scheme on the very high quality landscape would be moderate adverse, reducing to slight adverse after 15 years. The loss of 1.83 hectares of agricultural land within the AONB could not be mitigated. The effect on the townscape would be slight adverse and could not be mitigated.

Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

3.36 There would be no direct effect on the built heritage. No Scheduled Monuments, Areas of Archaeological Importance, archaeological features or Registered Battlefields would be affected. The proposed new free-flow link road would bring the highway closer to the Grade II listed buildings at Handy Cross Farm, and existing vegetation within the highway boundary would be lost, giving a slight adverse effect on their setting. Replacement planting would partially mitigate this effect.

3.37 Overall the scheme would have a slight adverse effect on cultural heritage, but this would be a very minor impact.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

3.38 The scheme would result in the loss of some semi-mature woodland planting within the highway boundary and would result in a slight adverse effect on local bird populations; there would also be some small areas of grassland lost. These would be offset by the creation of new habitats including woodland and chalk grassland which would be expected to support a greater diversity of flora and fauna than the current habitats.

3.39 No designated sites would be affected by the scheme. Badgers are present to the south of the motorway and there would be some loss of foraging areas. This would have a slight adverse effect. Badger fencing would be provided on the highway boundary to deter badgers from crossing the motorway.

3.40 Overall, there would be a slight adverse impact in the opening year (2006), but this would change to slight beneficial with the maturing of the proposed replacement planting.

Drainage and Water Quality

3.41 The groundwater has been assessed to be of high importance with regard to water supply and the transport and dilution of waste products. Vegetative treatment would be provided to mitigate the increased risk of a pollution incident which could be brought about by increased traffic passing through the junction.

3.42 Overall the scheme would have a neutral impact on water quality.

Physical Fitness

3.43 Improved pathways and pedestrian/cyclist crossing facilities at the junction would encourage greater pedestrian and cyclist activity between the urban fringe to the north of the M4 and the rural area to the south. The scheme would have a slight beneficial effect.

Response to the Environmental Statement

3.44 The responses to the Environmental Statement are shown in Appendix A to Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement (document D77).

3.45 English Nature confirmed that there are no sites of Sites of Special Scientific Interest near the proposals and that the recommendations set out in Bat, Badger and Reptile survey reports would provide adequate protection for these species.

3.46 The Environment Agency agreed the drainage design including treatment facilities providing compensation treatment for additional area of pavement.

3.47 English Heritage and the Countryside Agency had no comments.

3.48 Wycombe District Council advised that the proposed scheme would be located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Metropolitan Green Belt and that this could give rise to conflict with local policies in relation to these, but that the transportation improvements may justify development, providing that other requirements of the relevant policies are justified. The shadow Chilterns Conservation Board, which has responsibility for co-ordinating and initiating policies in the Chilterns AONB, state that they have no objection to the proposals.

Land Use and Agriculture

3.49 Land use to the south of the junction is predominantly agricultural, broadly divided by the C100 Wycombe Road into arable land to the west and grazing land to the east with a small field to the immediate south east of the junction used as a cover crop for game birds. The land is classified as Grade 3a Agricultural Land Quality, the lowest category under the Government's definition of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.

3.50 The scheme would make the maximum use of existing highway land. All of the permanent land take, amounting to some 1.83 hectares, would be located to the south and west of the junction. Of this, some 1.22 hectares would be arable land to the west of the C100 and between it and the M40, and approximately 0.61 hectares would be pasture between the C100 and the A404. All of this land would be required for the construction of the proposed link road and for landscaping works (plots 1/1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4 and 1/5).

3.51 In addition to the permanent loss of land, there would be three areas of agricultural land which would be required temporarily, amounting to some 1.13 hectares. These are: -

- An area to the south of the proposed new A404 to M40 link road required as a construction compound (plot 1/6)

- A strip of land parallel to the existing A404 south of the junction and on the east side of the road for use as a haul road (plot 1/7), and

- An area to the south east of the junction required as a working area (plot 1/8).

3.52 All this land would be from Handy Cross Farm. The total loss of land during construction, including the permanent loss, and amounting to some 2.96 hectares, represents about 1% of the total holding.

3.53 Land would also need to be acquired to the north of the junction for temporary access for construction of retaining walls and road widening (plots 2/1 and 2/2), and for the construction of a signing gantry (plot 2/3).

3.54 Full details of the need for the land contained in the draft CPO are shown in document HA/2.

Programme and Funding

3.55 If the Scheme and Order are made, the scheme would be programmed to start in late summer 2005. Funding for the scheme is included in the Highways Agency programme of works for 2005/6 (documents HA/11 and HA/12). There is no impediment which would be likely to block the implementation of the scheme should the Scheme and Order be made.

Green Belt

3.56 Around 50,000 hectares of land in Buckinghamshire are included within the Green Belt (paragraph 288 of document D109). The scheme would result in inappropriate development within a small part of the Metropolitan Green Belt and would have slight adverse visual effects beyond the area directly affected. However no alternative sites exist outside the Green Belt and as the scheme is in the national interest it is therefore considered an exceptional use.

4 THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS

The material points are:

Mr Morris

4.1 Mr Morris is the agricultural tenant of Handy Cross Farm (shown on document OBJ6/5), occupying land affected by the draft Compulsory Purchase Order. Mr Morris does not object to the Connecting Road Scheme, but objects to the proposed acquisition of plots 1/6, 1/7 and 1/8 because of

difficulties brought about by legislation.

4.2 Mr Morris' occupation of the land is protected by the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act 1986. The Agricultural Tenancies Act 1995 provides that the 1986 Act shall not apply in relation to any tenancy beginning on or after 1st September 1995. If land were to be taken out of Mr Morris' existing 1986 Act tenancy by the CPO, and then handed back, it would be a Farm Business Tenancy as provided for under the 1995 Act. Mr Morris would not enjoy security of tenure over it and it could subsequently be removed. This would have a significant effect on the farm business, with the possibility of severing the holding, and making it not viable to continue maintaining a dairy herd on that holding.

4.3 Additionally, acquisition of plots 1/7 to provide access to plot 1/8 would sever the main grazing area for the dairy cows to the east of the A404 from the main dairy complex at the farm. Regular movement of cattle is incompatible with the use of plot 1/7 as an access to works involved in plot 1/8. This impact would be minimal if the works were to be carried out between 1st November and 1st March so that unfettered access is available during the grazing period. Should the works continue past the 1st March, then the Agency should make immediate payment to Mr. Morris for additional feed costs for keeping the dairy herd for the longer period.

4.4 The acquisition of plot 1/6 for the inclusion of a temporary contractors' compound is not an essential requirement. It is normally the responsibility of the appointed contractor to negotiate for a compound area after the publication of the Scheme and Order and prior to work starting, thus letting the normal commercial market operate. This practice has never held up a scheme nor prevented one from taking place. The Highways Agency's original preferred location for the compound was to the north of the M40, but this has not been included in the CPO. The amount of land shown for the compound is excessive and should not include overnight accommodation for contractors' staff. A re-arrangement of the compound, an example of which is shown on document OBJ6/3, would result in a significantly reduced area.

4.5 The amount of land shown in plot 1/3 is excessive and the effect of the proposed landscaping could be achieved within a smaller area by reducing the size of the proposed mound to no more than 15 metres wide with a steeper slope on the southern boundary. Tree planting could be carried out on top of the revised mound.

4.6 The objection to the acquisition of plot 1/5 was originally withdrawn; however this was on the understanding that the Highways Agency would return this plot to Mr. Morris once the works were complete. As this undertaking has not been given, the objection remains. The plot is not required for the construction of the connecting road or any associated work. Although there would be no formal access to the land, this would not be necessary as any access could be gained from the C100. Mr. Morris requires the land to maximise the earnings from the farm.

The High Wycombe Society

4.7 The High Wycombe Society is an amenity society serving High Wycombe town. It strongly supports the main features of the proposed scheme, and does not object to the Connecting Road Scheme or the Compulsory Purchase Order, but objects to the proposed provision for NMUs.

4.8 A sustainable transport policy should seek to reduce the number and length of motorised journeys, helping to reduce congestion, CO_2 emissions and land required for roads and parking. There is a need to provide safe, attractive facilities for cycling and walking to encourage drivers and others to consider these alternatives which offer healthy exercise.

4.9 Cycling has declined since the mid 20th century when there was less traffic and large numbers cycled as a matter of course, often for long distances. Bicycles were used for leisure as well as transport, and the organisation Sustrans has developed a National Cycle Network which generally uses secluded routes such as canal paths, old rail tracks etc. However these are unsuitable for lone travellers, particularly during the hours of darkness, when travelling to work or school. For cycling to be used as a means of transport, routes which would be safe for cycling alone after dark are needed. These routes should be close to traffic, houses and work places but separated from heavy traffic, preferably by more than just a white line.

4.10 Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG 13) states that the level of cycling in the UK is significantly lower than that in a number of neighbouring countries which have taken steps to make cycle use attractive as a day to day means of transport. It recommends local authorities to develop land use policies and transport programmes which help to reduce the growth in the number and length of motorised journeys and encourage alternative means of travel which have less environmental impact.

4.11 Policy TR18 of the Buckinghamshire County Structure Plan (document D109) states that the County Council, in conjunction with the District Councils, will seek to provide facilities which assist the movement and parking of bicycles and encourage the development of cycling as a safe, convenient, healthy and non-polluting method of transport for journeys to work, school, shopping and recreation. Paragraphs 7.48 to 7.53 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (document D110) set out the District Council's objectives and policies which seek to encourage more and safer cycling.

4.12 The document TA/67/95, "Providing for Cyclists" (document D35) states that the location of at-grade crossings, whether controlled or uncontrolled, at slip roads of grade separated intersections should be avoided wherever possible, particularly where approach speeds are likely to be in excess of 40 miles per hour. If such crossings have to be provided they should be positioned away from locations where drivers might be applying maximum acceleration. It goes on to say that there is as yet no ideal solution to the problems encountered by cyclists at roundabouts. The choice is generally

between providing a peripheral cycle track around but away from the circulatory carriageway of the roundabout, or designing the approaches to the roundabout so that traffic entering the roundabout is brought down to a low entry speed, preferably 25 – 30 miles per hour.

4.13 The existing road layout is acknowledged as being hazardous, in particular cyclists and pedestrians are required to cross the on and off slip roads of the M40 without any protection.

4.14 The Highways Agency's proposal does not separate pedestrians and cyclists from vehicular traffic and involves additional crossings of the carriageway. Although these would be signal controlled and have pedestrian phases there are safety concerns in using the crossings for all except mature adults with experience of heavily trafficked roads; cyclists would not use this route because of delays in using the crossings. It relies on the signal controlled crossing points at five locations for the safety of NMUs. The road markings on the roundabout are complex and require a high level of concentration from drivers, and this leads to instances of red light jumping with the existing signals.

4.15 There is no justification for assuming that there is little demand for cycle facilities, nor for there being few attractions on the south side of the M40. Marlow is only some 5 kilometres from Handy Cross, and has housing, employment, recreation and a good rail service. The Highways Agency's proposed NMU route would do little to encourage cautious new cyclists, involving travelling round three sides of a rectangle instead of one with the High Wycombe Society's proposal, and cross to the centre of the roundabout and back again, each time crossing four lanes of traffic. The signal controls would delay traffic, increasing congestion contrary to the objectives of the scheme.

4.16 The Society's proposed alternative route is shown on drawing 3 attached to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Wallis (document OBJ1/4), but omitting the over bridge at John Hall Way, which is withdrawn. The route would follow the pavement from John Hall Way towards the M40 eastbound exit slip road where a subway would carry the route under the widened slip road. From this point the route would cross the M40 on a new foot/cycle bridge on the west side of the existing roundabout bridge from where it would cross under the westbound entry slip road in a further subway before rejoining the C100 Wycombe Road to cross over the proposed link road bridge.

4.17 Whilst there would be some steep gradients between the subways and the proposed new foot/cycle bridge these would be no greater than many of the hills around High Wycombe. Safety concerns about the use of subways could be addressed by efficient lighting and closed circuit television. The proposal would be a safer option than surface crossings of live traffic lanes.

4.18 The cost of the Society's alternative is some £1.598m and is detailed in document HA 16. It might be possible to reduce this by constructing a

foot/cycle bridge attached to the west side of the existing roundabout bridge. Further savings could be made by omitting the underpass under the eastbound exit slip road.

4.19 The total movements of NMUs across the M40 are approximately 17,600 per year, roughly divided equally between cyclists and pedestrians. This equates to some 352,400 movements over a 20 year period. There are likely to be more movements if the Highway Agency's scheme is built because the arrangements for NMUs may be perceived as being less hazardous and more pleasant; there is potential suppressed demand; and because of the Government's policy to encourage cycling to and from work.

CTC

4.20 The CTC does not object to the improvements to the highway capacity, and does not object to the Connecting Road Scheme or the Compulsory Purchase Order, but objects to the proposed provision for cyclists on the grounds that the proposed cycle route would not be a cycle route; that opportunity has not been taken to make positive provision for NMUs and the proposals do not reflect good practice.

4.21 The proposed cycle route would require cyclists to dismount and cannot therefore be considered as a cycle route. Handy Cross presents an ideal opportunity to demonstrate how positive provision for pedestrians and cyclists could be included in a programmed scheme. Approaches to the junction have high volumes of fast moving traffic, there are no current local authority plans to improve access to the junction and access by cycle using the northbound A404 would be more difficult with the proposed new slip road. The junction design would be to current design standards for motor vehicles, but not for pedestrians and cyclists. The layout would not conform to good practice guidelines, notably "Cycle-friendly Infrastructure Guidelines for Planning and Design" (Appendix 6 of Mr Coates' Proof of Evidence – document OBJ12/1), the main requirements being coherence, directness, attractiveness, safety and comfort.

4.22 The Highways Agency should work with the local authority to develop a proposal reflecting the requirements in the Guidelines. This should happen in conjunction with the proposed scheme for junction 4 as for practical, financial and strategic reasons it is very unlikely to be progressed independently.

4.23 The CTC supports the alternative proposals put forward and considers that these should be assessed by the Agency and appropriate measures included in the scheme currently being proposed.

Mr Honess

4.24 Mr Honess supports the scheme to improve the traffic flow at the junction, and does not object to the Connecting Road Scheme or the Compulsory

Purchase Order, but objects to the proposed provision for NMUs.

4.25 The proposed scheme is biased in favour of the motorist and the proposals for NMUs would be tortuous and unacceptably hazardous leading to fatal accidents, the cost of which would be over £1m each. The route for NMUs would also be of little value, as it would be on the west side of the junction.

4.26 Mr. Honess' proposes an alternative route for NMUs. An outline plan of this is shown on drawing No. 6 attached to Mr. Honess' Proof of Evidence (document OBJ2/1). It would be located on the east side of the junction and would start from the A404 Marlow Hill on the north east side of the junction, close to the Sports Centre and pass to the east of the roundabout, crossing the M40 and the two slip roads on the eastern side of the junction, to join the A404 south of the junction where it would continue alongside the A404 towards Maidenhead. This would enable walkers and cyclists to safely negotiate the junction.

4.27 The Highways Agency is developing a NMU crossing programme at some 1200 sites across the major road network. Proposals at this junction should be included in that programme.

Written objections

The material points are:

Little Marlow Parish Council

4.28 The Parish Council objects (correspondence folder 3) to the proposals in respect of pedestrian and cycle facilities. Pedestrian/cycle overpasses or underpasses, or a combination of the two should be provided. They would be safer and would not impact on the flow of traffic as would traffic signals.

The Chiltern Society

4.29 The Chiltern Society (correspondence folder 4) objects to the proposed provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Cycling and walking should be encouraged and facilitated by convenient, pleasant and safe routes. The M40 is a major obstacle for pedestrians and cyclists between Marlow and High Wycombe, with few motorway crossings. Junction 4 is one of these but is not suitable for inexperienced or less confident users.

4.30 The Society supports the alternative proposed by the Wycombe Society. A suggested alternative crossing via the tunnel approximately one kilometre west of junction 4 would not be an alternative, but would be complementary because they would serve different parts of High Wycombe.

Mr Kippax

4.31 Mr Kippax (correspondence folder 5) objects to the scheme on the grounds that traffic has grown on the A404 at Marlow leading to increased noise, and no mitigation action is planned. Road improvements may produce short term benefits to motorists, but in the medium to long term any such benefit would be eroded as more traffic uses the road, adding to the problems. Increased traffic would use Marlow at times of closure due to accidents etc., adding to congestion in the town.

4.32 The scheme would be an attempt to build a way out of trouble. A cheaper alternative to the proposed scheme would be the use of speed restrictions and enforcement. This would relieve the situation at the Bisham roundabout and at the M4 junctions as well as helping to alleviate noise for residents. The proposed scheme would increase traffic on the A404 and the problems that this could cause in Marlow, Bisham and Maidenhead have been ignored.

Mr Kersey

4.33 Mr. Kersey (correspondence folder 21) raises the question of increased traffic which the scheme would encourage.

5 THE CASE FOR THE COUNTER OBJECTORS

The material points are:

5.1 C. Morris and Son objects (document IN 6) to the proposal for a cycle and pedestrian track located to the east of the junction because of the likely impact of cyclists and pedestrians crossing or passing alongside fields and the cattle track.

5.2 Ms. Stanton objects (correspondence folder 16) to the proposed over bridge at John Hall Way as proposed by the High Wycombe Society because it would result in a lack of privacy and because of the likely impact on the security of her property. This part of the Society's alternative was withdrawn at the inquiry. She supports the alternative proposed by Mr. Honess.

6 WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

Written Support

The material points are:

6.1 Buckinghamshire County Council (correspondence folder 14) supports the

scheme because the junction is the main point of access to the M40 for traffic from the A404 and A4010 as well as for local traffic, and the existing junction regularly becomes congested. The County Council considers that the Highways Agency's proposals would be the best solution.

6.2 Councillor Cartwright (correspondence folder 15) supports the scheme because transportation is one of six priorities for the District Council and the junction plays a critical role both locally and within the region. The scheme would address current problems of delays to traffic, including bus and coach services; traffic diverting to other routes because of congestion; and the impact on local businesses and future development opportunities.

6.3 Mr. Young and Mr. Lambden (correspondence folders 9 and 10) support the scheme as going some way towards easing the problem of traffic congestion.

Written Representation by an Interested Party

The material points are:

6.4 Ms. McKean (correspondence folder 13) refers to traffic problems at Bisham and seeks improvements to these.

7 REBUTTAL BY THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY

The material points are:

Mr Morris

7.1 The Agency's intention would be to negotiate a temporary licence for plots 1/6, 1/7 and 1/8 and not to take title to the land. Use of this area for the scheme works would not substantially affect the character of the tenancy and if a temporary licence were agreed this would avoid Mr Morris having changes made to the tenancy over the land, which would be returned to him after the works have finished.

7.2 The Agency intends to instruct the contractor to carry out the works in plots 1/7 and 1/8 between 1st November and the end of February, and would write to Mr Morris to confirm this. Should the works overrun beyond the 1st March, then the cost of additional feed costs could be met from the compensation payable. Mr. Morris would be entitled to 90% of the Agency's estimated value of the total compensation upon entry to the land. This would effectively pre-pay Mr. Morris for the cost of the additional feed.

7.3 By including the contractor's compound in the CPO, the Agency seek to ensure that the land is available for the compound so that the scheme would not be delayed by the land not being available. The intention would be to acquire the land under temporary licence.

7.4 The form of procurement, involving early participation of the contractor, enables the Agency to establish the area of land required for the compound, access and working space and to include these in the Environmental Statement and CPO. Previous forms of procurement did not enable the Agency to identify land requirements for compounds prior to the draft CPO being published.

7.5 Alternative sites were investigated, but rejected in the case of land north of the M40. A site, owned by Wycombe District Council, was rejected because the land was allocated for development. A further site using the car park area attached to the UCI cinema was rejected because of inadequate access, risk to the public from large vehicles assessing a busy thoroughfare, inadequate space for storage and the effect on traffic safety resulting from reduced public parking. No Agency land was suitable and the area within the roundabout would not be of sufficient size and could not be provided with a safe access. Other sites for office accommodation in High Wycombe would not be suitable as they would be more than two kilometres from the works. The proposed site would be adjacent to the main works and would have safe access from the highway.

7.6 An illustrative plan showed some caravans for overnight accommodation; however accommodation is also needed for plant needing access to the storage area shown on plan 3 of Appendix B to document HA/OBJ/6/1, and for overnight parking. Caravans may be on site, but the areas would still be required whether the caravans were there or not.

7.7 Mr. Briggs' alternative layout for the compound would require the car parking to encroach on the permanent works area. If this were not done, there would be a risk because persons walking to and from their cars would not be separated for large construction vehicles. It would also involve installing stacking of accommodation/office units. This is an increased risk, particularly in inclement weather, because of the need for external staircases.

7.8 A plan showing the effect of adopting a compound which would have facilities for storage of materials, temporary works, stores for equipment, a small single office, local welfare services for workforce for meals, comfort breaks etc is shown on plan 0246/GD000636/GDD/SK – option 1 in document HA/14. This would have the effect of reducing the area of plot 1/6 to 1910 square metres.

7.9 The mounding in plot 1/3 has the objective of screening vehicles from the AONB, screening high vehicles and structures as quickly as possible and grading the mound to blend with the local contours.

7.10 A smaller mound some 15 metres wide as proposed by Mr. Morris would enable a similar width of planting to that currently proposed to be provided and would result in a mound of the same height as that proposed. However the steeper slope would not blend as effectively with the natural shape of

the area. The shadow Chilterns Conservation Board states that the change would have no greater impact on the Chilterns AONB than the original proposals and have no objection to it.

7.11 A plan showing the effect of adopting this smaller area is shown on plan 0247/GD000636/GDD/SK – option 2 in document HA/14 when combined with the compound as proposed by the Agency. This would reduce the area of plot 1/3 to 3732 square metres.

7.12 A plan showing the effect of adopting this smaller area together with the smaller compound is shown on plan 0248/GD000636/GDD/SK – option 3 in document HA/14. This would reduce the area of plot 1/3 to 3732 square metres and plot 1/6 to 2423 square metres. This is greater than the area for the smaller compound combined with the larger landscape plot because of the need to provide safe access from the highway.

7.13 Plot 1/5 would be required during construction, and afterwards to enable the planting in the area to be maintained and for the plot to be kept litter free. If the land were to be acquired permanently, then any compensation payable would take this into account.

The High Wycombe Society

7.14 The Agency's proposed scheme would improve the safety for both cyclists and pedestrians by providing extra width on the footpath/cycleway, controlled crossings, improved signing and provision of safety barrier guardrails, and the relocation to a safer position. There is always the risk of accident at any crossing, but the Agency's proposals would be safer than the existing uncontrolled crossings.

7.15 The Agency's scheme would safely accommodate up to 200 combined pedestrian and cycle movements per hour, a 25 fold increase on current flows. The pedestrian and cycle surveys show there is very low current use with little or no difference between weekend, midweek or during school holidays.

7.16 The main policies in PPG 13 relevant to pedestrians and cyclists are: -

- That the needs and safety of pedestrians and cyclists be given priority
- The provision of direct, safe and secure walking routes and reduced walking distances
- The provision of wider pavements and improved lighting and reallocation of road space for pedestrians
- The provision of pedestrian friendly road crossings, with priority

at traffic signals and avoidance of long detours and waiting

- Cyclist routes not to be isolated from other activities, so as to promote personal safety, and

- Giving priority at junctions and improving links, through the introduction of advanced stop lines, cycle by-passes, cycle gaps and contra flow cycle lanes.

7.17 The scheme would comply with these policies within the restriction imposed by the junction layout. Buckinghamshire County Council is proposing routes away from the junction which would improve facilities in the area in the long term.

7.18 The cost of a fully segregated footpath and cycleway would be some £1.598m for a separate footway/cycleway bridge over the M40 and two underpasses under each of the slip roads at both ends of the over bridge. The cost of the same scheme without the underpass under the eastbound exit slip road would be some £1.049m. Given the low number of accidents at this junction and low usage, money would be allocated elsewhere to NMU schemes with a higher priority. Document HA/16 shows the prioritised NMU schemes for The Agency's Area 3 which includes M40 Handy Cross. Junction 4 of the M40 is not included. There would be no priority for a scheme costing this amount of money in the programme.

7.19 The Agency's proposed scheme would result in an additional journey time of slightly less than three minutes more than the existing layout or the Society's proposal.

7.20 Whilst the Agency's proposed scheme does not provide the best provision for NMUs, it does provide a safe route having regard to the likely use. The additional gantry signing and road side signing would reduce the need for drivers to concentrate to ensure that they would be in the correct lane. This would reduce the incidence of red light jumping. In addition, the signalling system would incorporate short delays to ensure that traffic would be stationary before pedestrians and cyclists cross the carriageway.

CTC

Additional points are: -

7.21 The Agency's proposed route would involve cyclists dismounting from Marlow Old Road to the proposed new crossing at the eastbound M40 exit slip road (point 'Y' on drawing number 0245/GD00636/GDD/SK – Appendix A of document HA/OBJ/1/2), and those cycling from the A404 from High Wycombe would also have to cross the A404 dual carriageway. However, only one cycle per day was surveyed as making this movement and the Agency's proposal would be safer than the options now available. Although

it would not encourage cycling the proposal would cater for the likely low usage of some four movements per hour and could cater for up to 200 per hour safely.

7.22 At present there are no off-road facilities for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the M40 through the M40 junction.

Mr. Honess

Additional points are: -

7.23 The main NMU north-south movements through the junction are on the west side of the junction. A route on the east side would not serve these movements.

7.24 Mr. Honess' alternative proposal is not an alternative to the local need for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction, as it is a strategic route to provide an NMU Link from High Wycombe to the A4 at Maidenhead. The cost of such a scheme would be likely to be in excess of £2m and would need Orders and land. If there was justification for the scheme it could be considered as a separate scheme.

Mr. Kippax

7.25 The scheme is not an attempt to build a way out of trouble. The proposed scheme would deal with the immediate congestion problem at minimal cost and environmental impact in accordance with Government Policy. Speed restrictions and enforcement would not have a significant impact on the traffic growth.

7.26 Where resurfacing of the A404 is required it would be carried out with quieter surfacing material, however there are currently no plans for this.

7.27 Traffic growth is a nationwide problem, ways of managing demand in future will be considered. New roads would only be provided where there is a strong case. The Thames Valley Multi-Modal study has made recommendations about the motorway and trunk road network, including the A404.

Mr. Kersey

7.28 The scheme now proposed would deal with the immediate congestion problems at the junction at minimal cost and environmental impact. Its aim would not be to generate new strategic trips by road. However, some traffic might re-route to take advantage of the increased capacity. The predicted traffic in 2021 on the A404 south of the junction would be 55,600 vehicles annual average daily traffic without the scheme and this would rise to 70,900 with the scheme.

8 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Bearing in mind the submissions and representations I have reported, I have reached the following conclusions, reference being given in brackets to earlier paragraphs where appropriate.

8.2 If I am to recommend that the Connecting Road Scheme be made I need to be satisfied that, in accordance with Section 16(8) of the Highways Act 1980, having regard to local and national planning, including the requirements of agriculture, the scheme would be in the public interest. I need also to be satisfied that any adverse environmental impact would be proportionate, having regard also to the mitigation proposed.

8.3 If I am to recommend that the Compulsory Purchase Order be made, I need to be satisfied that

- there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest
- that this justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected, having regard, in particular, to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights
- that the acquiring authority has a clear idea of how it is intending to use the land it seeks to acquire, that all the land is required for the purpose of the scheme and that the acquisition is not premature
- that it can show that all necessary resources to carry out its plans are likely to be available within a reasonable timescale, and
- that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediment to implementation.

The Connecting Road Scheme

8.4 Only one objector opposes the construction of the scheme.

8.5 In considering the Connecting Road Scheme, it is clear that the scheme would provide significant benefits in terms of reduced congestion and queuing at the roundabout and that these benefits would amply justify the cost of the scheme [3.27]. It would perform well against the five key objectives set out in the White Paper [3.26], and other than for Green Belt policies, it is in accordance with local plan policies [3.24 & 3.25]. It is supported by the County Council and the District Council [3.25 & 6.1].

8.6 None of the objectors challenge the Environmental Statement. I have nevertheless considered this and conclude that the assessment is fair and reasonable. I have also considered the impact that the scheme would have on the environment.

8.7 Overall there would be a reduction in the impact of noise if the scheme

were to be provided compared to the situation without the scheme [3.30]. Although there would be a slight deterioration in air quality, all pollutant concentrations are predicted to remain below the national air quality standards [3.32]. In terms of landscape, the scheme would have a moderate adverse effect on the high landscape quality of the rural area to the south of the junction. However planting and landscaping would reduce this to slight adverse when these mature in 15 years [3.34 & 3.35].

8.8 There would be no direct effect on the built heritage, and no Scheduled Monuments, Area of Archaeological Importance, archaeological features or Registered Battlefields would be affected [3.36]. There would be a slight adverse impact on ecology and nature conservation in the opening year due to the loss of some woodland planting. This would change to slight beneficial when the proposed replacement planning matures [3.40]. Taking account of the mitigating measures proposed there would be no impact on water quality [3.42].

8.9 The statutory consultees to the Environmental Statement either have no comment or confirm that, in the case of English Nature and the Environment Agency, that proposed mitigation measures for wildlife and drainage respectively are appropriate [3.45, 3.46 & 3.47].

8.10 I have taken account of the Environmental Statement and other environmental information, including comments and representations made by statutory consultees and members of the public and I conclude that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the likely environmental impact when the proposed mitigation measures are taken into account.

8.11 The scheme would affect the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and would result in the loss of some 1.83 hectares of agricultural land. However the impact would be limited to the extreme edge of the AONB and the effect would be no more than slight adverse once the proposed landscaping had matured [3.34, 3.35].

8.12 Taking account of the views of the shadow Chilterns Conservation Board [3.48] together with the limited impact that the scheme would have on the edge of the Area, I conclude that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the effect on the AONB.

8.13 Part of the scheme would be within the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is clear that the proposal would be inappropriate development and, from paragraph 3.2 of PPG2, would therefore be harmful to the Green Belt [3.56]. The nature of the harm would be by reducing the openness of the area affected by the proposed new link road and associated works. It would also cause harm by encroaching into the countryside, in conflict with the 3rd purpose of including land in the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2. It would not however conflict with the other purposes in paragraph 1.5. In terms of the harm, the area affected would be confined to the edge of the Green Belt and would account for some 1.83 hectares compared with the 50,000 or so hectares of Green Belt within Buckinghamshire [3.56]. The

likely visual impact would be limited to slight adverse once the proposed landscaping had reached maturity [3.34 & 3.35]. The likely harm is therefore summarised by its inappropriateness and by limited reduction in openness and by limited encroachment into the countryside.

8.14 There were no objections to the scheme on the grounds of the likely impact on the Green Belt, and both the County Council, who have responsibility for the Structure Plan, and the District Council, who have responsibility for the Local Plan, strongly support the scheme [6.1 and 3.25]. Of the consultees to the Environmental Statement, only the District Council refers to the effect on Green Belt, stating that the scheme could give rise to conflict with local policies in relation to this, but that the transportation improvements may justify the development [3.48].

8.15 Paragraph 3.2 of PPG2 states that very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In this case, the benefits are those to the users of the junction [3.27]. I have also noted that the proposals would have a lesser impact on the Green Belt than other solutions considered [3.56], and I consider that the benefits would outweigh the harm which would be caused to the Green Belt. I conclude that very special circumstances exist in this case which justify allowing inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

8.16 In terms of agriculture, the scheme as proposed would require permanently some 1.83 hectares of Grade 3a agricultural land and some further 1.13 hectares during construction [3.49, 3.50 and 3.51]. This would be from the one holding, Handy Cross Farm. The amount lost permanently and during construction would amount to some 1% of the holding [3.52]. Notwithstanding consideration of Mr. Morris' objection to the CPO, this represents a small impact on agricultural interests; the effect of which I consider is outweighed by the benefits that the scheme would provide.

8.17 I conclude therefore that with the proposed mitigation measures in place, the environmental impact would be proportionate.

8.18 Mr. Kippax contends that the scheme is inappropriate and cheaper options would be as effective, and that increased traffic would have implications for areas away from junction 4 of the M40 [4.31 & 4.32]. However, the scheme is aimed at dealing with the immediate congestion problem with minimal cost and environmental impact in accordance with Government Policy [7.25]. Speed restrictions would not impact significantly on traffic growth [7.25] and no evidence was put forward how this option would achieve the objectives of the proposed scheme, or how the effect of increased traffic would outweigh the benefits of the proposed scheme. The issue of increased traffic was also raised by Mr. Kersey. However, although the scheme may be expected to increase traffic at the junction, this is largely due to re-routed or re-distributed traffic rather than generated new trips [3.5].

8.19 The issue raised by Ms McKean is not related to the current draft Scheme and Order.

8.20 None of the objectors disagrees with the Appraisal Summary Table (AST) except insofar as the non-motorised user (NMU) provision is concerned. The NMU issue does not directly affect the Scheme and is a matter of how the Highways Agency proposes to exercise their general powers in respect of NMUs. I have however considered the scheme in the light of these objections in assessing whether it complies with local and national planning, and is in the public interest. I deal with this in dealing with the objections to the NMU proposals.

The Compulsory Purchase Order

Mr. Morris

Plots 1/7 and 1/8

8.21 I note Mr. Morris' concerns about the impact that the temporary removal of these plots from his holding might have and the concerns about the severance of the grazing land during winter [4.3]. However, Mr. Morris does not suggest that the plots are not necessary, or that an alternative should be adopted. The Highways Agency has given the assurances Mr. Morris seeks on the temporary licence [7.1], timing of works and has explained that the additional feed costs in the event of the works overrunning could be met from the compensation payable [7.2]. I trust that the negotiations for a temporary licence would be successful, but if they were to fail I conclude that in, respect of these plots, there is a compelling need in the public interest.

Plot 1/6

8.22 I have considered the issue of plot 1/6 in three stages. The necessity for it, its proposed location and size.

8.23 In terms of necessity, it is clear that some form of area is needed for construction purposes, for storage of materials and working space [7.4]. It is also not contested that some form of contractor's compound is needed [4.4]. Mr. Morris' case is not that the land is not necessary, but that the acquisition should be by normal market operation. This could however be argued for any of the other land needed for the scheme. The test is whether or not the land is required for the purpose of the scheme and that there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest. My conclusion is that if the scheme is in the public interest and, as shown by the evidence, plot 1/6 is necessary for the scheme, then the acquisition of plot 1/6 is also in the public interest.

8.24 In terms of location, alternatives have been investigated, but these have been rejected either because of safety concerns, because they would either

be on land scheduled for development or would be too remote from the site. It would be adjacent to the main works and would have a safe access from the highway [7.5]. In view of the distance from the works of the options for the location of the compound to the north of the M40, and the safety concerns about the use of land within the roundabout, I consider that the likely safe access from the highway and the location adjacent to the works makes a compelling case for the proposed location when compared to these alternatives.

8.25 In terms of size, I have considered Mr. Morris' alternative proposal for a smaller area [4.4]. However this would either restrict the availability of the area needed for the permanent works or would raise safety concerns in the operation of the compound [7.7]. I have also considered the option of a compound which would provide for storage, temporary works, small single office and local welfare services. However this would still require land to be found by the contractor for office and vehicle storage, and no evidence was provided as to how this would be achieved, other than through normal market operations. I also note that, although some overnight accommodation is shown on the layout of the proposed compound, the area shown would still be required whether these were present or not [7.6].

8.26 I also note that the Highways Agency would seek a temporary licence for this plot and that this would not impact on the future security of Mr. Morris' tenancy [7.3].

8.27 On balance I consider that the disadvantages of the alternatives do not persuade me to recommend them. I conclude therefore that the land is needed, temporarily, for the scheme and that there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest and that this justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected, having regard, in particular, to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights.

Plot 1/3

8.28 Mr. Morris contends that the effect of the proposed landscaping could be achieved within a smaller area than that proposed in the draft Order [4.5]. I note that the smaller area would enable a similar width of planting, and although the steeper slope would not blend as effectively with the natural shape of the area, the Chilterns Conservation Board has no objection to this [7.10]. I therefore consider that the smaller area would adequately achieve the effect of the proposals contained in the draft Order and that the Order should be modified accordingly. The effect of this on plots 1/3 and 1/6 is shown on plan 0247/GD000636/GDD/SK – option 2 in document HA/14. The area of plot 1/3 would be amended to 3732 square metres and that of plot 1/6 to 3957 square metres in the accompanying schedule.

Plot 1/5

8.29 The necessity for plot 1/5 for constructing the works is not contested. Mr.

Morris wishes to retain this within his holding; this relates to maximising his income [4.6]. However, I note that this could be taken account of in the compensation payable, and the plot is also required for planting and the subsequent maintenance of the landscaped area [7.13]. On the clear basis that the plot is required for the scheme, I conclude that the proposed acquisition is in the public interest. I also accept the Agency's need to retain the land for subsequent maintenance purposes.

Summary

8.30 It is clear that the Highways Agency has a clear idea of how it is intending to use the land it seeks to acquire [3.54], that all necessary resources to carry out its plans are likely to be in place [3.2 & 3.55], and the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediment to its implementation [3.55].

8.31 I consider therefore that, with the Compulsory Purchase Order modified as indicated in paragraph 8.28, all the land is required for the scheme, there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest and that this justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected, having regard, in particular, to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights.

8.32 I conclude that the Compulsory Purchase Order should be made, with plots 1/3 and 1/6 modified as shown on plan 0247/GD000636/GDD/SK – option 2 in document HA/14 and that the area of plot 1/3 be modified to 3732 square metres and that of plot 1/6 to 3957 square metres in the accompanying schedule. The modification would, not in my view, amount to a substantial change to the Order and therefore the making of the Order would not need to be delayed to allow for further statutory procedures to be followed.

Non-motorised user provision

8.33 There is no doubt that the alternative put forward for NMUs by the High Wycombe Society and supported by the Little Marlow Parish Council, CTC and the Chiltern Society, would be an ideal route for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the M40 at junction 4, providing a route separated from traffic from John Hall Way to the C100 Old Marlow Road. However the proposal would be an expensive option involving the construction of three new structures [7.18]. It would still be expensive even with the suggested modifications to omit one of the under bridges and replace the separate bridge over the M40 with a structure built on to the existing over bridge [7.18]. There are no great numbers currently making this movement, indeed, there are only some 4 per hour [3.20], and although the objectors consider that there is suppressed demand [4.15 & 4.19], no substantive evidence was put forward on how much would be generated and I note that there is capacity in the Agency's proposals for up to 25 times the current usage [7.15]. Also the location does not feature as any form of priority in the prioritised list for NMU schemes [7.18].

8.34 I have noted the concerns about the likely safety of the draft proposals [4.25, 4.28 & 4.29]. However, although the Agency's proposals would involve crossing the carriageway, this would be via signal controlled crossings with pedestrian facilities incorporated which would enable pedestrians to cross in greater safety than at present [7.14]. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns about red light jumping [4.14], in my view the safeguards on signal timing which would be incorporated [7.20] would ensure that traffic would be stationary before pedestrians and cyclists crossed. Although the published proposals would not be ideal for NMUs, and would not fully meet the standards referred to by High Wycombe Society and CTC [4.12 & 4.21], they would be much safer than the existing arrangement which does not have controlled crossings at all points, and does not have any pedestrian phases incorporated into the signals [3.6, 3.7 & 3.8]. It would provide a safe and adequate route having regard to the likely use [7.20]. I do not consider that it would be unacceptably hazardous [4.25].

8.35 I conclude therefore that the additional benefits that the alternative would provide would not justify the likely cost in the light of the expected usage and I recommend that this should not be investigated further.

8.36 The alternative proposed by Mr. Honess, which is supported by CTC and Ms Stanton, would be a strategic long distance route. As well as being expensive, in excess of £2m, it would also not deal with the main movements at the junction [4.25 & 7.23]. In the light of the high cost, I do not consider that the expected increased cost of the scheme to incorporate this option would be justified by the likely benefits. However there would be nothing to prevent this scheme being considered at a later date should it be considered to be justified in its own right [7.24].

8.37 I have however considered the proposed cycling provision in the light of these objections and note that the proposals would require that cyclists dismount at a number of points when using the proposed route [4.21]. Taking account of the need to dismount in order to use the footway from John Hall Way [7.21] and to use the islands at the A404 and A4010 crossings, there would be a significant length of the route for which cyclists would be required to walk. This is not in my view an entirely satisfactory means of catering for cyclists.

8.38 I therefore recommend that the Highways Agency seeks, with the County Council, a means of permitting cyclists to ride on that part of the route from the A404 Marlow Hill to the crossing point on the eastbound exit slip road of the M40 (point 5 on drawing 3 attached to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Wallis (document OBJ1/4)).

8.39 I have considered the possible impact on the AST. This assesses the likely effect on physical fitness as being slightly beneficial because improved pathways and pedestrian/cyclist crossing facilities at the junction would encourage greater pedestrian and cyclist activity between the urban fringe to the north of the M4 and the rural area to the south with potential for

improved physical fitness [3.43]. However, the scheme would do little to encourage cycling [7.21], and no evidence was presented to substantiate how the scheme would achieve this. I conclude that, in my view, the effect of the scheme on physical fitness would be neutral. I do not however consider that this issue is sufficiently significant for me to recommend that the Scheme is not made.

Summary

8.40 I conclude that, having regard to local and national planning, including the requirements of agriculture, the scheme is in the public interest and that the Connecting Road Scheme should be made as drafted.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 I recommend

i) that the M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Connecting Road Scheme 200 be made, and

ii) that the M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Compulsory Purchase Order (No…..) 200 be modified as detailed in paragraph 8.32 and that the Order so modified be made.

N R Taylor

INSPECTOR

APPENDIX A

APPEARANCES

For The Highways Agency

Mr. D. Forsdick	of Counsel, instructed by The Treasury Solicitor
He called:	
Mr. P. R. Barnett, BSc CEng MICE MIHT	Project Sponsor, Highways Agency
Mr. G. Tanfield, BSc MA MLI	Landscape Architect, Hyder Consulting
Mr. A. Field, BA (Hons) MSc AIEMA MBIAC	Director, Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd.
Mr. B. Doughty, BSc CEng MICE	Project Design Director, Hyder Consulting
Mr. T. Athayde	Edmund Nuttall Ltd.

Objectors

For Mr. R Morris

Mr. E. H. S. Briggs MRICS FAAV	Partner, Faulkners, Chartered Surveyors, 49 High Street, Kings Langley, WD4 9HU

For The High Wycombe Society

Dr. C. M. Woodman, BA MSc PhD CBE	The High Wycombe Society, 39 Sunnycroft, Downley, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP13 5UQ
He gave evidence and called:	
Mr C. L. Wallis, CEng MICE MIOC	
Dr. E. Woodward, BSc CChem PhD	

For CTC

Mr. N. Coates, local representative	103 West End Road, High Wycombe, HP11 2QF

Individual Objectors

Mr. B. Honess, local resident	The Sycamores, Magpie Lane, Loudwater, Buckinghamshire, HP13 7BA

Appendix B

DOCUMENTS

Inquiry and Pre-inquiry documents

IN 1	Attendance lists
IN 2	Folders of correspondence with objectors, supporters and those making representations
IN 3	Inquiry notice
IN 4	Draft Connecting Road Scheme
IN 5	Draft Compulsory Purchase Order
IN 6	Letter from C. Morris and Son
IN 7	Letter from Little Marlow Parish Council

Proofs of Evidence

NB. The proofs of evidence are as submitted. The statements and opinions they contain may have been amended or withdrawn during the course of examination during the inquiry

Promoting Authority

PA/1/1	Summary Proof of Evidence of Mr. Barnett - Govt Policy & Overview of Scheme
PA/1/2	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Barnett - Govt Policy & Overview of Scheme
PA/1/3	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Mr. Barnett - Govt Policy & Overview of Scheme
PA/2/1	Summary Proof of evidence of Mr. Tanfield - Landscape Effects
PA/2/2	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Tanfield - Landscape Effects
PA/2/3	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Mr. Tanfield - Landscape Effects
PA/3/1	Summary Proof of Mr. Field - Land Use
PA/3/2	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Field - Land Use
PA/4/1	Summary Proof of Mr. Doughty - Non Motorised Users Route
PA/4/2	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Doughty - Non Motorised Users Route

PA/4/3	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Mr. Doughty - Non Motorised Users Route

Rebuttals

HA/OBJ 1/1	HA Rebuttal to The High Wycombe Society (Dr. Woodward)
HA/OBJ 1/2	HA Rebuttal to The High Wycombe Society (Mr. Wallis)
HA/OBJ 1/3	HA Rebuttal to The High Wycombe Society (Dr. Woodman)
HA/OBJ 2/1	HA Rebuttal to Mr. Honess
HA/OBJ 6/1	HA Rebuttal to Faulkners (Mr. Briggs) on behalf of Mr. Morris
HA/REP 12/1	HA Response to Cyclists Touring Club (Mr. Coates)

Objectors

OBJ1/2	Proof of Evidence of Dr. Woodward
OBJ1/4	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Wallis
OBJ1/5	Proof of Evidence of Dr. Woodman
OBJ2/1	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Honess
OBJ6/1	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Briggs
OBJ12/1	Proof of Evidence of Mr. Coates

Documents produced at the Inquiry

By Promoting Authority

HA/1	Compliance with Statutory Procedures Report
HA/2	Justification of Land In the draft Compulsory Purchase Order
HA/3	Highways Agency Opening Statement by Counsel
HA/4	Correspondence with Faulkners regarding use of plot 1/5
HA/5	Extract from Agricultural Holdings Act 1 986
HA/6	Explanatory Note accompanying Agricultural Holdings Act 1986
HA/7	Agricultural Tenancy Act 1995

HA/8	Section 239 of Highways Act 1 980
HA/9	CD of Audio Visual Presentation of the Scheme
HA/10	Effect of scheme on Green Belt and AONB
HA/11	HA Press Release HA 079-04 - "£1 bn Boost for National Strategic Roads"
HA/12	National Schemes - South East: Issued with HA/1 1
HA/13	HA response to Mr T. Kippax
HA/14	Options for CPO Amendments at Handy Cross Farm
HA/15	List of NMU Priority Action Sites on M40
HA/16	Summary of Agreed Alternate NMU Scheme Costs
HA/17	HA response to Mr P. Kersey
HA/18	Final Schedule of Objections, Representation, Supporters, Counter Objectors and Counter Supporters
HA/19	Highways Agency closing Statement

By Objectors

OBJ1/1	Opening statement of High Wycombe Society
OBJ1/3	Supplementary Statement by Dr. Woodward
OBJ1/6	Letter from Chairman, High Wycombe Society, confirming that Dr. Woodman is authorised to represent the Society
OBJ1/7	Community Plan for Wycombe District & Wycombe Development Framework – Imagine the Future – part 2, Consultation Document
OBJ1/8	Press cuttings
OBJ1/9	Closing Statement
OBJ6/2	Extract from the Agricultural Tenancies Act 1995
OBJ6/3	Plan showing alternative layout for site compound at Plot 1/6
OBJ6/4	Example of office accommodation in High Wycombe
OBJ6/5	Plan of Handy Cross Farm
OBJ6/6	Letter from Highways Agency dated 1st December 2004

OBJ6/7 Letter from Faulkners dated 1st December in reply to OBJ6/6

Deposit documents

Government Policy

D1 A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone. The Government's White Paper on the Future of Transport (1998)

D2 A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England (1998)

D3 A Targeted Programme of Improvements. Highways Agency Strategic Plan for Improving the Network

D4 A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England: Guidance on the New Approach to Appraisal (1998)

D5 Transport 2010: The 10-year Plan (2000)

D6 A Better Quality of Life: A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK (1999)

D7 Transport – Jam Tomorrow – The MMS Investment Plans (House of Commons Select Committee) – April 2003

D8 The Government's Response to the Transport Select Committee's Report Jam Tomorrow? The Multi-Modal Study Investment Plans – June 2003

Legislation

D9 Highways Act 1980

D10 Acquisition of Land Act 1981

D11 Land Compensation Act 1973

D12 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

D13 Water Resources Act (1991)

D14 Groundwater Regulations (1998)

D15 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1988 (SI 1988/1241)

D16 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1994 (SI 1994/1002)

D17 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/369)

D18	Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (SI 1975/1763)
D19	Noise Insulation (Amendment) Regulations 1988 (SI 1988/2000)
D20	The Highways (Inquiry Procedures) Rules 1994 (SI 1994/3263)
D21	The Compulsory Purchase by Ministers (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994 (SI 1994/3264)
D22	EC Directive on Environmental Assessment (85/337/EEC)
D23	Directive 97/11/EC
D24	Control of Pollution Act 1974
D25	Environmental Protection Act 1990
D26	Part IV of the Environment Act 1995, Local Air Quality Management, Technical Guidance LAQM.TG (03)
D27	Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000
D28	Nature Conservation Regulations - RAMSAR Convention and EC Directive on the conservation of wild birds (79/409/EEC)
D29	The EC Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (92/43/EEC) also called the Habitats Directive
D30	The Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 1994, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
D31	The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW Act)

Draft Scheme and Order

D32	The M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Connecting Road Scheme 200 .
D33	The M40 Motorway Junction 4 (Handy Cross) Compulsory Purchase Order (No.) 200 .

Supporting Technical Documents

D34	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Vol. 4 Sec 2 Pt 1 HA103/01 Vegetative Treatment Systems for Highway Runoff
D35	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 5 Sec 2 Pt 4: TA67/95 Providing for Cyclists
D36	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 5 Sec 2 Pt 1: TD36/93 Subways for Pedestrians and Pedal Cyclists Layout and Dimensions
D37	Interim Advice Note IAN 28/00 Trunk Road Traffic Calming

D38	Not Used
D39	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: HD19/03 Road Safety Audits
D40	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 6 Sec 1 Pt 1: TD9/93 Highway Link Design
D41	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 6 Sec 1 Pt 2: TD27/96 Cross-sections and Headrooms
D42	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 6 Sec 2 Pt 3: TD50/99 The Geometric Layout of Signal-controlled Junctions and Signalised Roundabouts
D43	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 6 Sec 3 Pt 3: TA57/87 Roadside Features
D44	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 8 Sec 3: TA 49/86 Appraisal of New and Replacement Lighting on Trunk Roads and Trunk Road Motorways
D45	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 8 Sec 3: TD 34/91 Design of Road Lighting for Motorway Trunk Roads
D46	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Volume 9:
D47	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol.10: Environmental Design
D48	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 11: Environmental Assessment
D49	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 12: Traffic Appraisal of Road Schemes
D50	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Vol. 13: Economic Assessment of Road Schemes
D51	Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment, Institute of Environmental Assessment (1995)
D52	Biodiversity and Environmental Impact Assessment – A Good Practice Guide for Road Schemes 2000
D53	A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England: Understanding the New Approach to Appraisal (1998)
D54	CHE MEMO 36/96; Liaison with National Rivers Authority on Highway Construction and Maintenance Schemes.
D55	Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (HMSO) 1998
D56	TRL Report LR756: Prediction of Noise from Road Construction Sites (1977)

D57 British Standards 5228 Part 1 1997: The Code of Practice for Basic Information and Procedures for Noise and Vibration Control

D58 Value for Money Manual, Part 5 (HMSO), (1996)

D59 Guidance on the Methodology for Multi Modal Studies (GOMMMS, Vol. 1) (2000)

D60 Guidance on the Methodology for Multi Modal Studies (GOMMMS, Vol. 2) (2000)

D61 Applying the Multi-Modal Approach to Appraisal to Highway Schemes ('The Bridging Document') (2001)

D62 H. M. Treasury revised edition of its Green Book, Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government, (2003)

Scheme Specific Documents

D63 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Non Technical Summary of the Environmental Statement

D64 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Display Boards used at the Public Exhibition held at Bassetbury Manor, 05-06 December 2003

D65 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Newsletter No. 1

D66 Not Used

D67 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Structures Options Report 0010_GD00636_GDR_R

D68 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Environmental Scoping Report 0003_GD00636_GDR_R

D69 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Road Layout Report 0016_GD00636_GDR_R

D70 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Report 0017_GD00636_GDR_R

D71 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Departures From Standard Report 0020_GD00636_GDR_R

D72 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Land Reference Schedule 0021_GD00636_GDR_R

D73 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Road Safety Audit Stage 1 Designer's Response 0029_GD00636_GDR_R

D74 M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Non-Motorised Users' Route Report 0031_GD00636_GDR_R

D75	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Local Model Validation Report 0033_GD00636_GDR_R
D76	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Traffic Forecasting Report 0034_GD00636_GDR_R
D77	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Environmental Statement Volume 1 0035_GD00636_GDR_R Volume 1 of 3
D78	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Environmental Statement Volume 2 0035_GD00636_GDR_R Volume 2 of 3
D79	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Environmental Statement Volume 3 0035_GD00636_GDR_R Volume 3 of 3
D80	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Scheme Assessment Report 0040_GD00636_GDR_R
D81	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Pre-Orders Exhibition Report 0042_GD00636_GDR_R
D82	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Pre-Orders Exhibition Report Appendices B and C 0044_GD00636_GDR_R
D83	Not Used
D84	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Economic Assessment Report 0043_GD00636_GDR_R
D85	M40 Junction 4 / A404 Handy Cross Improvements – Road Safety Audit Stage 1 Brief – 0014_GD00636_GDR_R
D86	Handy Cross Integrated Transport Study 1999-2000
D87	Stage 1 Scheme Assessment Report

Scheme Drawings

D88	Drawing No. 0017_GD00636_GDD_SK Preferred Option NMU Route
D89	Drawing No. 0162_GD00636_GDD_SK Western M40 Overbridge – Parapet Modifications
D90	Drawing Nos. 0150_, 0151_, 0169_, 0170_ and 0171_GD00636_GDD_SK – Gantries 1-5 General Arrangements
D91	Drawing Nos. 0140_, 0141_, 0142_, 0143_ and 0144_GD00636_GDD_SK Drainage Design Sections A to E
D92	Drawing Nos. 0040_ and 0041_GD00636_GDD_SK Traffic Signal Layouts
D93	Drawing Nos. 0028_ and 0030_GD00636_GDD_SK Regulatory and Advanced Directional Signage

D94	Drawing Nos. 0046_ and 0047_GD00636_GDD_SK Road Marking Layouts
D95	Drawing No. 0001_GD00636_GDD_PD Preferred Layout Option Plan
D96	Drawing No. 0002_GD00636_GDD_PD Connecting Road Layout Plan
D97	Drawing No. 0003_GD00636_GDD_PD Section 4 Agreement Plan
D98	Drawing No. 0004_GD00636_GDD_PD Land Reference Plan
D99	Drawing No. 0005_GD00636_GDD_PD Departures from Standards Layout Plan
D100	Drawing No. 0006_GD00636_GDD_PD Environmental Master Plan
D101	Drawing No. 0007_GD00636_GDD_PD Land Use Plan
D102	Drawing No. 0005_GD00636_GDD_SK Structure Names
D103	Drawing Nos. 0081_, 0082_, 0083_, 0084_ and 0085_GD00636_GDD_SK Lighting Design Sheets 1 to 5 of 5
D104	Drawing No. 0149_GD00636_GDD_SK Wycombe Road Overbridge
D105	Drawing No. 0146_GD00636_GDD_SK North East Retaining Wall
D106	Drawing No. 0147_GD00636_GDD_SK South East Retaining Wall
D107	Drawing No. 0018_GD00636_ENV_SK Environmental Base Plan
D108	Drawing No. 0018_GD00636_GDD_SK Preliminary Land Interest Plan

Local Authority Plans

D109	Buckinghamshire County Council Structure Plan 1991-2011
D110	Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011
D111	Buckinghamshire County Council Local Transport Plan

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Regional Planning Guidance

D112	PPG1 General Policy and Principles (February 1997)
D113	PPG7 The Countryside - Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development (February 2001)
D114	PPG13 Transport (March 2001)
D115	PPG23 Planning and Pollution Control (February 1997)
D116	PPG24 Planning and Noise (July 1994)

Others

D117 Highways Agency Statement of Case