



Adran yr Economi a'r Seilwaith
Department for Economy and Infrastructure

Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Amendment) Scheme 201-

The London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Order 201-

The M4 Motorway (West of Magor to East of Castleton) and the A48(M) Motorway (West of Castleton to St Mellons)(Variation of Various Schemes) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and The London to Fishguard Trunk Road (east of Magor to Castleton) (Side Roads) Order 201-

The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton)) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) (Supplementary) Scheme 201-

The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) and The London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton)) Supplementary Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

Erratum

Andrew Meaney, BSc (Hons) MSc

Port Economics

Document Reference: WG 1.4.4

1. Introduction

1.1 This document provides specific updates to comments made in erratum in my Proof of Evidence, (WG1.4.1). In general these corrections relate to changes to the explanatory text in my Proof, and do not affect my analysis or its conclusions; nevertheless I would like to present the correct information for the record.

2. Revisions

2.1 There are six revisions I would like to make to my Proof.

2.2 First, in paragraph 3.6.2 of my Proof, I refer to the percentage impediment associated with the Scheme, on the basis of deadweight tonnage of vessels that can no longer access North Dock with the bridge in place. I say that over the period 2005 to 2015, the total deadweight tonnage of vessels arriving at Newport Docks was 33.5 million tonnes; however, this should be 34.7 million tonnes. The percentage impediment is correct, at 1.6% for this calculation, and the calculations relied on the correct figures.

2.3 Second, in paragraph 3.7.6 of my Proof, I said that Mr Vine shows that berth capacity for a vessel of this size would be needed on 242 days over the last 11 years, and that on all but 10 days, there was sufficient space at the South Dock to accommodate this. Table 6-8 of Mr Vine's Proof shows that in fact reallocation is only needed on 121 days, and is possible in the South Dock on all but 5 days.¹ This does not affect my analysis.

2.4 Third, paragraph 4.4.15 of my Proof states that the Sibert Note (i.e. Appendix F to the Proof of Evidence of Ben Sibert, WG 1.5.3) has land loss shares of 20.3% and 11.6%. These numbers are indeed stated by Ben Sibert, although I shall add that they relate to CPO MOD2. For completeness, the numbers in the draft CPO are, according to Ben Sibert, 20.2% and 11.5%. This does not affect my analysis.

¹ The Proof of Evidence of Mr Jonathan Vine, WG 1.7.1. Table 6-8.

2.5 Fourth, Table 4.6 of my Proof mentions as the upper bound “Area currently rented to affected Tenants (at North Dock only)”. It should say “Area currently rented to affected Tenants”, i.e. this area relates to both North and South Dock. This does not affect my analysis.

2.6 Fifth, there are some referencing errors: Paragraph 5.2.5 should refer to Tables 5.1 to 5.5; paragraph 5.2.6 should refer to Table 5.1; and paragraph 6.5.3a refers to footnote 106 but should refer to footnote 107.

2.7 Sixth, Paragraph 4.2.4 should read: ‘I note that Newport’s acreage of 685 acres provided by ABP is slightly less than the area calculated by Geraint Jones and Ben Sibert of Arup (692 acres, the ‘Sibert Note’).’