

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



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Objection Ref OBJ6912

FILE REF WG/REB/OBJ6912/FSB

Response to Objector's Evidence:

Federation of Small Businesses (Wales)

1. GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION

1.1. Details

- 1.1.1. The Federation of Small Businesses (Wales) (the 'FSB') has resubmitted its consultation response to the M4 Corridor around Newport draft Plan dated 16 December 2013 as its Statement of Evidence in relation to the draft statutory Orders associated with the Welsh Government's proposals for the M4 Corridor around Newport, which has been received via the Programme Officer.
- 1.1.2. The Welsh Government understands the evidence submitted within the FSB's Statement to be based on the following:
1. Suggested the forecast traffic produced in the consultation does not present an accurate description of future growth as the TEMPRO model does not represent past trends, whilst other forecasts do not take into account the recession, and that the TEMPRO model has limitations and assumptions are based on economic activity and car ownership rather than any projected changes in modal split with no interpretation of the impact of major rail investment.
 2. Suggested factors such as modal shift, increases in car/petrol costs, spatial planning policies and the increase in mobile and communication technology (for instance Superfast Cymru) have not been taken into account.
 3. Suggested the forecasts are weakened by the omission of proposed wider Welsh Government infrastructure investments
 4. Suggested the Welsh Government has two key policies which would have an impact on congestion in and around Newport, the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 and the development of a South East Wales Metro. The metro could "address the Region's existing transport problems including congestion at key points on the road network (M4 J32-34, Newport & the A470 into Cardiff) and minimise the need for further congestion measures; avoiding costs of potentially hundreds of millions to 2030. Estimated reductions in peak traffic of around 20-30 per cent were seen following the introduction of similar schemes for example with the Bordeaux Tram Network and the Newcastle upon Tyne Metro.

5. Suggested the proposals do not take into account the Welsh Government's stated policies on sustainable transport and that investing in a South East Wales Metro would seem to better meet Welsh Government criteria around social inclusion, equality, diversity and human rights.
6. Suggested the three routes proposed in the consultation are unsuitable for numerous reasons and that a viable potential alternative – the so-called 'Blue Route' – has been left out of the consultation, which would cost an estimate £400m or 31 per cent of total borrowing capacity, allowing for investment in the other projects.
7. Suggested the Welsh Government should re-evaluate the measures that are needed in and around the M4 in Newport within the wider context of transport investment in Wales and present a range of updated, costed options to help alleviate the problems identified.
8. Suggested the affordability of the project has been properly examined. No cost implications are included in the consultation and there is no mention of the extent of capital borrowing powers available to Welsh Government to facilitate such a development. Questioned whether such a concentration of borrowing capacity is an equitable use of resources, particularly if more viable interventions are possible that could achieve the same aims.
9. Suggested that The Eddington Review stated that smaller projects are likely to offer the highest returns, whilst large projects with speculative benefits and relying on untested technology, are unlikely to generate attractive returns.
10. Suggested the current consultation does not meet the needs of businesses in South East Wales, while marginalising the problems faced as a result of transport issues faced by businesses elsewhere in Wales.
11. Suggested the environmental impact of the proposals is not properly assessed and the potentially extremely significant cost in both time and money of an environmental challenge is not considered.
12. Suggested all three options presented in the current consultation would incur significant environmental costs, particularly regarding the Gwent Levels SSSI.

2. REBUTTAL

2.1. Points Raised

2.1.1. Some of the above points have already been addressed in previous proofs of evidence. Others are dealt with by topic by the relevant witness in the following sections, in addition to their general proofs of evidence, to which readers should also make reference in their entirety for a full understanding of the Welsh Government's case. For ease of reference the places where the above points are addressed in this Rebuttal are listed in the table below:

Objector's point reference	Rebuttal paragraph reference	Objector's point reference	Rebuttal paragraph reference
1	2.2.1	7	2.3.2
2	2.2.2	8	2.3.2
3	2.2.3	9	2.4.1
4	2.2.4	10	2.4.2
5	2.3.1	11	2.3.3
6	2.3.2	12	2.3.3

2.2. Bryan Whittaker (Traffic)

2.2.1. Response to **Point 1** (Suggested the forecast traffic produced in the consultation does not present an accurate description of future growth as the TEMPRO model does not represent past trends, whilst other forecasts do not take into account the recession, and that the TEMPRO model has limitations and assumptions are based on economic activity and car ownership rather than any projected changes in modal split with no interpretation of the impact of major rail investment):

1. Section 4.2 of the Revised Traffic Forecasting Report (Document 2.4.13, updated at Document 2.5.2) describes the background to the Department for Transport's National Trip End Model (NTEM), which is made available through the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPRO). The NTEM datasets are long-term forecasts, representing the DfT's estimate of the long-term response to demographic and economic trends. Modelling guidance states that future year forecasts should be based on NTEM growth in demand, so allowing local transport models to be developed on a consistent basis.

2. Currently NTEM provides growth forecasts from 2011 onwards. These take account of observed trends such as declining trends in some trip rates and a lack of traffic growth, due in part to economic conditions. As these are forecast to improve in the future, the DfT takes the view that there is reason to believe the decline will not continue at its current rate in the long term. The latest NTEM central growth scenario therefore is based on the latest trip rate review and assumes a declining trend in trip rates between its base year of 2011 and 2016 and then constant trip rates thereafter.
 3. It is not the function of the NTEM forecasts to consider the potential for modal shift as a result of, for example, major rail investment. NTEM forms the basis of the development of the Reference Case travel demand. As explained in Chapter 9 of the Revised Traffic Forecasting Report (Document 2.4.13), the Reference Case demand forms an input to the Variable Demand modelling process within the M4CaN transport model. This process adjusts the reference forecasts to take account of changing variations in travel costs. This includes the effect on modal shift on changing public transport travel costs that might result from, for example, major rail investment.
 4. In any case, the Welsh Government has considered the potential impact of investment in public transport including improvements in rail, and have concluded that these would not change the need for a new section of motorway to the south of Newport in order to address the identified problems now and in the future. Further information is provided in response to Point 3 (below).
- 2.2.2. Response to **Point 2** (Suggested factors such as modal shift, increases in car/petrol costs, spatial planning policies and the increase in mobile and communication technology (for instance Superfast Cymru) have not been taken into account):
1. Considerable effort has been made to build a model which takes account of projected changes in public transport service levels. The M4CaN transport model takes into account the Great Western Route Modernisation, opening of new Stations on the Valley Lines (Metro Phase 1) + Valley Lines Electrification (Phase 2). Outside the M4CaN transport

model, further rail elements of a South Wales Metro and a strategic Park and Ride site at Llanwern together with Newport Bus Rapid Transit have been assessed to estimate the potential effect on traffic flows on the existing M4 Corridor. This assessment is set out in the Updated Public Transport Overview (2.4.19) and further information is provided in the Inquiry Document ID/073..

2. The predicted changes in fuel costs, together with changes in the mix of petrol, diesel and electric vehicles, are all included in the DfT's forecast values of time and vehicle operating costs, and are therefore taken into account in the determination of travel costs within the Variable Demand modelling process.
3. Section 4.4 of the Revised Traffic Forecasting Report (Document 2.4.13, updated at Document 2.5.2) describes how local uncertainty in travel demand and supply has been addressed in the forecasting process. This includes the impact of local development proposals on the Reference Case forecasts produced from NTEM, so that current spatial planning policies are taken into account in the M4CaN transport model.
4. With regard to developments in mobile and communication technology, while teleworking may have some potential to reduce commuting traffic, the 'Smarter Choices Report' by UCL, Transport for Quality of Life, The Robert Gordon University and Eco-Logica to the Department for Transport noted a number of secondary effects that could limit the overall impact:
 - a. The employee may make other journeys by car during the day (for example to take the children to school or to visit the shops), which previously might have been made as part of a linked trip if she or he had been driving to work;
 - b. Another family member may take advantage of the fact the car is available, for example to drive to work when he or she would previously have used public transport; and
 - c. In the longer term, teleworking could encourage people to live further from their work. The benefit of reduced travel time on teleworking days would be offset (in part or even in whole) by increased travel on days when the employee travelled to work.

5. The report also noted that the effect of teleworking would be greater with a small number of employees who telework most of the time, than with a greater number of employees who only telework occasionally. In many organisations, however, while occasional teleworking may be feasible, the scope for employees to spend most of their time teleworking is likely to be limited. Indeed, the 'Smarter Choices Report' makes the point that some jobs do not lend themselves to teleworking.

2.2.3. Response to **Point 3** (Suggested the forecasts are weakened by the omission of proposed wider Welsh Government infrastructure investments):

1. In making this suggestion, the FSB mistakenly concludes that the impact of modal shift from the South East Wales Metro is not taken into account. As noted in my response to Point 2 above, the M4CaN transport model takes account of the projected changes in public transport service levels arising from the Metro proposals, including the Great Western Route Modernisation, opening of new Stations on the Valley Lines (Metro Phase 1) + Valley Lines Electrification (Phase 2). Outside the M4CaN transport model, further rail elements of a South Wales Metro and a strategic Park and Ride site at Llanwern together with Newport Bus Rapid Transit have been assessed to estimate the potential effect on traffic flows on the existing M4 Corridor. This assessment is set out in the Updated Public Transport Overview (2.4.19) and further information is provided in the Inquiry Document ID/073..
2. The combined effect of these public transport measures is to reduce M4 traffic by a maximum of 6%, which does not resolve the M4 problems. The assessment confirms the Welsh Government position that the M4 proposal and the Metro schemes are complementary to each other.

2.2.4. Response to **Point 4** (Suggested the Welsh Government has two key policies which would have an impact on congestion in and around Newport, the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013 and the development of a South East Wales Metro. The metro could "address the Region's existing transport problems including congestion at key points on the road network (M4 J32-34, Newport & the A470 into Cardiff) and minimise the need for further congestion measures; avoiding costs of potentially hundreds of millions to 2030. Estimated reductions in peak traffic of around 20-30 per cent were seen following the

introduction of similar schemes for example with the Bordeaux Tram Network and the Newcastle upon Tyne Metro):

1. The Active Travel (Wales) Act requires Welsh Government and local authorities to improve walking and cycling facilities in Wales. While such initiatives may have some impact in reducing car usage for short distance trips on the local network, its impact in reducing longer distance movements by cars using the strategic network, including the M4 around Newport, is likely to be negligible.
2. My response to Points 1,2 and 3 above illustrates the extent to which the M4CaN transport model takes account of the South Wales Metro proposals. The combined effect of these public transport measures is to reduce M4 traffic by a maximum of 6%, which does not resolve the M4 problems. The assessment confirms the Welsh Government position that the M4 proposal and the Metro schemes are complementary to each other.
3. The predicted reduction in traffic is much smaller than that claimed by the FSB for the Bordeaux tram network or the Tyne and Wear Metro. The 20-30% reduction is taken from Professor Stuart Cole's submission to the National Assembly for Wales in 2013. This submission, however, gives no indication of the source of these figures, so it is not possible to verify these claims. But it might be expected that a greater reduction in peak traffic volumes could be achieved on the radial routes of an urban area which is the focus of a new metro scheme, than could be achieved for a strategic motorway serving longer-distance movements that have multiple origins and destinations across a wide area.

2.2.5. I confirm that the statement of truth and professional obligations to the inquiry from my main proof still applies.

2.3. Matthew Jones (Chief Witness)

2.3.1. Response to **Point 5** (Suggested the proposals do not take into account the Welsh Government's stated policies on sustainable transport and that investing in a South East Wales Metro would seem to better meet Welsh Government criteria around social inclusion, equality, diversity and human rights):

1. Section 9 of Matthew Jones' evidence (WG1.1.1) explains how public transport and the metro proposals have been taken into account, clarifying that the Scheme "in collaboration with our proposals for a South Wales Metro, it forms a vital part of the Welsh Government's vision for an efficient and integrated transport network for Wales."
2. The Scheme has clearly been developed in collaboration and integration with the Metro. For example, the proposed Glan Llyn junction connects to the 4000 home, 6000 job new community planned at Glan Llyn, including a new Metro station. The proposed new Magor junction enhances access to Severn tunnel junction park and ride, encouraging modal shift, and a new section of cycleway in the area completes a continuous cycleway link from Magor to central Newport. It has also been developed in collaboration with our plans for rail electrification and includes measures to promote cycling and walking.
3. The Scheme includes 4 new bridleways and 2 new public footpaths and provides for all footpaths to be maintained after construction. It does not preclude the Welsh Government and local authorities from other actions to improve provision for walking and cycling to complement the improvement of the strategic road network embodied in the Scheme.
4. Congestion on the motorway currently affects the roads in Newport, causing delays and making it difficult for those who rely on public transport. The Scheme would address a range of problems and sectors. It would assist businesses that rely on road transport; it would make it easier for employees to get to work both by car and public transport; it would make it easier for everyone to travel within and outside the City by road whether they use private or public transport.

5. Furthermore, by reducing congestion on the existing M4 and providing a more resilient motorway network the Scheme would provide better opportunities for people to access employment, education and training, social and other opportunities.
 6. It does not preclude the Welsh Government and local authorities from other actions to improve provision for walking and cycling to complement the improvement of the strategic road network embodied in the Scheme. For these reasons it would arguably reduce social exclusion.
 7. It should be noted too that a Health and Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and can be found at Environmental Statement Appendix 5.4 (Document 2.3.2), which explains the net health benefits that the Scheme would provide as a result of addressing the transport problems on the M4 around Newport.
 8. WG1.1.1 section 18 outlines that “The Welsh Government considers that there is a compelling case for the Scheme and that the public interest necessitates temporary and permanent acquisition of land and rights. As aforementioned, the Scheme is considered to be the sustainable, long term solution to the social, environmental and economic problems associated with the main gateway into South Wales.”
- 2.3.2. Response to **Points 6, 7 and 8** (Suggested the three routes proposed in the consultation are unsuitable for numerous reasons and that a viable potential alternative – the so-called ‘Blue Route’ – has been left out of the consultation, which would cost an estimate £400m or 31 per cent of total borrowing capacity, allowing for investment in the other projects) and (Suggested the Welsh Government should re-evaluate the measures that are needed in and around the M4 in Newport within the wider context of transport investment in Wales and present a range of updated, costed options to help alleviate the problems identified) and ((Suggested the affordability of the project has been properly examined. No cost implications are included in the consultation and there is no mention of the extent of capital borrowing powers available to Welsh Government to facilitate such a development. Questioned whether such a concentration of borrowing capacity is an equitable use of resources, particularly if more viable interventions are possible that could achieve the same aims):

1. As set out in section 3 of my Proof of Evidence (WG1.1.1); since the early 1990s, numerous assessments and consultations have been undertaken to develop a solution to the transport related problems associated with the M4 around Newport. The history of the route development and its reviews are described in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document 2.3.2) at sections 4.3.9 to 4.3.12.
2. A suggested alternative was submitted to the Welsh Government in responses to the M4 Corridor around Newport draft Plan consultation, referred to as the 'Blue Route'. The Blue Route was sometimes described as improvements to the Newport A48 Southern Distributor Road (SDR), and A4810 (previously known as the Steelworks Access Road). The suggested alternative was then published by Professor Stuart Cole in an Institute of Welsh Affairs (IWA) paper titled 'The Blue Route: a cost effective solution to relieving M4 congestion around Newport' (December 2013).
3. Whilst works to the A48 SDR and A4810 have previously been ruled out as individual solutions as they separately did not fulfil the objectives set for the draft Plan, the combined effect of these proposals was then re-examined as the Blue Route, following the submission of the Blue Route paper by respondents to the draft Plan consultation in 2013. Assessment concluded that the Blue Route would not address the problems or achieve the objectives of the M4 Corridor around Newport.
4. An Appraisal of Objectors' Alternative Blue Route Proposals Report (Document 6.2.35) reconsiders the Blue Route and reconfirms it would not address the problems or achieve the objectives of the M4 Corridor around Newport. The Blue Route is being considered at the Inquiry as an objectors' suggested alternative, as presented within the Objectors' Suggested Alternatives Report (Document 2.4.2).
5. Separate rebuttals to Cycling UK who are promoting the Blue Route at the Inquiry have been provided to the Inquiry, which should be read for further information about the Blue Route and its appraisal (WG/REB/OBJ0247).

6. As stated in WG1.1.1 para 24.17, the Scheme is considered by Welsh Government to be the long term, sustainable solution to the serious problems experienced on the M4 around Newport. In collaboration with our proposals for a South Wales Metro, it forms a vital part of our vision for an efficient and integrated transport network for Wales. There is a compelling case in the public interest for the Scheme to proceed.
 7. Proof of Evidence WG1.1.1 paragraph 13.5 explains that funding for the delivery of this project has been explicitly identified and provision set aside within the Welsh Government's published capital plans for the next four years. Allocations are not made beyond a 4 year period but suitable forecasts are in place to enable assurance to be given that the full funding requirements associated with the project are available within a reasonable timescale should the decision be taken to proceed.
 8. The Scheme would be funded through a combination of UK Government borrowing and Welsh Government Transport capital budgets. The Welsh Government would not be allocating the full amount of our borrowing capacity to this scheme, important though it is. The balance of the current borrowing limit, over £500m, will be available to fund schemes in other parts of Wales from 2018/19 onwards when Stamp Duty & Landfill Tax are planned to be devolved to Welsh Government.
- 2.3.3. Response to **Points 11 and 12** (Suggested the environmental impact of the proposals is not properly assessed and the potentially extremely significant cost in both time and money of an environmental challenge is not considered) and (Suggested all three options presented in the current consultation would incur significant environmental costs, particularly regarding the Gwent Levels SSSI):
1. Environmental matters are summarised in section 14 of Proof of Evidence WG1.1.1. The assessment of environmental impacts and effects of the Scheme, including consideration of the construction phase, are reported in detail in the ES together with mitigation measures. A Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Environmental Impact Assessment is included in Volume 1 of the ES and as a free-standing document (Document 2.3.3). This describes environmental matters in easy to understand language.

2. The development of appropriate mitigation measures has been an integral part of development of the Project and the subject of regular meetings and dialogue with representatives of Natural Resources Wales, Cadw, the relevant Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.
 3. Particular consideration has been given to potential impacts on the Gwent Levels Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Severn Estuary SAC, Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. This recognises duties including Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, The Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
 4. Further details on the environmental engagement as well as the process of assessing the effects on the different aspects of the environment, the proposals for suitable mitigation and the overall conclusion of the effects of the Scheme are set out in Dr Peter Ireland's Proof of Evidence (WG 1.7.1).
 5. I acknowledge the Scheme would result in a number of environmental benefits on the existing M4, but would also introduce a variety of adverse environmental impacts along the proposed new section of motorway. Those impacts have been mitigated as far as practicable to avoid, reduce or remedy the effects.
 6. Matthew Jones (WG1.1.1) and John Davies (WG1.23.1) considers the balance of environmental, social and economic issues and impacts of the Scheme, concluding that the Scheme is considered by Welsh Government to be the long term, sustainable solution to the serious problems experienced on the M4 around Newport. In collaboration with our proposals for a South Wales Metro, it forms a vital part of our vision for an efficient and integrated transport network for Wales.
- 2.3.4. I confirm that the statement of truth and professional obligations to the inquiry from my main proof still applies.

2.4. Stephen Bussell (Economics)

2.4.1. Response to **Point 9** (Suggested that The Eddington Review stated that smaller projects are likely to offer the highest returns, whilst large projects with speculative benefits and relying on untested technology, are unlikely to generate attractive returns):

1. The Eddington Report supports the case for investment in transport in general terms. Eddington states in paragraph 1 on page 5:
2. *'This Study demonstrates that the performance of the UK's transport networks will be a crucial enabler of sustained productivity and competitiveness: a 5 per cent reduction in travel time for all business travel on the roads could generate around £2.5 billion of cost savings – some 0.2 per cent of GDP. Good transport systems support the productivity of urban areas, supporting deep and productive labour markets, and allowing businesses to reap the benefits of agglomeration. Transport corridors are the arteries of domestic and international trade, boosting the competitiveness of the UK economy.'*
3. Above all, the Eddington Report (paragraphs 9 and 10 on page 6) recommends a targeted approach to transport investment.
4. *'To meet its economic goals for transport, Government should prioritise action on those parts of the system where networks are critical in supporting economic growth, and there are clear signals that these networks are not performing. On this basis, the strategic economic priorities for long-term transport policy should be growing and congested urban areas and their catchments; and the key inter-urban corridors and the key international gateways that are showing signs of increasing congestion and unreliability.'*
5. Investing in the M4CaN Scheme is in step with this approach.

2.4.2. Response to **Point 10** (Suggested the current consultation does not meet the needs of businesses in South East Wales, while marginalising the problems faced as a result of transport issues faced by businesses elsewhere in Wales):

1. As Matthew Jones explains in his evidence (WG1.1.1), numerous assessments and consultations have been undertaken to develop a solution to the transport related problems associated with the M4 around Newport since the early 1990s. In particular, as part of the M4 CEM Programme, a comprehensive engagement process was launched in September 2010 culminating in a public consultation being held on different options and their associated transport, health, equality and environmental assessments, between March and July 2012 (Document 4.3.7). During this period more than 100 possible measures were considered including network improvements, travel planning, demand management and alternative modes of transport. A wide range of individuals with an interest in the economy, society and environment responded to the consultation exercise, and feedback helped Ministers decide to adopt the Plan for the M4 Corridor around Newport (see section 3 of Matthew Jones' evidence for further information).
2. Matthew Jones' evidence (WG1.1.1) at paragraph 22.2 explains that in response to the draft Orders consultation in March 2016, 199 unique correspondence letters or emails were received that clearly express support for the Scheme. Of these, 59 appear to have been written on behalf of a company or organisation, including a range of businesses.
3. The CBI and South Wales Chambers of Commerce have given evidence at this inquiry (SUP167 and SUP132 respectively) which suggests that the proposed scheme will better meet the needs of Welsh businesses. In the CBI's evidence the feedback from members was summarised as follows:

CBI members have, over many years, consistently called for action to relieve congestion on the M4 around Newport. The need for a relief road has been recognised and members have consistently called for it since the early days of devolution. Members consistently view it as an impediment to doing business in Wales due to the high levels of congestion and the resultant uncertain travel times. Our members inform us that the lack of a safe, resilient and swift motorway corridor to England has a corrosive impact upon investment decision making.

4. The M4 is the primary route in and out of Wales for around 70% of the country's economy. It provides access for all parts of South Wales to the South West of England, the South East and London. It is also the most heavily used transport infrastructure in Wales. Congestion on the M4 around Newport results in delays both for inter-urban or inter-regional east-west travel, but also for a range of other journeys including for commuters traversing through South Wales. In this context, whilst the direct effects of the Scheme will be felt most keenly by Newport, Monmouthshire and Cardiff, it is reasonable to expect that the benefits of the Scheme will be felt over a wide area.
5. Moreover, areas of South Wales are already highly connected and interdependent. This is demonstrated by existing commuting patterns (2011 Census) which show that 40% of jobs located in Newport are filled by those resident outside of the City. In this context, the whole of South Wales is dependent on the economic performance of the urban areas along the M4 corridor. This, in essence, is the basis for the city-region agenda which is shaping economic development policy in South Wales.

2.4.3. I confirm that the statement of truth and professional obligations to the inquiry from my main proof still applies.

Annex – Correspondence List

Date	In/Out	Author	Email/Letter/Meeting
21/03/2017	Out	Welsh Government	Email
21/03/2017	In	FSB	Email
22/03/2017	In	FSB	Email

Correspondence

From: Matthew Williams [<mailto:Matthew.Williams@fsb.org.uk>]
Sent: 22 March 2017 09:42
To: Jones, Matthew (ESNR-Transport-Infrastructure Delivery)
Cc: Ben Cottam; Janet Jones
Subject: RE: M4 Corridor around Newport Project - Public Inquiry

Matt,

I'm assuming this is a mistake in the timetable – we are not intending on submitting oral evidence and I have had discussions with the inquiry around this. I have emailed the programme officer to get this corrected too.

The request was a holding request pending our decision to participate or not.

Best
Matt

From: Janet Jones
Sent: 21 March 2017 22:27
To: Matthew.Jones@wales.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: Matthew Williams; Ben Cottam
Subject: Re: M4 Corridor around Newport Project - Public Inquiry

Hi Matt,

Thank you for your email. I'll check tomorrow with the office and someone will get back to you.

Incidentally, our Policy Advisor is Matthew Williams and I've copied him in also.

Kind regards,

Janet

Janet Jones
Welsh Policy Chair
South Wales Region Chair
Federation of Small Businesses
07970 208767

Sent from my iPad

On 21 Mar 2017, at 21:57, "Matthew.Jones@wales.gsi.gov.uk"
<Matthew.Jones@wales.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Janet

I've found your contact details through the FSB website. I'm the Welsh Government Project Engineer and Chief Witness for the M4 Corridor around Newport Project which you will likely be aware is currently the subject of a Public Inquiry being held in Newport.

Whilst FSB have not registered objection or support for the draft Orders published for the project in March 2016 it has come to my attention that FSB have requested to appear at the Inquiry and the appearance is scheduled for 30 March 2017. I understand the request was made by your Matthew Williamson, for whom I've attempted to guess the email address as a cc to this email.

Can you firstly please confirm whether FSB are supporting or objecting to the draft Orders, or neither.

Those wishing to appear at inquiry were requested by the Inspectors to provide evidence by 7 February (Refer to minutes of the Pre-Inquiry Meeting [here](#)). I am not aware that any evidence has been received to date, so if it remains your intention to appear I kindly ask that it be provided urgently to allow us to consider it and provide a response.

Should you have any queries more generally regarding the proposals I would be happy to answer them and, if useful, arrange a meeting with myself or relevant members of the team.

More information regarding the project, including business case documents and environmental reports can be found at www.gov.wales/m4newport.

Cofion/Regards
Matt

Matt Jones BEng CEng MICE
Peirannydd Prosiect / Project Engineer
Trafnidiaeth / Transport
Adran yr Economi a'r Seilwaith / Department for Economy and Infrastructure
Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government
Parc Cathays, Caerdydd / Cathays Park, Cardiff
CF10 3NQ
Ffon / Tel: 02920 826616 07712 765 506
E-bost / E-mail: Matthew.Jones@Wales.gsi.gov.uk

On leaving the Government Secure Intranet this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Wrth adael Mewnwyd Ddiogel y Llywodraeth nid oedd unrhyw feirws yn gysylltiedig â'r neges hon. Mae'n ddigon posibl y bydd unrhyw ohebiaeth drwy'r GSi yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.

On leaving the Government Secure Intranet this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Wrth adael Mewnwyd Ddiogel y Llywodraeth nid oedd unrhyw feirws yn gysylltiedig â'r neges hon. Mae'n ddigon posibl y bydd unrhyw ohebiaeth drwy'r GSi yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.