

A417 Missing Link
TR010056

7.3 Statement of Commonality

Planning Act 2008

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 7

May 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A417 Missing Link

Development Consent Order 202[x]

7.3 Statement of Commonality

Regulation Number:	5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010056
Application Document Reference	7.3
Author:	A417 Missing Link

Version	Date	Status of Version
C01	May 2021	Application Submission

Table of Contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	2
2	Structure of Statements of Common Ground	3
3	List of Statements of Common Ground	4
	3.1 Parties subject to an SoCG	4
	3.2 Engagement with SoCG organisations	5
4	Summary of current position	6
5	Commonality	10
6	Current position	11
	6.1 Local authorities	11
	6.2 Prescribed consultees	11
	6.3 Interested parties	13
7	Statutory Undertakers Position Schedule	16
	Appendices	i
Appendix A	Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Joint Councils	ii
Appendix B	Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency	iii
Appendix C	Draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England	iv
Appendix D	Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England	v
Appendix E	Draft Statement of Common Ground with Cotswolds Conservation Board	vi
Appendix F	Draft Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	vii
Appendix G	Draft Statement of Common Ground with the National Trust	viii
Appendix H	Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group	ix

Table of Tables

Table 3-1	List of Parties entered into an SoCG with Highways England	4
Table 4-1	Summary of current position of SoCGs at time of DCO submission	7
Table 5-1	Table of Commonality at DCO submission	10
Table 7-1	Statutory undertakers position schedule	16

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Commonality has been prepared by Highways England (as the Applicant) to accompany an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the A417 Missing Link scheme (the scheme).
- 1.1.2 This document has been prepared to provide the Examining Authority (ExA) with the current position on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and prescribed consultees and other interested parties in relation to the scheme. The document also demonstrates where there is commonality on specific points between the SoCGs.
- 1.1.3 This document will be updated at each deadline during the Examination of the scheme to reflect the current position of the SoCGs.
- 1.1.4 This document also sets out the current position between Highways England and statutory undertakers affected by the scheme.
- 1.1.5 This document has been prepared and submitted in compliance with Regulation 5(2)(q) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 ('the APFP Regulations') which states:
"The application must be accompanied by ... any other documents considered necessary to support the application."
- 1.1.6 A detailed description of the scheme can be found in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 2 The Project (Document Reference 6.2).

2 Structure of Statements of Common Ground

- 2.1.1 To ensure consistency in the approach taken to documenting matters agreed, matters subject to further negotiation or matters not agreed, each of the SoCGs adopted a standard format in order to provide clarity to other parties and ultimately the ExA.
- 2.1.2 Each SoCG has the following structure:
- Section 1: provides an introduction to the SoCG and a description of its purpose.
 - Section 2: describes the role and where relevant, the responsibilities, of the other party (or parties) in the SoCG and summarises the engagement that has occurred between the Applicant and other party (or parties).
 - Section 3: sets out the topics covered in the SoCG.
 - Section 4: sets out the matters which are agreed.
 - Section 5: sets out the matters which are subject to further negotiation or which are not agreed.
 - Appendix A: the signing sheet for the SoCG.
- 2.1.3 In some instances, parties subject to an SoCG have not been able to determine a position on a matter until they can receive and review the published DCO documents, such as the ES. Where this is the case, some SoCGs include an appendix containing such matters.
- 2.1.4 Also, additional appendices may be provided in the SoCG containing any relevant documents or information that are referenced in the SoCG and do not otherwise form part of the DCO application.

3 List of Statements of Common Ground

3.1 Parties subject to an SoCG

- 3.1.1 Highways England has prepared SoCGs with a number of parties during the preparation of the DCO application. This includes organisations with which Highways England has a statutory duty to consult with, under section 42 of the Act. It also includes other organisations which have an interest in the scheme and with whom Highways England has engaged with and formally consulted.
- 3.1.2 The parties with which Highways England has prepared an SoCG are listed in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3-1 List of Parties entered into an SoCG with Highways England

Party
Local Authorities (as defined under section 42(1)(b) of the Act)
1. The 'Joint Councils' comprising Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council
Prescribed Consultees (as defined under section 42(1)(a) of the Act)
2. Natural England (NE) 3. Environment Agency (EA) 4. Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE), more commonly known as 'Historic England' 5. Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) ¹
Other Interested Parties
6. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (GWT) 7. National Trust (NT) 8. Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group (WCH TWG): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Gloucestershire; • British Horse Society (BHS); • Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Gloucestershire; • Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign; • Cotswold District Council; • Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly Cotswolds Conservation Board); • Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership; • Cycling UK; • Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) PRoW officer; • GCC transport officer; • GCC ThinkTravel Coordinator; • Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF); • Gloucestershire Ramblers; • Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust; • National Trust; • Natural England; • Sustrans; • The Disabled Ramblers; and • Trail Riders Federation.

¹ The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) is a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), managed and looked after by the Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB)

3.1.3 As Table 3-1 identifies, some organisations are represented both within an individual SoCG and within the SoCG with the WCH TWG. To avoid duplication where appropriate, cross-references are provided between SoCGs where organisations agree or disagree with WCH matters. Furthermore, the organisations listed at 2, 5, 6 and 7 in Table 3-1 have agreed that they will only sign their own SoCG but are content to have their views on WCH matters recorded in the separate WCH TWG SoCG.

3.2 Engagement with SoCG organisations

3.2.1 As set out in the Consultation Report submitted with the DCO application (Document Reference 5.1), Highways England has sought to engage with the parties listed in Table 3.1 throughout the development of the scheme. This has included the following activities:

- Non-statutory public consultation in 2018 on route options for the scheme (Chapter 3 of the Consultation Report);
- Non-statutory consultation and engagement between 2019 and 2021 (Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report);
- Statutory public consultation between 27 September 2019 and 8 November 2019 (Chapters 5 to 7 of the Consultation Report);
- Supplementary statutory public consultation between 13 October 2020 and 12 November 2020 (Chapters 8 to 10 of the Consultation Report); and
- Additional, targeted statutory consultation with land interests (Persons with an interest in Land 'PILs') was carried out during January 2020 and March 2021 (Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report).

4 Summary of current position

4.1.1 This section provides the current position of each SoCG.

4.1.2 Table 4-1 provides a high-level position and where necessary includes further detail to aid understanding. The high-level positions used in the table are:

- **SoCG in draft** – The SoCG has been drafted by the Applicant, it has been shared with the other party and comments have been provided. Discussion is ongoing to reach a ‘Final Signed SoCG with all matters agreed’ or ‘Final Signed SoCG with matters outstanding’.
- **Final Signed SoCG, all matters agreed** – The final SoCG has been signed by both parties and all matters are agreed.
- **Final Signed SoCG, with matters outstanding** – The final SoCG has been signed by both parties, and there remain matters outstanding that the Applicant and the other party agree will not be resolved during the Examination of the scheme.

4.1.3 Where SoCGs have been submitted with matters subject to further discussion (‘SoCG in draft’), all parties will continue to review these matters in order that a final update can be provided during the Examination.

4.1.4 Table 4-1 also provides a document reference which will be used for each SoCG once signed and submitted to the ExA. Any draft SoCGs updated at each deadline will be appended to this document.

Table 4-1 Summary of current position of SoCGs at time of DCO submission

Document Reference	Party (or Parties)	Position at time of DCO submission	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 2	Position at Deadline 3	Position at Deadline 4
Local Authorities						
7.3.1	Joint Councils [Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council]	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix A of this document				
Prescribed Consultees						
7.3.2	Environment Agency	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix B of this document				
7.3.3	Natural England	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix C of this document				

Document Reference	Party (or Parties)	Position at time of DCO submission	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 2	Position at Deadline 3	Position at Deadline 4
7.3.4	Historic England	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix D of this document				
7.3.5	Cotswolds Conservation Board	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix E of this document				
Interested Parties						
7.3.6	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix F of this document				

Document Reference	Party (or Parties)	Position at time of DCO submission	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 2	Position at Deadline 3	Position at Deadline 4
7.3.7	National Trust	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix G of this document				
7.3.8	WCH TWG	SoCG in draft and agreed for submission with DCO application on 07/05/2021. Provided at DCO submission as Appendix H of this document				

5 Commonality

5.1.1 This section of the document provides a summary of principal topics covered in the SoCGs and highlights where topics have been agreed, are subject to further discussion, or where a topic is not agreed.

5.1.2 The summary in Table 5-1 is presented in such a way to show topics covered within the various SoCGs and any position for each topic. The topics are defined at a high-level to enable overview and comparison and may not reflect the structure of each individual SoCG. The topics have been defined where possible to broadly align with those of the Environmental Statement (ES), which comprises Volume 6 of the DCO application. Table 5.1 shows topics covered within the various SoCG and how these are relevant to each other party. It provides a position for each topic as follows:

	Matter agreed
	Matter subject to further discussion
	Matter not agreed
	Matter not relevant to party / not included in SoCG

Table 5-1 Table of Commonality at DCO submission

SoCG Ref	Party	Broad topics considered in SoCG and current position																									
		Principle of Development	Project Description	Consultation	Consideration of Alternatives	EIA Methodology	Air Quality	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Visual	Biodiversity	Geology, and Soils	Material Assets and Waste	Noise and Vibration	Population and Human Health	Public Rights of Way	Drainage/Water Environment	Climate	Cumulative effects	De-Trunking	Traffic and Transport	Crossings of the A417	Engineering Design	Draft DCO	Land	Environmental Management Plan	Construction Traffic Management Plan	
7.3.1	Joint Councils																										
7.3.2	Environment Agency																										
7.3.3	Natural England																										
7.3.4	Historic England																										
7.3.5	Cotswolds Conservation Board																										
7.3.6	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust																										
7.3.7	National Trust																										
7.3.8	WCH TWG																										

6 Current position

6.1.1 This section provides a summary of the current position between the Applicant and each other party, where there are matters outstanding. The individual SoCG should be referred to for the full detail on specific matters.

6.1 Local authorities

Joint Councils

6.1.1 The SoCG with the Joint Councils is included at Appendix A of this document.

6.1.2 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.

6.1.3 The most recent SoCG meeting with the Joint Councils was held on 6 May 2021.

6.1.4 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:

- a) The provision of lighting on the scheme;
- b) The approach to archaeological trenching and cultural heritage assessment methodology; and,
- c) The effects of the scheme on the local road network and the requirement, in the view of the Joint Councils, for funding to mitigate such effects.

6.1.5 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the Joint Councils is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES.

6.1.6 Highways England and the Joint Councils will therefore continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG. Discussions will be aided by the Joint Councils being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

6.1.7 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

6.2 Prescribed consultees

Environment Agency (EA)

6.2.1 The SoCG with the EA is included at Appendix B of this document.

6.2.2 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.

6.2.3 The most recent SoCG meeting with the EA was held on 21 April 2021.

6.2.4 There are no principle matters outstanding with the EA, however there are a number of matters upon which the EA's position is pending upon the publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES.

6.2.5 Highways England and the EA will therefore continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG. Discussions will be aided by the EA being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

6.2.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

Natural England (NE)

- 6.2.7 The SoCG with NE is included at Appendix C of this document.
- 6.2.8 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.
- 6.2.9 The most recent SoCG meeting with NE was held on 11 May 2021.
- 6.2.10 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:
- The proposals regarding Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and in particular a recommendation for the closure of the Barrow Wake car park within and its restoration to calcareous grassland, as part of the scheme.
 - Natural England expresses concerns about the losses of tufa habitat as a result of the scheme, and considers the current proposals for compensation to be insufficient.
- 6.2.11 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of NE is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES.
- 6.2.12 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with NE. Discussions will be aided by NE being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 6.2.13 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

Historic England

- 6.2.14 The SoCG with Historic England is included at Appendix D of this document.
- 6.2.15 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.
- 6.2.16 The most recent SoCG meeting with Historic England was held on 28 April 2021.
- 6.2.17 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:
- Historic England does not consider that sufficient information has been submitted to provide a clear understanding of the nature and full extent of the potential impacts on the historic environment as required either by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework.
 - Notwithstanding a need for further information once the ES and Environmental Management Plan are published, it is Historic England's position that the scheme will have a significant environmental impact, in EIA terms, on the historic environment, and that it will cause impacts on a number of designated heritage assets of national importance.
- 6.2.18 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the Historic England is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with Historic England. Discussions will be aided by Historic England being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

- 6.2.19 Notwithstanding a need for further information once the ES and Environmental Management Plan are published, it is Historic England's position that the proposed development will have a significant environmental impact, in EIA terms, on the historic environment, and that it will cause impacts on a number of designated heritage assets of national importance.
- 6.2.20 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB)

- 6.2.21 The SoCG with CCB is included at Appendix E of this document.
- 6.2.22 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.
- 6.2.23 The most recent SoCG meeting with CCB was held on 12 May 2021.
- 6.2.24 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:
- The overall impact of the scheme on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and more broadly the environmental impact of the scheme and the outcome of the EIA, subject to review of the DCO application documents. This includes whether they agree that the scheme fulfils the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), subject to review of the public DCO documents including ES and Case for the Scheme.
 - The regard and consideration had of recommendations made by CCB relating to other design aspects of the scheme including junction location, vertical alignment and the link road designs.
- 6.2.25 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of CCB is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES.
- 6.2.26 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with CCB. Discussions will be aided by CCB being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 6.2.27 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

6.3 Interested parties

Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (GWT)

- 6.3.1 The SoCG with GWT is included at Appendix F of this document.
- 6.3.2 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.
- 6.3.3 The most recent SoCG meeting with GWT was held on 6 May 2021.
- 6.3.4 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:
- GWT is concerned that the scheme vision, design principles and sub-objectives do not explicitly commit to Biodiversity Net Gain.
 - GWT disagrees with the conclusion that the café and parking business at Crickley Hill will not experience a significant adverse effect by the construction period.

- GWT considers that there will be an adverse impact on the ecological features of the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI because of increased recreational pressure during the operation of the scheme and its improved PRow network.
- GWT is disappointed that drafts of key documents relating to ecological issues have not been shared with strategic stakeholders ahead of DCO submission.
- GWT is concerned that no information has been provided about the time lag between habitat loss and the establishment of new habitat of equivalent quality. Information is also required on what area of priority habitat will become more fragmented and fall beneath minimum viable areas, either permanently or temporarily, because of the scheme. This is important to assess the level of extinction risk for threatened species that require priority habitats and, therefore, the suitability of the design, and relevant management plans.
- It is imperative that the scheme is truly landscape-led, repairing historic damage to wildlife habitats and improving ecological networks, rather than just minimising further damage.

6.3.5 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of GWT is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES.

6.3.6 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with GWT. Discussions will be aided by GWT being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

6.3.7 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

National Trust (NT)

6.3.8 The SoCG with NT is included at Appendix G of this document.

6.3.9 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.

6.3.10 The most recent SoCG meeting with NT was held on 27 April 2021.

6.3.11 The principle matters that are currently outstanding are:

- The scheme's approach to delivering biodiversity net gain;
- The conclusion of the predicted impact on Crickley Hill during construction and operation; and
- That a holistic landscape approach should be taken for scheme mitigation that overlays cultural heritage, historic environment and natural environment.

6.3.12 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with NT. Discussions will be aided by NT being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

6.3.13 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group (WCH TWG)

6.3.14 The SoCG with the WCH TWG is included at Appendix H of this document.

6.3.15 The SoCG is provided in draft and is not signed.

6.3.16 The most recent SoCG meeting with the WCH TWG was held on 29 March 2021.

- 6.3.17 The principle matter that is currently outstanding is:
- The need for the scheme to provide at least one additional crossing of the A417 between Bentham Lane and Grove Farm underpass, to retain severed or fragmented PRowS.
- 6.3.18 It should be noted that the principal matter outstanding relates to only some members of the WCH TWG, as some members are in agreement with Highways England on the matter.
- 6.3.19 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the WCH TWG is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Annex F PRow Management Plan of ES Appendix 2.1 (Document Reference 6.4).
- 6.3.20 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the SoCG with the WCH TWG. Discussions will be aided by the TWG members being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 6.3.21 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the Examination.

7 Statutory Undertakers Position Schedule

- 7.1.1 Highways England has sought to engage with statutory undertakers who are affected by the scheme, including through statutory pre-application consultation, as required by the Act and as set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) submitted with the DCO application.
- 7.1.2 Table 7-1 sets out the current position of statutory undertakers who are affected by the scheme. C3 budget estimate refers to draft scheme and budget estimates as defined in subsection C3 of Appendix C of the Measures Necessary Where Apparatus is Affected by Major Works (Diversionary Works): A Code of Practice 1992 (COP). C4 detailed estimate refers to final scheme and detailed estimates as defined in subsection C4 of Appendix C of the COP.

Table 7-1 Statutory undertakers position schedule

Statutory undertaker	Summary of C3/C4 process and agreement of technical matters	Consultation on draft DCO/Protective Provisions	Summary of current position
British Telecoms (Openreach)	All technical matters were agreed through direct meetings with representatives of British Telecoms Openreach. British Telecoms Openreach split their C4 estimate into three sections. Agreement was confirmed on 18 November 2020 (section 2) and 15 December 2020 (section 3 and 4) as discussions with British Telecoms Openreach led to the diversion route being agreed as a C4 estimate.	Highways England provided a draft of the proposed Protective Provisions to British Telecoms Openreach in April 2021 and will continue to engage on these in the coming months.	All technical matters agreed. Utility diversions agreed with undertaker, incorporated into scheme design and costs.
Gigaclear Ltd	All technical matters were agreed through direct meetings with representatives of Gigaclear Ltd. Agreement was confirmed 21 August 2019 as discussions with Gigaclear Ltd led to the diversion route being agreed as a C4 estimate.	Highways England provided a draft of the proposed Protective Provisions to Gigaclear in April 2021 and will continue to engage on these in the coming months.	All technical matters agreed. Utility diversions agreed with undertaker, incorporated into scheme design and costs.
Severn Trent Water Ltd	All technical matters were agreed through direct meetings with representatives of Severn Trent Water Ltd. Agreement was confirmed 11 November 2020 as discussions with Severn Trent Water Ltd led to the diversion route being agreed as a C4 estimate.	Highways England issued a Draft Agreement to Severn Trent in April 2021 and will continue to engage on the content of this Agreement in the coming months.	All technical matters agreed. Utility diversions agreed with undertaker, incorporated into scheme design and costs.
Western Power Distribution plc	All technical matters were agreed through direct meetings with representatives of Western Power Distribution plc. Agreement was confirmed 19 November 2020 as discussions with Western Power Distribution plc led to the diversion route being agreed as a C4 estimate.	Highways England issued a Draft Agreement to Western Power Distribution in April 2021 and will continue to engage on the content of this Agreement in the coming months.	All technical matters agreed. Utility diversions agreed with undertaker, incorporated into scheme design and costs.

Appendices

Appendix A Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Joint Councils

Table of contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3	Status of this SoCG	2
2	Consultation	3
2.1	Role of the Joint Councils	3
2.2	Summary of consultation	3
3	Topics covered in this SoCG	15
4	Matters agreed	16
5	Matters outstanding	31
5.1	Principal matters outstanding	31
5.2	Matters outstanding	31
Appendix A	Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B	Matters to be determined	ii
Appendix C	Landowner Position Statement with GCC	xx

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with the Joint Councils since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG	15
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England	16
Table 5-1	Matters outstanding between the Joint Councils and Highways England	31

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England (the Applicant) and the 'Joint Councils' in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme. The Joint Councils comprise of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC) and Cotswold District Council (CDC).
- 1.1.2 The Joint Councils comprise of three local authorities which are defined as statutory consultees under the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). While all three authorities were notified of statutory consultation individually, they elected to submit a joint formal response to statutory consultation in 2019 and again in response to supplementary consultation in 2020. On this basis, it was agreed between Highways England and the three authorities to enter into a SoCG in a Joint Councils format. This SoCG therefore summarises the discussions held with representatives with all three Councils.
- 1.1.3 The document identifies the following between the parties:
- Matters which have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.4 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.5 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the Joint Councils is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with the Joint Councils. Discussions will be aided by the Joint Councils being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.6 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and Examination stages.
- 1.1.7 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.
- 1.1.8 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

- Section 2 states the role of the Joint Councils in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken with the Joint Councils since Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019.
- Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
- Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
- Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of all parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.

1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.

1.2.4 Appendix C includes the Landowner Position Statement for the Joint Councils.

1.2.5 A number of technical notes discussed and shared with the Joint Councils are referred to in this document. They are available to the Examining Authority (ExA) upon request. The latest versions of these documents are:

- Technical Note H01 Local Roads (last issued 12 April 2021)
- Transport Modelling and Analysis Technical Note (last issued 9 April 2020)
- Signage Strategy (last issued 12 April 2021)
- Drainage Strategy Report (last issued 12 April 2021)
- De-Trunking Report (last issued 28 August 2020)
- Technical Note H02 Lay Bys and Arrester Beds (17 March 2021)

1.3 Status of this SoCG

1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.

1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the Examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of the Joint Councils

Gloucestershire County Council

- 2.1.1 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated wholly within the boundaries of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC). It is therefore a statutory consultee for the scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(c) of the Act.
- 2.1.2 Gloucestershire County Council is the local highway authority in Gloucestershire and is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) for Gloucestershire. Gloucestershire County Council also has statutory duties in relation to drainage and flood risk, and heritage assets and archaeology.
- 2.1.3 Gloucestershire County Council also has statutory duties relating to Public Rights of Way (PRoW). GCC is therefore also engaging with Highways England on issues relating to PRoW and provision for walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH) within the A417 Missing Link scheme, through the WCH Technical Working Group (WCH TWG). The discussions between Highways England and GCC relating to PRoW are recorded in a separate Statement of Common Ground with the WCH TWG.

Tewkesbury Borough Council

- 2.1.4 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated within the boundaries of Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC). It is therefore a statutory consultee for the scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(b) of the Act.
- 2.1.5 Tewkesbury Borough Council is the local planning authority for Tewkesbury borough.

Cotswold District Council

- 2.1.6 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated within the boundaries of Cotswold District Council (CDC). It is therefore a statutory consultee for the scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(b) of the Act.
- 2.1.7 Cotswold District Council is the local planning authority for Cotswold District.

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with the Joint Councils during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 All three councils were invited to participate in the following stakeholder groups:
- Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group (TWG)
 - WCH TWG
 - Strategic Stakeholder Panel (SSP)
- 2.2.3 See Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information on stakeholder groups.
- 2.2.4 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with the Joint Councils, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other

exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.

2.2.5 The consultation with the Joint Councils since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with the Joint Councils since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
2 May 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations including: Gloucestershire County Council	Project update provided to the SSP on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred route announcement – review and feedback Status update on the technical working groups Technical partner and programme update Programme/governance update Preliminary design and what to expect
13 June 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Cotswold District Council	Update on the scheme provided. All parties participated in facilitated sessions on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building connections and working together The vision and purpose of the SSP Next steps: shared objectives and ways of working
19 June 2019	Statement of Community Consultation Meeting	Highways England Tewkesbury Borough Council Cotswold District Council	Proposed Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) and consultation proposals presented and feedback sought.
21 June 2019	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Tewkesbury Borough Council Cotswold District Council	The Highways England noise specialist emailed all three councils seeking to discuss the proposed noise assessment approach in the Preliminary Environmental Impact (PEI) report
1 July 2019	Statement of Community Consultation Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council	Proposed SoCC and the consultation proposals presented and feedback sought.
2 July 2019	TWG Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including: Gloucestershire County Council (Drainage Officer, PRow Officer, Transport Officer, Landscape Officer) Cotswold District Council (Archaeology Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update to the scheme 2019 PEI report update Opportunities mapping TWG terms of reference Working group technical discussions

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
30 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including: Council (Drainage Officer, PRoW Officer, Transport Officer, Flood Officer, Heritage Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities mapping feedback • PEI report update • Landscape update – approach and sketch designs • Working group technical discussions • Overview of Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)
02 Aug 2019	Phone call	Highways England Tewkesbury Borough Council (Environmental Health Officer)	Highways England noise specialist contacted the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) regarding noise assessment within PEI report. EHO confirmed assessment approach to be satisfactory.
07 Aug 2019	Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Highways, Transport Planning, Heritage, Environment and Flooding officers	Overview of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCO process • Local Impact Report required to be produced by GCC • Statement of Common Ground process. • Landscape approach to the scheme, which is landscape-led • Programme of the scheme • Traffic modelling process • EIA process and PEI report production • Statutory consultation
8 Aug 2019	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG Member Organisations including Gloucestershire County Council Highways Officer	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of the scheme • Purpose of the TWG • PEI report assessment • Draft PRoW Management plan and upcoming statutory consultation. Feedback was sought from attendees.
14 Aug 2019	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG Member Organisations including Gloucestershire County Council (PRoW Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of the scheme • Purpose of the TWG • PEI report assessment • Draft PRoW Management plan and upcoming statutory consultation. • Assessment methodology • Baseline information
15 Aug 2019	Email	Highways England Landscape officers/representatives at statutory body organisations, including the Joint Councils	Highways England landscape specialist emailed the landscape representatives to share figures of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and indicative viewpoint locations and seek feedback.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
20 Aug 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG Meeting	Highways England TWG Member Organisations including: Gloucestershire County Council (Drainage Officer, Ecology Officer, Archaeology Officer, Landscape Officer) Cotswold District Council (Archaeology Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Landscape update on design approach and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions
2 Sept 2019	Email	Highways England Cotswold District Council (CDC)	Highways England noise specialist received an email in response to a written request (21 June 2019) for the Joint Councils' comments on the proposed assessment methodology.
4 Sept 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including: Gloucestershire County Council	Highways England provided a project update to the SSP members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress update • TWG update • Public consultation details and materials preview
9 Sept 2019	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways and traffic modelling officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the traffic modelling to date • review of meeting minutes from a meeting held in April • Agreement to answer GCC queries.
17 Sept 2019	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (Highways Officers)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the Local Roads Technical Note • Design of mainline and climbing lane • Design of junctions • Traffic modelling and GCC concerns over traffic impacts • Design standards for local roads • Attenuation basins • Review of revised technical note • Agreement that meetings on drainage, de-trunking and maintenance were required
17 Sept 2019	Site walkover and scheme orientation visit	Historic England Gloucestershire County Council	Discussion on assets beyond 1km which could potentially experience setting impacts- agreed to consider Leckhampton Camp in the ES.
26 Sept 2019	Stakeholder Preview Event	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council	Highways England hosted a Stakeholder Preview Event ahead of the launch of statutory consultation on the 27 September 2019, to allow key stakeholders to familiarise themselves with the consultation material and ask any questions to the Highways England team.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
27 Sept 2019	Formal notification of statutory consultation	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Tewkesbury Borough Council Cotswold District Council	Highways England sent formal notification of the statutory consultation via post and email to all three Councils, in accordance with section 42(1)(b) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 8 November 2019. GCC were also notified under section 42(1)(d) of the Act due to their affected land interests.
10 Oct 2019	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (PRoW Officer) and Gloucestershire Local Access Forum	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information relating to scheme progress EIA methodology Design of crossings, and signage. The importance of attending public consultation events and submitting formal consultation responses Agreement to provide further update following the finalisation of the scheme design
25 Oct 2019	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (Drainage and Highways officers)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current baseline information on existing drainage within the project area Current design and underlying concepts with regard to drainage for the project Design standards B4070/Barrow Wake road connection.
4 Nov 2019	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (Highways Officers)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements and strategy for signage design and placement along the scheme Proposals to take forward into further design revisions
8 Nov 2019	Formal response to statutory consultation	Joint Councils	The Joint Councils submitted a joint formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
11 Nov 2019	Email	Gloucestershire County Council Heritage Team Leader to Highways England	Email response regarding trenching plan.
20 Nov 2019	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways and traffic modelling officers	Discussion on traffic modelling and reassignment at Leckhampton Hill.
27 Nov 2019	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (PRoW Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An update of the project Draft PRoW Management Plans SoCG An overview of next steps and programme

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
24 Jan 2020	Technical meeting	Historic England Gloucestershire County Council Highways England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current position regarding archaeological surveys, geophysics and trial trenching • Reasoning for number and location of trenches • Datasets used to establish baseline • Basis for assessment • Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation, • Risk to construction programme • Proposed GI and the scope of the archaeological watching brief and geoarchaeological interpretation
27 Jan 2020	Email	Highways England to Joint Councils	Highways England described the methodology for the air quality assessment following updates to DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) methodology and invited questions and comments.
27 Jan 2020	Email	Cotswold District Council	CDC provided comments about the selection of receptors and monitoring for model verification for the assessment and were satisfied with the proposed methodology.
5 Feb 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council (Drainage, Traffic Modelling and Highways Officers)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The latest position on issues relating to de-trunking • The local road network including road adoption, traffic modelling and drainage design
6 Feb 2020	Email	Gloucestershire County Council Heritage Team Leader to Highways England	Follow-up email regarding additional trenches proposed by Highways England.
3 March 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Gloucestershire County Council (PRoW Officer)	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme • Draft PRoW Management Plan • WCH SoCG
6 March 2020	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council drainage and highways officers and Environment Agency	Highways England shared the draft Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for comment.
9 April 2020	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council highways officers	Issue of updated Transport Modelling and Analysis Technical Note.
22 April 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft SoCG (as shared on 18 March 2020) comments • Update of the next draft SoCG via the SoCG comment tracker.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
27 April 2020	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Issue of drainage strategy report and drawings for review.
28 May 2020	Email/phone call	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council transport planning manager Cotswold District Council head of paid service Tewkesbury Borough Council deputy Chief Executive	Email to explain that the A417 DCO submission would be postponed to 2021, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiteration of Highways England's commitment to the scheme and stakeholder engagement, • Funding for the scheme
18 June 2020	Email	Gloucestershire County Council transport officer to Highways England	Email including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCC had reviewed the updated Transport Modelling Technical Note sent on 9 April 2020 • Confirmation that the updated Technical Note is sufficient to address the issues previously identified by GCC
30 June 2020	Email	Gloucestershire County Council Archaeologist to Highways England cultural heritage specialist	Query as to when trial trenching might be happening and if any project update is available.
02 July 2020	Email	Highways England cultural heritage specialist to Gloucestershire County Council Archaeologist	Confirmed that trenching likely to start in middle of August however land access issues are causing some issues regarding certainty of programme for trenching. An update on the scheme would be provided imminently from the project team.
20 July 2020	SSP Meeting	SSP members including representatives of Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme • Design changes and the programme change • Governance that has underpinned this change
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG members and Walking Cycling and Horse Riding TWG members	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update following delay to programme • Key changes to the design and the amended timescales • Invited questions from stakeholders during the session
22 July 2020	Email	Highways England to TWG member organisations including Historic England and GCC	Request and agreement that the SOCG meeting with Historic England on 30 July include GCC Heritage Team and Historic England's Science Advisor.
29 July 2020	Landowner meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Landowner meeting to discuss design change and effect on GCC land.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
29 July 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach to the SOCGs following the scheme design change Design changes that were presented at TWG and SSP Progress of SOCG to date Programme for sharing information and updated SOCG
30 July 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Historic England and Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic environment Scheme update Key design changes Meeting minutes and slides were provided on 18 August.
30 July 2020	Statement of Community Consultation Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Meetings to discuss the draft Statement of Community Consultation and seek views of the Joint Councils on the proposals it contains ahead of being formally consulted on the draft SOCC.
31 July 2020	Statement of Community Consultation Meeting	Highways England Cotswold District Council officers	
3 Aug 2020	Statement of Community Consultation Meeting	Highways England Tewkesbury Borough Council officer	
4 Aug 2020	Email	Gloucestershire County Council traffic modelling officer to Highways England	Query as to whether traffic modelling will be redone based on the scheme programme and design change.
10 Aug 2020	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council	Highways England notified each Council via email of formal consultation on the draft SoCC under section 47(1) of the PA2008, requiring feedback by 7 September 2020. Highways England sought feedback on any additional groups that should be included.
12 Aug 2020	Email	Highways England traffic modelling officer to Gloucestershire County Council traffic modelling officer	Confirmation that traffic modelling will be redone based on the changing nature of the scheme and that Highways England is monitoring Department for Transport (DfT) guidance on modelling related to Covid-19. Suggestion of a teleconference in near future to advise what the updated modelling is showing and to discuss DfT guidance.
12 Aug 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Members of the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding TWG including: Gloucestershire County Council PRow officer and Think Travel officer	The following matters were discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on how the design changes in the scheme have resulted in changes to the PRow network. Outline of next steps

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
20 Aug 2020	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council transport planning manager	Email to state that Highways England considering the provision of a school bus stop in Birdlip following consultation feedback, requesting a meeting with relevant people in GCC to discuss further.
25 Aug 2020	Email	Gloucestershire County Council Highways team to Highways England	Email to confirm that 10 Departures from Standards are signed off by GCC's Highways Operations Manager.
28 Aug 2020	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council officers and members of WCH TWG (including Cotswold District Council officer)	Email containing a link to a first tranche of technical information for review and comment including ecology surveys, updated De-Trunking Report and Work in Progress 2020 PEI Report chapters.
Sept 2020	Email(s)	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council archaeologist	A series of emails exchanged discussing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) shared with GCC archaeologist and Historic England by Highways England contractor, and initial comments • Highways England specialist shared LIDAR data and discussion around this, its findings and presentation in ES • Geophysical/trenching update
4 September 2020	Email	Highways England to Historic England and GCC archaeologist	Email discussing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that specific palaeoenvironmental sampling was not planned to be undertaken as part of the trenching • Geoarch monitoring, interpretation and deposit modelling has been included in the scope of future GI • In terms of the lidar interpretation, a number of new features have been identified, but none specifically within the DCO Boundary • Shared the draft interpretation shapefiles for information
16 Sept 2020	Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council PRow officer and highways officer	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's position on a new unclassified road connecting to Shab Hill junction • Historic severance of PRow either side of Dog Lane and Cold Slad
18 September 2020	Email	Highways England to Historic England and GCC archaeologist	Email to share OWSI.
28 Sept 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Meeting to discuss updated draft of the Joint Councils SoCG and next steps.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
29 Sept 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Cowley and Birdlip Parish Council	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus stop provision and feedback received by Highways England in relation to this issue, Impact of scheme on local bus services/routes.
29 Sept 2020	TWG meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council PRow officer	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WCH SoCG Updates to the PRow Management Plan, ahead of supplementary consultation
30 Sept 2020	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council officers and members of WCH TWG (including Cotswold District Council officer)	Email containing a link to second tranche of technical information for review and comment
30 September 2020	Emails	Highways England to Historic England and GCC archaeologist	Emails to share latest survey results and drawings with trench numbers attached.
7 Oct 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP members including Joint Councils	Meeting to review discussions had through Collaborative Planning meetings (Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust, National Trust, Cotswold National Landscape) and upcoming supplementary consultation.
7 Oct 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council traffic modelling officers	Meeting to discuss updates to traffic modelling and implications of Covid-19 on model updates.
9 Oct 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Historic England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Historic England SoCG meeting with attendance from GCC officers.
13 Oct 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council Tewkesbury Borough Council Cotswold District Council	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to all three Councils, in accordance with section 42(b) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 12 November 2020. Gloucestershire County Council were also notified under section 42(d) of the Act due to their affected land interests.
20 Oct 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council PRow officer	Meeting to discuss proposals for Cotswold Way National trail under revised scheme design.
11 Nov 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	Joint Councils	The Joint Councils submitted a joint formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
11 Nov 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council PRow officer	Meeting with Gloucestershire Local Access Forum to discuss revised proposals within the scheme relating to PRow.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
24 Nov 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways and drainage officers	Discussion of revised drainage strategy for the scheme and its implications – feedback sought from GCC on the proposals ahead of their inclusion in the final design.
24 Nov 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways officers	Discussion of the scheme design and maintenance.
2 Dec 2020	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crossings and integration strategy within the revised scheme design, with reference to feedback received at supplementary consultation
14 Dec 2020	Email	Highways England Planning officers at Gloucestershire County Council, Tewksbury Borough Council and Cotswold District Council	Highways England Specialist emailed planning officers at all three Councils to update the list of developments to inform the assessment in Chapter 15 Assessment of Cumulative Effects for the ES.
15 Dec 2020	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Response on behalf of the Joint Councils providing comments on technical information issued to the Councils by Highways England during September and October. This includes comments on updates to all Technical Notes.
13 Jan 2021	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council drainage officer National Star College	A meeting was held to discuss drainage design around the area of National Star College.
3 Feb 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Meeting to discuss updated draft of the Joint Councils SoCG and next steps.
17 Feb 2021	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways and PRoW officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the project with regard to PRoW since the design fix Feedback sought on the issues of additional crossings to the west of the scheme and proposed bus stop near Birdlip
17 Feb 2021	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP members including Joint Councils	Highways England provided an update on the scheme and its timeline. Outstanding issues for the SSP members were discussed and a Q&A session provided.
23 Feb 2021	Technical meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council highways, public transport and PRoW officers	Follow-up meeting from 17 Feb 21 meeting, to discuss provision of a bus stop in Birdlip within the scheme.
17 Mar 2021	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Email containing updated SoCG for discussion at meeting on 24 March 2021, as well as Technical Note H02- Lay Bys and Arrester Bed provision.
19 Mar 2021	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	Email containing list of Departures from Standard affecting Highways England retained network

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
24 Mar 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated draft of the Joint Councils SoCG • Landscape matters • Next steps
6 Apr 2021	Phone call	Highways England noise specialist Gloucestershire County Council highways officer	Discussion regarding noise effects of the scheme affecting GCC road network ahead of meeting on 7 April.
7 Apr 2021	Meeting	Highways England noise specialist Gloucestershire County Council highways officer and noise specialist	Meeting to discuss results of noise assessment in the ES and effects on GCC road network outside of the DCO Boundary.
9 Apr 2021	Meeting	Highways England traffic modelling specialist Gloucestershire County Council highways officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding matters relating to traffic modelling for the scheme • Effects of the scheme on the road network
20 Apr 2021	Email	Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council officers	Following the 7 April meeting, Highways England provided information to GCC on significant noise effects at Stratton and Leckhampton Hill and options being considered.
5 May 2021	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP members including GCC and TBC	Highways England provided a project update and information on the next steps following submission of the DCO application.
6 May 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Gloucestershire County Council officers	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated draft of the Joint Councils SoCG ahead of DCO submission

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Consultation
Relevant ES Chapter	3.	Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)
	4.	Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)
	5.	Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)
	6.	Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)
	7.	Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)
	8.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	9.	Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)
	10.	Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)
	11.	Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)
	12.	Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)
	13.	Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)
	14.	Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)
	15.	Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)
Other topics	16.	De-trunking
	17.	Traffic and Transport
	18.	Crossings of the A417
	19.	Engineering design, also including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • design of local roads • safety • drainage • signage • lighting
	20.	Draft Development Consent Order
	21.	Land
	22.	Environmental Management Plan (EMP)
	23.	Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

4 Matters agreed

- 4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.
- 4.1.2 Where a matter relates to the position of one council only, or there are differences in the position between the councils, the matter is subdivided. In all other instances, the position relates to that of the Joint Councils.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that the need for this scheme has been apparent for many years with the road's poor safety record, daily congestion and severance affecting users. There have been 10 fatal personal injury collisions between 2013 and April 2018, which have affected many lives in the area. It is agreed that this scheme will reduce this unacceptable level of serious accidents on this road.	Response to statutory consultation, covering letter, 8 November 2019
1.2.	The Councils fully support Highways England's vision of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme that will deliver a safe and resilient free-flowing road whilst conserving and enhancing the special character of the nationally important protected landscape of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) that the new route passes through. The Councils' vision of the scheme is also that which reconnects landscape and ecology; brings about landscape, wildlife and heritage benefits, includes enhanced visitors' enjoyment of the area; improves local communities' quality of life; and contributes to the health of the economy and local businesses.	Response to 2019 statutory consultation, (p4), 8 November 2019
1.3.	The Joint Councils support the changes to the scheme design since 2019, which were subject to a supplementary consultation in October and November 2020.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p1/p29) 12 November 2020
2. Consultation		
2.1.	Since the previous consultations in 2018 and 2019, the Joint Councils and Highways England have worked collaboratively through the Stakeholder Group, Technical Working Groups, topic-based sessions and individual meetings to ensure that the objectives of the A417 Missing Link scheme are met. The three authorities and Highways England continue to be satisfied that the scheme is being designed as a landscape-led exemplar project.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (covering letter), 12 November 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
2.2.	The Joint Councils would like to continue to be involved in the development of the detailed design of the scheme and its implementation. Highways England agrees with this intention and will continue to engage with the Joint Councils during the detailed design and construction of the scheme.	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
2.3.	Outside of the DCO process, the Joint Councils and Highways England are jointly committed to ongoing discussions regarding designated funds projects within the area, including in relation to active travel and cycle initiatives.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
3. Consideration of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)		
3.1.	The Joint Councils fully support the proposal known as 'Option 30' to improve the single carriageway section between the Brockworth bypass and Cowley roundabout. The Joint Councils have previously set this out to Highways England in their formal responses during the 2018 consultation and 2019 consultation.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (covering letter), 12 November 2020
4. Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)		
4.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that there is sufficient and appropriate reference to the local development plans of relevance to the scheme within the 2020 PEI Report. This is set out in Chapter 1 of the 2020 PEI Report and each topic chapter of the 2020 PEI Report includes a summary of adopted local planning policies, supplementary planning documents and non-statutory plans of relevance to each assessment. The full ES, published at DCO submission, will continue to contain these references as well as any updates required for any new relevant policy published between production of the 2020 PEI Report and the ES.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p7), 12 November 2020
5. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)		
5.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England consider that the scheme will help to address the existing air quality management area by cutting congestion along the whole length of the scheme.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (covering letter), 12 November 2020
5.2.	It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that the air quality assessment in the 2020 PEI Report has followed the DMRB guidance LA105 which is appropriate for this project.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p11), 12 November 2020
5.3.	It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that the scheme should not have a significant adverse effect on air quality and should lead to improvements at the Birdlip AQMA.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		consultation (p10), 12 November 2020
6. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)		
6.1.	Following comments made by the Joint Councils in response to the 2019 statutory consultation, Highways England extended the 1km search buffer to include all visual and noise receptors, and included the scheduled Leckhampton Camp and barrow in impact assessments. The Joint Councils and Highways England agree this matter is resolved.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p12), 12 November 2020
6.2.	The Joint Councils are satisfied that Portable Antiquities (PAS) data has now been included in the desk-based assessment by Highways England, as set out in the 2020 PEI Report. Although not used to inform trial trenching, the extent of Roman settlement near to the Cowley roundabout should still be reasonably established by ongoing trial trenching.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p13), 12 November 2020
6.3.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the demolition of the Air Balloon Public House (a non-designated heritage resource) has been assessed in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the 2020 PEI Report and ES. It is agreed that to mitigate the demolition of the Air Balloon Public House, the building would be subject to Level 3 recording prior to and during its demolition, according to the standards set out in Historic England's guide Understanding Historic Buildings. This is set out in 2020 PEI Report and the subsequent ES and EMP.	SoCG update, March 2021
6.4.	It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that the WWII building 91B, which is proposed to be converted to a bat roost as part of the scheme, is a building of low significance and in a poor state of repair. The proposed conversion to a bat roost would preserve the structure.	SoCG meeting 24 March 2021
7. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
7.1.	<p>The use of LA107 Landscape and Visual Effects for the assessment methodology and production of visuals has been agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England. The following aspects of the assessment are also agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the additional viewpoints added into the visual assessment for the 2020 PEI Report • that assessment of impacts of changes to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and the effect on the landscape, and the assessment of sequential views along PRoW • An eye level of 1.6m for the ZTV • The assessment contained in the 2020 PEI Report is clearer on where significant (adverse and beneficial) landscape and visual effects are likely to occur, or the elements of the proposal that are generating these adverse impacts • although the scheme would not be lit, the visual assessment will include a qualitative assessment of the predicted changes in light levels/light pollution as a result of traffic moving along the scheme 	SoCG meeting 24 March 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the updated Zone of Theoretical Visibility as provided in the 2020 PEI Report the use of Landscape Character Types (LCTs) in the LVIA the extent and scope of cross-sections to be provided as part of the assessment 	
7.2.	The Joint Councils consider that the amended scheme design presented at the 2020 consultation does not appear to have any additional landscape impacts over and above the scheme design consulted upon in 2019.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p16), 12 November 2020
7.3.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the Phase 2A ground investigations will be used to inform the ES, including Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects. It is agreed that Phase 2B investigations will be undertaken as part of detailed design and will not inform the ES.	SoCG update, March 2021.
7.4.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree on the approach taken to assessing the impacts on views from sensitive visual receptors including residential receptors, in which combined effects on several properties have been considered through aggregating properties within settlements and reporting against 'community' groups. It is agreed that Highways England has engaged with property owners where queries have been made about the specific effects on views from their property, including those that are isolated receptors. In addition, statutory consultation with affected landowners has been undertaken during the development of the scheme as set out in the Consultation Report submitted with the DCO application.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
7.5.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that there is a need for a document within the DCO application setting out the design rationale for the scheme and how the landscape-led design approach was applied to the scheme. The Design Summary Document to be submitted with the DCO application will set this out, and the Joint Councils may choose to make comment on that document when published with the application.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)		
8.1.	The Joint Councils consider that the scope and detail of the ecology survey methods undertaken by Highways England appear to be appropriate although it is recognised that some survey work remains incomplete (due to land access issues).	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p17), 12 November 2020
8.2.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that the assemblage of bats in the area is of national importance and a key factor for the EIA to consider, particularly crossing points over existing and proposed A417 layouts. Habitat and roost loss should be temporary and reversible with local populations conserved and potentially enhanced in the long-term.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p18), 12 November 2020
8.3.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that reptiles in the area are of at least county importance with 4 species occurring in many places. Translocation is required from affected areas, but the scheme will retain much habitat and probably create new/improved opportunities for reptiles.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		consultation (p18), 12 November 2020
8.4.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that invertebrates within the scheme footprint are of at least county importance and at Crickley Hill of national importance. The scheme will retain as well as create/enhance habitat for invertebrates.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p18), 12 November 2020
8.5.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that whilst the need for achieving BNG is reflected in the Government's 25 Year Plan and is also set out in local policy, the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) makes no specific policy requirement for national networks NSIPs to provide BNG. It is also agreed that the draft Environment Bill specifically excludes NSIPs from the statutory requirement to achieve BNG.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
8.6.	The Joint Councils agree that Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme. Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures. Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that the scheme must aim to deliver biodiversity net gain, but that this should not just be evaluated using the draft Defra 2.0 metric - professional ecologists' judgement is important too.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
8.7.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that overall, there will be a significant net gain in hedgerow length once the scheme is complete and in the operational phase. Newly planted hedgerows will be species-rich comprising a mix of at least seven woody native species of local provenance and in keeping with species recorded in the area. Some honeysuckle is to be included to attract dormice which are in surrounding areas but do not seem to be within the DCO footprint. Advance planting where possible will happen to help early mitigation for later losses.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p19), 12 November 2020
8.8.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that rock exposures and substrate suitable for colonisation of calcareous grassland species is an important feature of the landscaping in places along limited areas of woodland and trees for critical ecological reasons only.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p16), 12 November 2020
8.9.	It is agreed that the assessment described in the 2020 PEI Report has followed the DMRB guidance LA108 (EIA) and LA115 (HRA), which is appropriate for this project.	SoCG update March 2021
8.10.	Following the 2020 supplementary statutory consultation, Highways England amended the scheme design to incorporate two new habitat patches (or 'stepping stones') to the north and south of the scheme that would mitigate the impacts of fragmentation, by providing functional habitat connectivity for species associated with Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI units to disperse. This change was implemented taking into account feedback received from environmental stakeholders and the Joint Councils in response to the supplementary	SoCG update, April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	consultation. The Joint Councils are in agreement that this change to the scheme design provides the required connectivity between the two units of the SSSI and addresses concerns of habitat fragmentation.	
9. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)		
9.1.	The Joint Councils consider that the summary of geology and geomorphology impacts is appropriate.	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
9.2.	The Joint Councils accept that Highways England has used available ground investigation up to 1 June 2020 to inform the 2020 PEI Report. Highways England has advised that ground investigation works were ongoing at time of writing the 2020 PEI Report and the results of these works will be used to inform the ES when they become available.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p20), 12 November 2020
9.3.	The Joint Councils consider the methodology for the assessment of construction impacts and operational impacts to be appropriate. The methodology has been updated in the 2020 PEI Report and is in accordance with the DMRB LA109 guidance.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p20), 12 November 2020
10. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)		
10.1.	Highways England and the Joint Councils are in agreement that the amount of surplus material that needs to be transported within or out of the county should be minimised to ensure minimal effect on the environment. It is agreed that Highways England would re-use as much material as possible on-site, if it is suitable for re-use, as set out in the 2020 PEI Report and Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste of the ES.	SoCG update March 2021
10.2.	Highways England and the Joint Councils consider that a benefit of the revised scheme design, in which the proposed gradient of the highway up Crickley Hill has been increased from 7% to 8% (although still a reduction from the existing 10%), is that it has significantly reduced the volume of surplus material that would be generated by the scheme. Following the update to the volumes of material use and waste generation in the 2020 PEI Report, the Joint Councils agree with Highways England's assessment that effects will be slight, and impacts will not be significant.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p21), 12 November 2020
10.3.	It is agreed that the assessment described in the PEI Report has followed the DMRB guidance LA110, which is appropriate for this project.	SoCG update March 2021
10.4.	It is agreed that the site construction compound locations have been included in the assessment that was provided in the 2020 PEI Report and that will be included in the ES. It is agreed that the General Arrangement Plans published as part of the 2020 supplementary statutory consultation identified where the construction compounds would be located.	SoCG update March 2021
11. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
11.1.	The Joint Councils consider that the 2020 PEI Report assessment has followed the DMRB guidance LA 111, which is appropriate for this project.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p22), 12 November 2020
11.2.	The Joint Councils and Highways England are in agreement that the scheme would result in no adverse significant effects to Noise Important Areas (NIAs). As set out in the 2020 PEI Report, where two NIAs would have been subject to noise increases as a result of the scheme, noise mitigation has been incorporated to reduce noise to below those levels without the scheme (a permanent likely significant beneficial effect).	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p22), 12 November 2020
11.3.	The Joint Councils consider that the construction noise assessment within the 2020 PEI Report is appropriate and resolves concerns raised by the Joint Councils in response to the 2019 PEI Report.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p22), 12 November 2020
11.4.	The Joint Councils stated in response to the 2019 PEI Report that noise mitigation should avoid the use of artificial features such as noise fencing. It is agreed, upon review of the 2020 PEI Report, that Highways England has proposed 14 noise mitigation enhancements mainly consist of earth bunds and stone walls, with only 2 proposed noise barriers in areas where there are space constraints.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p22), 12 November 2020
11.5.	The Joint Councils and Highways England are in agreement that the potential change in noise on the concrete section of road (the A417/A419 south of the scheme) has been assessed by Highways England, and that the change in noise was not found to be significant.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p22), 12 November 2020
12. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
12.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the assessment methodology of Chapter 12 has been updated based on the most up-to-date guidance (DMRB LA 112), which is appropriate for this project. It is agreed that the majority of comments made by the Joint Councils on the assessment methodology in response to the 2019 PEI Report have been incorporated into the 2020 PEI Report.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p23), 12 November 2020
12.2.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the assessment of employment impacts during construction and operation no longer forms a part of the DMRB LA112 assessment guidance and the removal of this topic from Chapter 12 is therefore accepted and agreed,	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
12.3.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the assessment of Driver Stress no longer forms a part of the DMRB LA112 assessment guidance and the removal of this topic from Chapter 12 is therefore accepted and agreed.	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
12.4.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that Chapter 12 of the 2020 PEI Report (and ES) sets out, at a high level, employment and economy matters during construction. Further information on this matter can be made	SoCG update, March 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	available if a contractor is appointed and if the scheme is progressed to construction, Highways England would engage in further discussions with the Councils on these matters. Highways England recognises that the Joint Councils would like these discussions to include information on: anticipated workforce numbers by employment type (to understand the opportunities available to local small and medium enterprises); a commitment to employing locally where possible; and, accommodation and transportation of workers during construction.	
12.5.	Highways England and the Joint Councils are in agreement regarding changes made to the proposed parking near the Golden Heart Inn following the 2020 supplementary statutory consultation, which were made to help to address concerns expressed about a possible redistribution of anti-social behaviour to the area.	SoCG update, April 2021
Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
12.6.	The Joint Councils are engaging with Highways England and other stakeholders in the WCH TWG Statement of Common Ground and comments on PRoW are provided through this ongoing process.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p23), 12 November 2020
13. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)		
13.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the methodology for Chapter 13 of the 2020 PEI Report has been updated and is in accordance with the new DMRB LA104 and LA113 guidance, which is appropriate for this project.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p24/25), 12 November 2020
13.2.	<p>Following clarifications provided within the 2020 PEI Report, the Joint Councils agree with Highways England on the following aspects of the Chapter 13 assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the purpose of the Tracer Test was to ascertain hydraulic connection to Norman's Brook • that 2-D and conceptual groundwater models will be used by Highways England to inform design • that the effect of changing groundwater level and flow on Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs) will be assessed in the ES, as will further details of construction practices and accidental spillage • the cross-reference to the assessment (including aquatic ecology) in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the ES • that a Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance assessment will be conducted in support of the ES • that the study area of the assessment has been extended beyond a 1km buffer to reflect comments of the Planning Inspectorate and Environment Agency • that the appropriate stakeholders were consulted with by Highways England • that the use of the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT) to assess the potential impacts of routine runoff on surface water quality is appropriate 	<p>Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p24-26), 12 November 2020 /</p> <p>Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p5), 15 December 2020</p>

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be produced in support of the ES the intention to consider Natural Flood Management options as part of the scheme 	
13.3.	The Joint Councils consider that the approach to surface water quality monitoring taken by Highways England is reasonable, with the expected parameters being tested.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p5), 15 December 2020
13.4.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the Tracer Test confirms that Crickley Hill stream discharges to Norman's Brook	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p5), 15 December 2020
14. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)		
14.1.	Highways England recognises that all three statutory authorities which comprise the Joint Councils have adopted a Climate Change Strategy and have pledged to reduce carbon emissions.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (covering letter), 12 November 2020
15. Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)		
15.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the assessment methodology of Chapter 15 Assessment of Cumulative Effects reflects DMRB guidance and has been structured clearly to distinguish between in-combination and combined effects.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p27), 12 November 2020
15.2.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that the method for selecting relevant projects for Chapter 15 is consistent with DMRB guidance.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p27), 12 November 2020
15.3.	It is agreed that the Joint Councils have assisted Highways England to provide relevant projects to inform Chapter 15 of the ES, as well as preliminary assessment in Chapter 15 of the 2020 PEI Report and 2019 PEI Report.	SoCG update March 2021
16. De-trunking		
16.1.	Technical discussions regarding de-trunking are ongoing through meetings with GCC officers and Highways England, and the issue of a De-Trunking Report technical note. An updated De-Trunking Report was shared with GCC on 28 August 2020 for comment and it is agreed with the Joint Councils that this version reflects design changes made to the scheme.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p7), 15 December 2020.

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
16.2.	The Joint Councils support the proposals by Highways England to either remove or downgrade existing lengths of carriageway to WCH routes where they are no longer required.	Joint Councils' response to statutory consultation (p13), 8 November 2019
17. Traffic and Transport		
17.1.	<p>The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • added benefits of the Missing Link scheme will be the reduction of the rat running that takes place through communities who suffer on a daily basis, with traffic using roads that are unsuitable. • Local businesses will benefit from greater reliability for their journeys bringing prosperity across the county. • There will be significant traffic benefits of relieving a key long-term constraint and accident blackspot. 	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (covering letter), 12 November 2020/ SoCG update March 2021
17.2.	It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that GCC and their consultants have been overseeing and reviewing the Highways England SATURN model (developed for the scheme) over a number of years and reviewing the traffic figures and impact of the scheme as a whole, and not just on the 'missing link' scheme itself. Changes were made from the initial Stage 1 model (completed for the Option Sifting) to incorporate further detail, and incorporate all anticipated network changes and committed development, particularly on a local level within the County.	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
17.3.	A revised Transport Modelling and Analysis Technical Note was issued by Highways England to Gloucestershire County Council traffic modelling officers in April 2020. A further meeting was held on 7 October 2020 to discuss updates to the traffic modelling. The information provided resolved numerous matters raised by GCC regarding the traffic modelling and the effects of the scheme on the road network. However, both parties agree that there will be a new traffic model run in 2021 when revised TAG information is available and further discussion will be undertaken when the results of that model are available.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p7/8), 15 December 2020
17.4.	It is agreed that the change to Cowley junction as presented at the 2020 supplementary consultation (removal of general vehicular access to Cowley Wood Lane) sufficiently resolves concerns previously raised by GCC regarding potential for rat-running through Cowley junction. Whilst this change has been included in the latest traffic modelling exercise (April 2020 Technical Note), Highways England is undertaking re-modelling to account for network changes and will share this with GCC upon completion in 2021.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p8/10), 15 December 2020
17.5.	The Joint Councils agree with Highways England that the design change to B4070 since the 2019 statutory consultation would have little effect on traffic flows. Highways England have confirmed that this has been included within the latest traffic modelling exercise (April 2020 Technical Note).	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p10), 15 December 2020
17.6.	The Joint Councils and Highways England recognise that Covid-19 could have long-term impacts on traffic and travel patterns. There have been discussions between Highways England and the Department for Transport on	Traffic modelling meeting 7 October 2020.

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	how the impact of COVID-19 is dealt with. It may be that the low growth sensitivity test takes on a more prominent role in the appraisal of the scheme. The Department of Transport issued the Route Map for Updating TAG on 23 July 2020 and this details the process for updating the relevant information and an indication as to when this data is likely to be available. This matter was discussed with GCC officers at a meeting held on 7 October 2020 and Highways England will review the modelling and economic assessment in light of any changes to TAG databook when made available.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p10), 15 December 2020
18. Crossings of the A417		
18.1.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that potential crossing points of risk for animals have been identified (especially for bats, barn owls, badgers, deer and other mammals/amphibians) and mitigated/improved as part of the scheme. There will always be a risk to barn owls from the proposals however, but some of the risk has been reduced down as far as is reasonably possible without compromising too many other biodiversity objectives. Landscaping and structures in the right locations and of the right type/design are critical so they are effective as crossing routes. Some will require monitoring and suitable aftercare.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p18), 12 November 2020
Gloucestershire County Council		
18.2.	In terms of the baseline at the western end of the scheme, Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) and Highways England agree that the previous A417 scheme caused fragmentation or severance of historic crossing points of the A417 near Dog Lane and Badgeworth Footpath 86, which has been exacerbated by increased traffic levels. GCC has expressed these routes may have been better stopped-up to prevent safety concerns associated with some users continuing to attempt to cross the A417 mainline at grade despite areas of vegetation, embankment, fencing and central reservation/safety barriers causing obstruction to crossings. GCC and Highways England agree that, where possible and reasonable to do so, the scheme could help to provide enhancement rather than mitigation by addressing the fragmentation or severance caused by the previous scheme by providing crossings of the A417 where appropriate and safe to do so. The proposal for the Grove Farm underpass would adequately achieve this.	WCH TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 GCC PRoW meeting held on 16.09.2020
19. Engineering design		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering design 		
19.1.	The Joint Councils agree that Highways England has taken into account the 10 principles of good road design in the Highways England publication The Road to Good Design.	SoCG Meeting 22 April 2020
19.2.	In the response to statutory consultation (page 6, 8 November 2019), the Joint Councils queried the need for the northbound exit at Cowley junction and sought that Highways England revisit this aspect of the design. In the revised scheme design, Highways England has removed the northbound exit to Cowley from Cowley junction. This change was driven by concerns raised during statutory consultation about the necessity and safety of this	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p11), 15 December 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<p>junction. The link to Cowley has now been removed and replaced with a private means of access to fields and residential properties. The Joint Councils are satisfied with and agree with this design change.</p> <p>The Joint Councils also queried whether the junction with the old A417 needs to be a roundabout – noting that traffic figures are low and other similar left in, left out junctions on the A417 towards Cirencester do not have a roundabout.</p> <p>Highways England have explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the northbound off-slips at Cowley would also impact on the business of the Golden Heart Inn which is currently accessed via the Cowley junction. • A roundabout at this location also helps with the construction phasing of the scheme. • The design of Cowley junction has been refined as a result of comments received during the statutory consultation. <p>The Joint Councils are satisfied with this explanation and this matter is agreed between both parties.</p>	
19.3.	The Joint Councils agree that Highways England has reduced and refined the size, excavations and land take required for the proposed Shab Hill Junction in order to reduce the potential for significant impacts.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p9), 12 November 2020
19.4.	The Joint Councils support the change in gradient of the scheme on the Crickley Hill section from a change of 10% (as existing) to 8% (proposed), as presented at the 2020 supplementary consultation.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p11), 15 December 2020
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of local roads 		
19.5.	An updated version of Technical Note H01 – Local Authority Roads reflecting the revised scheme design issued 12 April 2021 is accepted by the Joint Councils and the content agreed in principle. It is agreed between Highways England and the Joint Councils that further discussion on the design of local roads can be discussed in the detailed design stage of the scheme, should it receive development consent.	Updated technical note H01, issued 12 April 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways safety 		
19.6.	<p>Risk-assessments in relation to snow fencing have not been undertaken – it is agreed by Highways England and the Joint Councils that it is expected that these would be undertaken during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>It is agreed that a Maintenance and Repair Strategy has been developed for the scheme by Highways England which outlines proposals for dealing with inclement weather as well as other maintenance activities. Careful consideration of methods to mitigate issues with drifting snow will be reviewed during later stages of design of the scheme. GCC would like to obtain a copy of GG104 Risk Assessments once completed</p>	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
19.7.	The Joint Councils are satisfied that a Safety Risk Assessment in accordance with GG104 has been undertaken. Highways England has confirmed to the Joint Councils that a comprehensive review of road safety has been ongoing throughout the design process recorded through a number of documents. A number of Risk Assessments (RA's) in accordance with GG104 have been undertaken. During this stage of the design process a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken. The Design CDM Risk Register records identified hazards and associated control measures to eliminate or control risk.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020
19.8.	The Joint Councils are satisfied by the assurance of Highways England that where there is a hazard identified in relation to cutting slopes identified, appropriate control measures would be provided to protect mammals and users. These may include fences, walls and hedges. The Councils are satisfied with Highways England's reassurance that safety measures would be applied to the revised, shallower cutting of 8%.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020
19.9.	<p>In their response to statutory consultation (page 5, 8 November 2019), the Joint Councils raised concern over the design of the climbing lane approaching Shab Hill junction and the potential for side-swipe type accidents. The Joint Councils are satisfied that Highways England has modified the design of the climbing lane at Shab Hill junction to ensure the merge from Lane 3 to Lane 2 would occur prior to the eastbound merge from Shab Hill junction. The revised eastbound merge would now merge approximately 220m further east. This would therefore separate these manoeuvres and ensure safe operation of the road reducing the probability of congestion issues.</p> <p>In addition, the Joint Councils and Highways England agree that community safety during construction, related to slow HGVs climbing the Crickley Ridge, will be addressed in the Public Rights of Way Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted with the DCO application.</p>	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020 / SoCG update, March 2021
19.10.	The Joint Councils are satisfied that Highways England has allowed for stopping sight distances in accordance with standards on the connector roads. The landscaping proposals indicated would be refined to ensure visibility is compliant with requirements. Due to minor road flows, Cowley junction has been designed in accordance with the requirements for compact grade separated junctions.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020
19.11.	The Joint Councils are satisfied that Highways England would provide appropriate anti-dazzle measures in the design.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020
19.12.	Following the amendments to the scheme design since the 2019 statutory consultation, Highways England has removed the access from Grove Farm to the mainline A417 from the scheme. This has sought to improve safety and accommodate design changes to the mainline. An alternative access is provided by the Grove Farm underbridge. This change was previously advocated for by the Joint Councils and is therefore wholly supported and agreed.	Joint Councils comments on SOCG and technical information (p12), 15 December 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
19.13.	With regard to future proofing the route, the Joint Councils are satisfied that the design of the route has been undertaken to provide predicted traffic capacity for up to 15 years after opening and that provision for new technologies is under constant review by Highways England across the network.	SoCG update, March 2021
19.14.	Highways England and the Joint Councils have reached agreement on the Departures from Standard affecting GCC carriageways and GCC have also received a list of departures affecting the Highways England retained network, as previously requested.	Email, 19 March 2021
19.15.	Highways England and the Joint Councils agree that the potential for an arrester bed within the scheme has been considered and assessed by Highways England, within Technical Note H02 Lay By and Arrester Bed Provision which has been shared with the Councils. Highways England and the Joint Councils agree with the conclusions of this assessment are that an arrester bed will not be provided within the scheme.	SoCG update, April 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage 		
19.16.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that discussions on the drainage design for the scheme, including information on hydraulic modelling, have taken place during the development of the scheme. This discussion has included technical meetings and the issue of technical notes, including the Drainage Strategy Report, by Highways England to GCC officers for comment, in their capacity as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The most recent issue of information was 12 April 2021. Comments of GCC have been taken into account by Highways England in developing the drainage design, which is agreed in principle and forms Appendix 13.10 Drainage Report of the ES. It is agreed between Highways England and the Joint Councils that the parties will continue to engage on matters relating to drainage in the detailed design stage of the scheme, should it receive development consent.	Issue of updated drainage information, 12 April 2021
19.17.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that discussions relating to the Flood Risk Assessment have taken place during the development of the scheme. Technical discussions regarding the Flood Risk Assessment scheme have taken place through meetings with GCC officers, the Environment Agency and Highways England. It is agreed that GCC flood risk officers have provided comments on 15 December 2020 to Highways England on the draft Flood Risk Assessment and that Highways England has had regard to such comments in developing the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the DCO application, as Appendix 13.3 of the ES. It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that the parties will continue to engage on matters relating to flood risk in the detailed design stage of the scheme, should it receive development consent.	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage 		
19.18.	The Joint Councils and Highways England agree that discussions relating to road signage on the scheme have taken place during the development of the scheme design. This has included the issue of a Signage Strategy by Highways England to GCC officers for comment, which have subsequently been taken into account. The most recent version of the Signage Strategy was issued on 12 April 2021 and the content of the document is agreed in	Updated Signage Strategy, issued 12 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	principle. It is agreed between the Joint Councils and Highways England that the parties will continue to engage on matters relating to signage in the detailed design stage of the scheme, should it receive development consent.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting 		
Cotswold District Council		
19.19.	CDC are in support of the proposal by Highways England to provide no street lighting at side road junctions. CDC consider this is key in reducing the potential landscape impacts as dark skies are an important component of the character of the Cotswolds AONB and the Dark Skies initiative. CDC support the Dark Skies policy and the conclusions of the TA49 Lighting Assessment Report which states that lighting is not justified. A GG104 risk assessment has been undertaken to evaluate risk and identifies mitigation measures to address risk. Highways England and Cotswold District Council recognise that their agreement on this matter differs from that of Gloucestershire County Council, the local highway authority, as set out in Table 5.2 of this SoCG. CDC has not undertaken a safety assessment of the impacts of lighting (or lack of lighting) on highway safety, as this is outside their remit. CDC consider that additional landscape assessment work will be required if lighting is to be installed – this may lead to the need for further changes to the highway design to minimise the need for lighting, or for additional landscape/biodiversity mitigation proposals to minimise the impacts of any lighting on the wider landscape and biodiversity.	SoCG update, April 2021
20. Draft Development Consent Order		
20.1.	No matters identified	
21. Land		
21.1.	No matters identified	
22. Environmental Management Plan (EMP)		
22.1.	No matters identified	
23. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)		
23.1.	No matters identified	

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between the Joint Councils and Highways England are:

- The provision of lighting on the scheme;
- The approach to archaeological trenching and cultural heritage assessment methodology; and,
- The effects of the scheme on the local road network and the requirement, in the view of the Joint Councils, for funding to mitigate such effects.

5.2 Matters outstanding

5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters that are outstanding between the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date of the latest position.

5.2.2 Where a matter relates to the position of one council only, or there are differences in the position between the councils, the matter is subdivided. In all other instances, the position relates to that of the Joint Councils.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between the Joint Councils and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1.	No matters identified.			
2. Consultation				
2.1	No matters identified.			
3. Consideration of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
3.1.	No matters identified.			
4. Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
4.1.	No matters identified			
5. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
5.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
6. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
6.1.	Assessment methodology	<p>The Joint Councils raised concern regarding the DMRB methodology in response to the 2019 consultation, stating: it is concerning that the method does not outline the division and interlinks between buried archaeology, built heritage and historic landscape. The Joint Councils have a concern that this is not sufficient for a landscape-based design approach and requires significant expansion. In response to the 2020 consultation, and publication of the 2020 PEI Report, the Councils continue to raise concern over the methodology of the cultural heritage assessment, stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the heritage chapter references the 2020 updated DMRB heritage guidance but does not appear to apply it with regard to developing a more holistic, landscape led and predictive approach. No reference to Highways Agency 2007 guidance on Assessing the Effect of Road schemes on Historic Landscape Character. Whole treatment of historic landscape would have benefited from applying the approach outlined in this, as well as Historic England guidance on the subject. Cotswold AONB guidance (Policy CE6) also needs to be referenced and reference also made to Natural England's National Character Areas. 	<p>The assessment utilises survey data to predict the presence and significance of archaeological remains. The chapter meets the requirements of DMRB.</p> <p>The guidance referenced is useful, however it is now 13 years old and new approaches to HLC assessment have been developed in the intervening period. Highways England's approach has been used on other major infrastructure with the support of Historic England, and uses a landscape scale approach. Highways England consider it an appropriate methodology that recognises the key aspects of the historic landscape within which the scheme sits.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
6.2.	Trial trenching	<p>Trenching is well designed, however a higher sample density would usually be required for other proposed developments. There is a risk of unexpected discoveries during construction, and potential requirement for archaeological supervision of topsoil strip.</p> <p>As of February 2021, the Joint Councils still consider that, as the low density of trial trenching has not changed, this matter remains not agreed.</p>	<p>Discussions have been held with GCC regarding proposed trial trenching. Trenching commenced in Autumn 2020. Weekly monitoring has been undertaken by Highways England, GCC and Historic England so that all parties are fully informed of findings on site, and that this ongoing discussion will feed into the Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation. This will ensure that appropriate mitigation is put in place for the pre-construction and construction phase.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Joint Council's position is that trial trenching density is not sufficient. Highways England's position is that the baseline is sufficient for the environmental assessment and that appropriate data has been included to meet the requirements of NPSNN and DMRB.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
7. Landscape and Visual (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
7.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
8.1.	Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Notwithstanding the matters agreed at Table 4-1, Reference 8.5 and 8.6, the Joint Councils express the need for the project as a whole to achieve a neutral or better biodiversity net gain score when applying the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric calculator.</p> <p>GCC will determine at the DCO stage whether the best practical long-term result for biodiversity will be achieved.</p>	<p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These new and improved habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity, in line with the nature recovery network strategy for the area.</p>	SoCG update, April 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			<p>Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme.</p> <p>Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.</p>	
8.2.	Surveys at Emma's Grove	<p>It is noted that protected and notable species surveys are not complete at Emma's Grove. Also, woodland NVC and Potential Tree Roost features for bats surveys have yet to be completed/reported on as part of the EIA.</p>	<p>Surveys were not previously able to be undertaken due to issues with land access. Access has recently been secured and survey work started at Emma's Grove week commencing 8th March 2021 (badgers, ground level tree assessment for bats). However, Highways England has now secured access and started surveys w/c 8 March 2021. This includes badger surveys and ground level tree assessment for bats.</p> <p>Where survey data has not been available to date in undertaking the EIA, a precautionary approach has been taken in which a 'reasonable worst-case' valuation was made based on the information available. This has included consideration of any available field or desk study data (including aerial photography), a comparison with similar habitat areas occurring in the wider local</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			area, and a qualitative consideration against any factors that indicate suitability for the particular habitat or species in question. The degree of precaution built into the assessment is linked to the level of confidence in the existing data upon which the assessment is based. The majority of ecological surveys considered to be required have been completed.	
8.3.	Ponds on land at Star College and at/near Bentham Lane	In these extended areas for drainage works there are ponds that need surveying for Great Crested Newt (GCN) potential. If the drainage works in this area were subject to a county or district planning permission instead of a DCO then entry into a GCN District Level Licensing Scheme is possible which would not require detailed GCN survey(s) of the ponds. However, it is recognised that there is a high probability that the pond at Star College may have a low Habitat Suitability Index score for GCNs and therefore not require repeated sampling visits by ecologists.	All ponds within the extended drainage works have now been assessed (Bentham Lane and National Star College). Habitat Suitability Index (HIS) surveys on the ponds at National Star College indicated poor habitat suitability for GCNs and it is not considered likely that GCNs are present at this location. 2019 desk study information indicated that a small population of GCNs are using a small pond adjoining a drainage ditch that is within the far western end of the scheme, at the southern extent of a complex of four further ponds that are further from the scheme within Bentham Green Space. This feature is included within the scheme to allow for access to a culverted section of the ditch for inspection, cleaning and potentially repair of the culvert and headwall where the ditch joins the pond. No major physical works are proposed to the culvert. If temporary habitat disruption and reinstatement became required to facilitate the drainage works, reasonable avoidance measures would be	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			implemented to ensure that no loss of GCN habitat would occur and that risk to individual newts was reduced to a negligible level, i.e. licensable impacts to GCN would be avoided. This would principally be achieved through planning the timing and duration of works for periods when GCNs would be unlikely to be present within any affected habitat. In addition, any works at this location would follow a precautionary non-licensed working method, including a watching brief by a suitably qualified ecologist.	
9. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
9.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
10. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)				
10.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
11. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
11.1.	Noise effects at Leckhampton Hill and Stratton	<p>GCC is aware that there is currently no mitigation proposed by Highways England that can avoid the significant adverse noise effects to the 17 properties at Stratton and Leckhampton Hill, as reported in recently held meetings with Highways England.</p> <p>Highways England are leading discussions with all interested parties to identify a solution.</p>	<p>Due to increases in traffic as a result of the scheme, the noise assessment has identified significant adverse effects relating to 12 properties in Stratton and 5 properties on Leckhampton Hill, outside of the DCO Boundary.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with GCC and will be undertaken with all interested parties regarding possible measures to mitigate this effect. Potential solutions have been presented by Highways England to GCC and discussed at an initial stage, to help identify possible acceptable mitigation measures.</p>	SoCG meeting, 6 May 2021
12. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
12.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
Please see the Statement of Common Ground between Highways England and the WCH groups for further details.				
13. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
13.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
14. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
14.1.	Assessment Methodology (GHG emissions assessment)	The methodology does not describe assessment of energy consumption for infrastructure operation, which is a requirement of DMRB LA 114.	ES Chapter 14 Climate will state that there are likely minimal direct emissions associated with operating the scheme since the scheme lighting is minimal. Power consumption has been assumed as negligible in the context of the scheme and therefore the associated carbon impact does not form part of the GHG emissions assessment. Operational energy use emissions have been scoped out of the assessment. The scheme has been designed to reduce the requirement for energy consuming operational equipment and therefore associated emissions are assumed to be insignificant.	SoCG update, March 2021
14.2.	Assessment Assumptions and Limitations (GHG emissions assessment)	The Joint Councils raise concern over the scope of the greenhouse gas emissions assessment, and consider that the following items should be included within the scope, or a justification for exclusion provided in accordance with LA114: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several life-cycle modules as stated in Table 17-4 of the 2020 PEI Report, in particular operational energy use; Construction waste management; 	Justification is provided for the inclusion or exclusion of each life cycle module. The scheme has been designed to reduce the requirement for energy consuming operational equipment such as street lighting or intelligent transport systems wherever possible. Where lighting may be potentially required, for example at Grove Farm underpass, low lux demand sensitive lighting is proposed. There would be a negligible difference between the operational	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Change and Land Use and Forestry Tree planting to offset emissions 	<p>energy required for the scheme compared with the existing A417, and therefore associated emissions are assumed to be insignificant.</p> <p>Construction waste management - Module A5 (Construction/installation processes) emissions, which include waste management, have been calculated using emissions factors from the Highways England carbon emissions calculation tool, based on information provided by design teams.</p> <p>Land Use Change: GHG emissions associated with ongoing land use change/sequestration have been calculated over the 60-year operational period for 'habitats lost' and 'habitats gained'.</p> <p>Tree planting to offset emissions - It is estimated that an area of between 200-300ha of forest would be required to sequester the embodied carbon impacts of the scheme over its design life. Therefore, an intervention to sequester the carbon impacts of the scheme is not considered feasible and has not formed part of the GHG emissions assessment.</p>	
15. Assessment Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)				
15.1.	Development scale thresholds	Following review of the 2020 PEI Report, the Joint Councils consider that previous comments made on the thresholds of development scale are unresolved. The Councils consider that it is appropriate to apply professional judgement to the DMRB guidance and consider other factors. The study area is predominantly rural and the	The thresholds for the long list of development have been updated for the ES Chapter 15 and have been derived based on the specific criteria listed in DMRB volume 11, section 2, LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring (section 3.19 – 3.22), as set out above. The assessment methodology	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		Joint Councils consider that thresholds for the scale of "other development" should be reduce to accurately reflect this context. The cumulative effects of small scale residential and employment sites should be considered.	in relation to development scale threshold reflects the DMRB standard, as the standard approach Highways England applies to the design, assessment and operation of its motorway and all-purpose trunk roads.	
15.2.	Zone of Influence	Table 15-5 of the 2020 PEI Report provides the proposed ZOI extents for the assessment of potential cumulative impacts. The proposed ZOI extent for landscape and visual cumulative impacts is up to 1.9 miles (3km). This appears inadequate particularly for the assessment of in combination effects with 'other developments', given the landscape importance of the Cotswold AONB and the long distance views of the scheme, particularly from PRow. It is recommended that this is increased to the maximum CEA ZOI extent of 3.1 miles (5km)	DMRB LA 107 states that in establishing the study area, it should be suitable and proportionate for this specific scheme. Highways England has considered the suggestion. It is considered that the level of information provided is proportionate to the project and assessment.	SoCG update, March 2021
16. De-trunking				
16.1.	Extent and status of future GCC local road network	<p>GCC has identified three categories which will apply to their local road network upon completion of the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing A417 to be de-trunked and retained as highway. Existing A417 to be re-purposed, re-engineering and become a WCH asset. New carriageway connections from the existing local road network to the A417. <p>Highways England have provided a revised De-Trunking Report on 28 August 2020. This report provides a list of assets that are to be removed and a list of assets being retained post completion. However, the following</p>	<p>Chapter 2 of the ES will set out in detail the proposals for the project, including those sections of the existing A417 to be de-trunked. Highways England has been in discussion with GCC on the proposals for de-trunked A417 and the extent of and future maintenance of assets. This has included the issue of information such as the De-Trunking Report. It is considered that discussion on these matters, including any commuted sums, will continue during the detailed design stage of the scheme.</p> <p>Should the scheme proceed to construction, there would be a detailed design phase, when surfacing and other</p>	SoCG meeting, 24 March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>points remain outstanding for further discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details /thorough assessment of the extent of additional assets that GCC will be inheriting, • commuted sums that would be agreed and paid to GCC to enable adequate maintenance of said assets • the proposals for CCTV equipment • the ownership of Barrow Wake Bridge • specification of the repurposed A417 	<p>detailed matters for the repurposed A417 would be agreed. Highways England will consult with Gloucestershire County Council and refer to the latest guidance for cycle infrastructure design from the Department for Transport. Suggestions put forward by Gloucestershire County Council and other interest groups have been included as a commitment in the Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan) submitted with the DCO application.</p>	
17. Traffic and Transport				
17.1.	Through traffic	<p>Through Traffic - GCC have asked in the past for evidence of the numbers for through traffic impacting on GCC roads versus local trips. We do not believe this information has been provided.</p> <p>The Joint Councils request clarification of the percentage of traffic using the new link that is travelling through the County – ie: origin and destination outside of the County, compared to the traffic that has an origin or destination within the County. The link that would be most appropriate for this test would be the new section of carriageway up / down Crickley Hill.</p> <p>GCC requests a full note of the information based on the latest findings in modelling the scheme changes on this matter be provided to enable further review and consideration.</p>	<p>Highways England is producing a technical note which will provide further information on this matter, as requested by GCC.</p>	<p>Technical meeting, 9 April 2021</p>
17.2.	Impact on local highways	<p>The Joint Councils and Highways England acknowledge that there would be an increase in traffic in some locations as a direct result of</p>	<p>Highways England is open to discussion on mitigating the effects of the A417 Missing Link project. Information on the traffic modelling and traffic impacts of the</p>	<p>Technical meeting, 9 April 2021.</p>

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>the scheme. This would include increases in traffic at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leckhampton Hill • Gloucester Road, Stratton • B4070 south of Birdlip • Road leading to Brimpsfield in 2026 forecasts an increase <p>The Councils have concerns over the impact of the scheme on the four locations above, where increases in traffic are forecast. Whilst supportive of the scheme, the Councils consider that mitigation measures for these impacts (which are directly attributable to the scheme) will be required in these locations, for which there are currently no schemes or funding identified. GCC requests that HE provides more information to demonstrate how these traffic increases can be reduced to current levels.</p>	<p>scheme will be set out within the DCO application documents, namely the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (ComMA) (Document Reference 7.6) and Transport Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p>	
18. Crossings of the A417				
18.1.	Cotswold Way crossing	<p>It is understood that the appearance of the bridge will be dealt with during detailed design to be secured by a DCO requirement. The Joint Council's would need to be a named consultee to be consulted prior to the discharge of the Requirement.</p>	<p>Highways England are committed to continue to work with the Joint Councils during the detailed design stage of the project, including on matters relating to the design of the Cotswold Way crossing. However, Highways England does not consider it necessary to specifically capture this in the DCO itself.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
19. Engineering design				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting 				
Gloucestershire County Council				

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
19.1.	Lighting on new highway to be maintained by GCC	<p>GCC is supportive of the Dark Skies initiative and recognises the need to protect landscape character and ecological assets. It is; however, considered necessary for some parts of the scheme to be illuminated. GCC requires that any new 'Conflict Zones' on sections of the highway which GCC will have responsibility for maintaining must be illuminated in accordance with BS/EN 5849 and BS/EN 13201.</p> <p>The Conflict Zones which GCC consider must be lit to BS/EN standards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cowley junction; • Shab Hill junction; • Leckhampton roundabout; • Barrow Wake roundabout; • Ullenwood junction. <p>GCC considers that there are opportunities to develop an appropriate and sensitive highway lighting scheme which accords with the BS/EN standards while also protecting ecological assets and the dark skies initiative in the AONB.</p> <p>Highways England should develop a highways lighting scheme for the identified Conflict Zones and should consider guidance from the Commission for Dark Skies and Institute of Lighting Professionals, incorporate innovative lighting solutions such as appropriate landscaping, low warm white (yellow) colour temperature LED Luminaires with Glare and Obtrusive Light Control that comply with Glare Classes G*5 and G*6, limit the use of lighting columns to the minimum required to accord with BS/EN standards and</p>	<p>Highways England notes that the view of GCC differs from that of Cotswold District Council, and the comments provided on Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the 2020 PEI Report, which stated:</p> <p><i>“Lighting is not essential and should be avoided for biodiversity (e.g. bats, barn owls) and landscape (dark skies) reasons. Temporary lighting during the construction phase is acceptable if the approach at 8.9.21 is followed.”</i> Previous comments from the Joint Councils' landscape specialist has also stated that it is accepted that there will be no road lighting on the scheme.</p> <p>Highways England has provided a copy of the following documentation to the Joint Councils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA49 Lighting Assessment Report • A417 Missing Link GG104 Safety Risk Assessment • A417 Missing Link Road Safety Audit Stage 1 – Designers Response • A417 Missing Link Supplementary Road Safety Audit Stage 1 – Designers Response <p>During Stage 2 of the project, a TA49 lighting assessment was undertaken for the scheme which concluded that lighting would not be required for the scheme. Since this initial review, the Stage 3 preliminary design for the A417 Missing Link has been completed. Latest design</p>	SoCG update, April 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>use 'low level lighting' e.g. reflective studs and reflective signage elsewhere.</p> <p>The height, quantity and colour of lighting columns should aim to minimise landscape and visual impacts, during both day and night. The landscape scheme should provide long-term visual screening of distant views of the lighting columns. GCC is committed to working with Highways England to develop a suitable lighting scheme at Conflict Zones.</p> <p>The impacts of lighting should be fully assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment. At present, highway lighting is provided at the A417 Air Balloon Roundabout, Cowley Junction and at other Conflict Zones in the surrounding area. Proposed highway lighting should be assessed against the existing baseline.</p> <p>In the event that that the scheme is approved without highway lighting at Conflict Zones which GCC will be responsible for maintaining, GCC requires that Highways England would wholly fund retrospective street lighting installation works required to bring the scheme into compliance with BS/EN standards.</p>	<p>changes will only have a negligible impact on the TA49 economic assessment figures. The TA 49 assessment for lighting based on the economics concludes that lighting is not justified.</p> <p>Highways England provided the TA49 Assessment to the Joint Councils on 28 August 2020.</p> <p>Highways England is undertaking a study to consider whether innovative lighting solutions could be compatible with Dark Skies areas, however the scheme is not proposed to be lit.</p> <p>Based on the technical assessment work undertaken to date, which has concluded that lighting is not required, the ES assesses the scheme without lighting and would only be able to consider lighting on the scheme if an appropriate and agreed design is forthcoming.</p> <p>At this point in time, and based on the technical assessment work completed to date, Highways England cannot commit to any retrospective costs. Highways England is, however, committed to continuing discussions on the need for lighting across the scheme with the Joint Councils.</p>	
20. Draft Development Consent Order				
20.1.	Consultation on DCO requirements	The Councils wish to fully understand any commitments for monitoring and/ or enforcement that may be placed on the Council by the DCO Requirements and how that monitoring and enforcement will be funded.	Requirements (akin to conditions) in the DCO will be discharged by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Local authorities have a statutory duty to enforce any unauthorised development on land within	SoCG update, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>The Council's acknowledge their statutory responsibility to monitor and enforce unauthorised development and non-compliance with a DCO within their jurisdiction. However, the Council's would seek to enter into legally binding side agreements with Highways England to secure any arrangements and funding for the management and monitoring of any elements of the scheme which the Council's would consider appropriate and reasonable.</p>	<p>the Order Limits, including non-compliance with the terms of the DCO. This is set out in sections 160 to 173 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Any future agreement in relation to this stage of the project is difficult to define until the Order is granted. Highways England are committed to continuing to discuss GCC's role as the project progresses.</p>	
21. Land				
21.1.	Land acquisition	<p>In response to the 2020 consultation, GCC Asset Management and Property Services stated:</p> <p>As confirmed in the previous consultation, it would appear that the only land affected by the revised DCO Boundary that Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) own that is not part of the publicly maintainable highway is the land previously identified as Parcel 2/45. In respect of this parcel, we remain ready to discuss your acquisition of this land at the appropriate time. Please be aware this land is currently leased to Ullenwood Cricket Club and we have advised them separately of the consultation.</p> <p>In terms of the other land parcels owned by GCC, these appear to be part of the current publicly maintainable highway network for which we are responsible. GCC colleagues will respond separately on matters affecting this land.</p>	<p>As statutory consultation in 2019 and 2020, Highways England consulted with Gloucestershire County Council as a land interest as required under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, in addition to consultation carried out in accordance with the status of GCC as a 'host authority' under section 42(1)(b).</p> <p>Highways England most recently met with GCC to discuss matters relating to land acquisition discussions on 10 November 2020.</p> <p>Position Statements have been drafted for all land owners effected by the scheme including GCC. The GCC Lands Position Statement has been shared with GCC on 12 April 2021 and will form an appendix to this document (Appendix C). This document will be submitted early in the examination.</p> <p>Discussion in relation to land acquisition, led by the District Valuer Services (DVS) on behalf of Highways England are due to begin in February 2021. Further</p>	SoCG update, April 2021

Ref.	Matter	Joint Councils' position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			discussions are also planned in relation to commuted sums in advance of submission of the DCO.	
21.2.	Car park at Barrow Wake	<p>The Councils consider that there are still some missed opportunities for example in establishing a new car park for Barrow Wake (and potentially Crickley Hill) in a much less prominent location.</p> <p>To try and achieve a net gain for biodiversity and conserve/enhance the SSSIs the existing car park at Barrow Wake should not be resurfaced but broken up and re-purposed for natural colonisation by vegetation. This does not rule out some modest access provision at this location, e.g. for the disabled visitor. The proposals for 'Air Balloon Way' parking should not go forward in addition to improving existing parking at Barrow Wake as this is very likely to have a significant adverse impact on the SSSIs. This and other matters will be covered by a Barrow Wake Car Park review led by GCC.</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledges feedback received in response to public consultation, which has suggested the reduction, removal or relocation of the Barrow Wake car park. This change is outside the scope of the scheme and the car park is not owned as part of the strategic road network by Highways England and acquisition of the land could not be justified as part of the DCO. However, Highways England has offered the relevant stakeholders help to inform or facilitate any discussions about any changes that might be proposed to the Barrow Wake car park. Highways England will ensure the A417 scheme is able to accommodate the existing car park arrangement, or a future scenario where the car park is reduced or removed.</p>	SoCG update, April 2021
22. Environmental Management Plan (EMP)				
22.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			
23. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)				
23.1.	No matters identified. Further comments may be provided following a review of the Environmental Statement and DCO application documents.			

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Gloucestershire County Council
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Cotswold District Council
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Tewkesbury Borough Council
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of the Joint Councils is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B-1.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with the Joint Councils during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by the Joint Councils being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B 1 Matters to be determined between the Joint Councils and Highways England

Ref	Matter	Councils' Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
4. EIA Methodology				
A.1	EIA methodology	Paragraph 4.5.3 of the 2020 PEI Report outlines the scope of assessment that has been addressed by each PEI chapter. This includes the assessment of the likely significant effects of the scheme, following the application of design, mitigation and enhancement measures. Is this effectively the identification of potential residual effects following mitigation? Should a further stage be added, to identify additional essential mitigation measures and enhancements which may be required to address the likely significant effects of the scheme mitigation (the step before identifying likely monitoring requirements)?	The EIA process is iterative and the scheme has continually sought to avoid and mitigate significant effects throughout the design development. The residual effects summarised in ES Chapter 16 are the effects which it has not been possible to mitigate sufficiently to reduce to non-significant. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the ES upon submission of the DCO application.	SoCG Update, March 2021
A.2	HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) - Paragraph 4.6.2 states that the HRA screening of each Special Area of Conservation (SAC) has been undertaken, but does not indicate the results of the screening, whether significant effects are likely or have been identified, or whether an	An updated HRA screening and Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (SIAA) have recently been completed and shared with Natural England. Both of these documents will be submitted with the DCO application.	SoCG Update, March 2021

		Appropriate Assessment is likely to be required.		
A.3	Potential effects of Covid-19	<p>Covid-19 is a recent phenomenon, the effects of which are probably too early to predict in terms of impacts upon overall traffic flow volumes, peak hour travel and changes to the workplace, such as the location and scale of employment facilities required in the future. Some form of consideration of the potential effects of Covid-19 on the scheme should be included in Chapter 4, to at least acknowledge the issue and commit to monitor any significant changes in national policy that may result.</p>	<p>Highways England do not consider it is appropriate to include reference to Covid-19 within the EIA at this time. Whilst the short term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the road network has been a reduction in traffic, the long-term impact on road traffic volumes, mode choice and travel patterns remains unclear, There is currently no evidence that there will be a substantial drop in traffic volumes on the road network in the long term. At present Highways England is following the Department for Transport recommendation to use the current traffic growth forecasts in the appraisal of the scheme.</p> <p>The DCO application documents will reference Covid-19 where it has had an impact on process or procedure, such as the Consultation Report, which will clearly explain how we met our statutory duties despite the restrictions associated with Covid-19.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
6. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
A.4	PEI Report, Cultural Heritage chapter	<p>In response to the 2019 public consultation, the Joint Councils stated that the 2019 PEI Report did not give a good appreciation of how much will be required from a cultural heritage perspective, whilst recognising that a significant amount of assessment and survey work was still required.</p> <p>In response to the 2020 consultation on the 2020 PEI Report, the Joint Councils consider that the 2020 PEI Report is still based on an incomplete data set.</p> <p>Geophysical survey has been undertaken over much but not all of the red line area is due to be completed in early 2021 but full reports are not yet available. Trial trenching is due to recommence ongoing at the time of</p>	<p>All surveys will be completed for the submission of the DCO. Areas in which surveys were unable to be undertaken will be included for investigation in the OWSI /DAMS.</p> <p>In terms of baseline Highways England considers that appropriate data has been included to meet the requirements of NPSNN.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Joint Councils in fine tuning the OWSI/DAMS. Highways England are committed to ensuring that all archaeological mitigation is robust.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

		<p>writing in areas where landowner permission was not previously available but still at a lower than normal density which leaves a risk of further significant archaeology only being encountered at a late stage, potentially including during construction. The report into archaeological trial trenching is not expected until late April and therefore cannot fully inform the ES and an Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation for mitigation recording that is currently in preparation. Additionally, some large areas are currently inaccessible until after the DCO process is complete due to landowner and to ecological constraints. It should therefore be recognised that the archaeological baseline information is incomplete and not all undesignated heritage assets will have been identified in the ES.”</p>		
A.5	Assessment methodology	<p>The Joint Councils raised concern in response to the 2019 consultation that the 2019 PEI Report did not assess non-designated built and landscape heritage. In response to the 2020 consultation, and publication of the 2020 PEI Report, the Councils continue to raise concern that there appears to have been no assessment of the significance of impact on undesignated built heritage.</p>	It will be set out in ES Chapter 6, that there would be no significant effects on non-designated built heritage.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p13) 12 November 2020
A.6	Assessment of effects	<p>The Joint Councils considered that there was not enough information presented [in the 2019 PEI Report] to ascribe Large Adverse as the overall effect. The Councils await the result of the archaeological evaluation work and subsequent assessment of the effects of the scheme in the ES before further comment can be made.</p>	The ES will provide an assessment of the effects of the scheme in Chapter 6, Cultural Heritage. It is recognised that the Joint Councils await receipt of this chapter prior to making further comment on the overall effect of the scheme in relation to cultural heritage.	SoCG update, March 2021

A.7	Hedgerow Regulations	<p>There is no reference to any assessment in relation to the criteria set out in Sections 2 and 3 of Schedule 1, Part II of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.</p> <p>Position pending publication of ES.</p>	<p>This reference will be included in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the ES upon submission of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.8	Impact on undesignated archaeology	<p>Impacts should be re-assessed using the results of the geophysical survey and trial trenching (once available) as much new information is being produced that was not available when the desk-based assessment was written. This should include better understanding of potential geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental baseline along the route. Critical sections (i.e. Shab Hill) could benefit from at least basic deposit modelling based on results from geotechnical work already undertaken. Reference could be made to Historic England's 2020 guidance on this.</p> <p>Position pending publication of ES.</p>	<p>These assets have been re-assessed based on the results of the trial trenching. This will be reported in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the ES upon submission of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.9	EMP	<p>The Joint Councils consider that it is clear that all impacts will be mitigated as appropriate through the EMP to be produced by Highways England as part of the DCO application.</p>	<p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the EMP is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the EMP upon submission of the DCO application.</p>	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p13), 12 November 2020
A.10	Air Balloon Way	<p>The naming of streets is a district council statutory function. The process for naming a road involves consultation with local parish and town councils, ward members and properties on the road. Until the process and consultation has been carried out the district</p>	<p>In recognition of the heritage of the area in relation to Edward Jenner and one of the first British balloon flights, Highways England has proposed that the new WCH link on the repurposed A417 is named the 'Air Balloon Way'. It is acknowledged that the Councils reserve a position on this until</p>	Cotswold District Councils comments on SOCG 26 April 2021.

		council could not confirm its support for renaming the repurposed A417 to 'Air Balloon Way'.	further consultation is carried out as per the process for naming streets, and will continue to engage with the Councils on this matter.	
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
A.11	Impact of changes to the PRow network	<p>The Joint Councils seek clarification on whether the impact of changes to the PRow network, for example at Barrow Wake, could impact on surrounding areas. For example, the Cotswolds Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is already being put at risk by recreational pressures and local authority partners and Natural England have recently commissioned work to assess the nature of the recreational pressures at the SAC and to investigate ways in which these can be addressed.</p> <p>The Joint Councils consider this matter outstanding until a completed version of the SIAA is available for review. The SIAA has not been provided, but the Councils assume that it will be updated to take account to alterations to PRow networks and amendments to bridge/crossing point proposals.</p>	It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until an SIAA is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the SIAA upon submission of the DCO application.	SoCG update, March 2021
A.12	Additions to the assessment	<p>At statutory consultation, the Joint Councils recommended that in the environmental assessments, consideration is also given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> grassland habitats as these are an important component of the local biodiversity Nature Recovery networks and how the scheme can contribute positively to those, while also minimising habitat fragmentation 	<p>The Nature Recovery Network is being discussed and agreed with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. Highways England will seek to liaise with GWT regarding the sharing of information with the Joint Councils.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity considers the effects of the scheme on grassland habitats and sets out proposals for mitigation, including planting of calcareous grassland. It also considers the issue of climate change in relation to species. ES Chapter</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects of climate change on key habitats and species that are affected by the scheme <p>To date, the Joint Councils have not been provided with draft versions of the ES or any detailed assessment of hydrology and related ecological effects, therefore this matter remains outstanding. Highways England commitments to connectivity and resilience to future climate change is welcome.</p> <p>The Joint Councils endorse discussion with GWT regarding the Nature Recovery Network and would be grateful to receive a summary of any such consultation.</p> <p>Can Highways England confirm whether consideration is being given to grassland habitats, and the effects of climate change of key habitats and species in ES?</p>	<p>14 provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme in relation to climate change. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the ES upon submission of the DCO application.</p>	
<p>A.13</p>	<p>Emma's Grove, ancient woodland</p>	<p>The Joint Councils will await full details of any justification the Emma's Grove should not be classed as ancient woodland and will respond on that point. The Joint Councils agree with the statement that the woodland is a priority habitat in any eventuality and welcome Highways England commitment to mitigate loss. Whilst the Joint Councils consider the evidence provided by Highways England appears adequate, the Joint Councils await receipt of the full ES before this point can be reviewed and agreed.</p>	<p>The 2020 PEI Report identifies that Emma's Grove is not ancient woodland.</p> <p>Old mapping was researched at the British Library which indicates that Emma's Grove is not ancient as it does not appear on maps over 400 years ago. Numerous cartographic sources dating between 1577 and 1800 were consulted in order to investigate whether the woodland surrounding the barrows would be qualify as Ancient Woodland. The woodland was first present on the 19th century OS 25" first edition map, produced between 1844-1888 Both the Saxton map of 1577 and the Walpoole map of 1794 identify the presence of the barrows with no woodland surrounding them. Ullen Wood, as noted in the OS 25" second edition map of 1894-1903 is located north-east of the site, where woodland there is noted on Taylor's earlier maps of 1777 and 1800. The southern half of Emma's Grove only appears on maps from 1902.</p>	<p>SoCG update, March 2021</p>

			It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the full ES is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.	
A.14	Cotswolds Beechwood SAC	<p>The Joint Councils note that no detail on the impact of the scheme on the Cotswolds Beechwood SAC is provided in the HRA in the PEI Report and therefore it is not clear whether there are significant effects expected on this site.</p> <p>While the Joint Councils consider Highways England's summary of SIAA in terms of recreational impacts on Cotswolds Beechwoods SAC helpful, until a completed version of the SIAA is available for review, this matter remains outstanding.</p>	Highways England has completed a Habitats Regulation Assessment for the revised scheme design, which is currently with Natural England for comment / approval of the screening results. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the SIAA upon submission of the DCO application.	January 2021
A.15	Hydrology	<p>The Joint Councils seek to understand if Highways England have fully understood the long-term impacts of changes in hydrology on biodiversity, as the PEI Report indicates that such assessment has not been undertaken. The Councils would like to understand the mitigation proposals for such impacts.</p> <p>Comments on reduction on groundwater impacts as a result of reduced cutting depth are welcomed.</p> <p>To date, the Joint Councils have not been provided with draft versions of the ES or any detailed assessment of hydrology and related ecological effects, therefore this matter remains outstanding.</p>	<p>Impacts and proposed mitigation for aquatic ecology effects due to changes in hydrology will be detailed within the ES and underpinned by detailed assessments for fish, macroinvertebrates and river habitat, provided as separate appendices to Chapter 8 of the ES. The 2020 PEI Report provided a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme on aquatic ecology.</p> <p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the full ES is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.16	Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (SIAA)	The Joint Councils stated in the response to statutory consultation that they are satisfied with the approach being taken and the methodologies applied for the ecology assessment. However, until a completed	Highways England has completed a Habitats Regulation Assessment for the revised scheme design, which is currently with Natural England for comment / approval of the screening results.	SoCG update, March 2021

		version of the Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment is available for review, this matter will remain outstanding.	It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until an SIAA is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.	
A.17	Veteran trees	In reference to the National Policy Statement for National Networks (para 5.32), it will be necessary for the applicant to demonstrate that any loss of veteran trees is unavoidable.	The Case for the Scheme submitted with the DCO application will set out how the scheme is compliant with the NPSNN.	SoCG update, March 2021
A.18	Creation of rock exposures, calcareous grassland, scrub and woodland mainly by natural colonisation	<p>There does not seem to be any explicit reference to a default position of allowing natural colonisation to happen which is both an economical approach and one that would give better biodiversity outcomes in the medium to long term. New exposed substrates should have minimal or no treatment. This means reseeding and planting with trees should be only actioned for well justified reasons (biodiversity/landscape) and the mentioned re-use of turf or top-soil to be kept as far as possible to only re-using that material arising from existing species rich vegetation impacted by works.</p> <p>This needs to be more explicitly set out in the EIA/ES perhaps a table showing what methods of habitat creation and landscaping are being proposed, i.e. why natural colonisation is or isn't being promoted for a given spot. An important priority with new cuttings and embankments is the encouragement and creation of calcareous grassland which would be low nutrient, species-rich and require less management (cutting). Trees should not be planted except where critical for ecological or landscape reasons.</p> <p>There is concern that the public consultation booklet includes a cross section image showing a verge would be planted and seeded (giving an impression that this would</p>	<p>The new exposed rock face (2.6ha) would be allowed to colonise naturally.</p> <p>The majority of tree planting is required as part of mitigation measures for both ecology and landscape and requires a fast establishment period so that habitats become functional relatively quickly, which natural colonisation would not be able to achieve.</p> <p>There is a limited amount of land available within the DCO Boundary that would be suitable for natural colonisation / regeneration, with several parcels returning to grazing. The area of land between the new A417 and the edge of Ullen Wood was considered for "rewilding" but this was discussed with GWT and discounted. As stated in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to be submitted as part of the DCO application, locally sourced seed will be used as much as possible so as not to introduce 'seed mix' varieties.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that natural colonisation is of value, woodland (and hedgerow) planting is required in most places in order to provide habitat connectivity for several species, in particular bats. It is important that such connectivity establishes quickly in order to reduce the impacts of habitat fragmentation.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

		happen in many places). The mitigation map in the public consultation booklet also implies there will be extensive wildflower planting as well as tree and woodland planting rather than making the most of ecological processes. We need to accept that ecological value of the best sort will arise over time through natural colonisation.		
9. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
A.19	Historical data	There is no clear identification in Chapter 9 of the PEI Report of what historical chemical data is available and if it has been ruled out for use in the baseline due to the age and subsequent uncertainty of using this data. Section 3 of Appendix 9.3 Geo-Environmental Assessment of the 2020 PEI Report confirms that the chemical data from Phase 1 and Phase 2A have been used to inform the assessment but there is no clear identification of what historical chemical data is available and if it has been ruled out of the assessment due to the age and subsequent uncertainty of using this data.	Historical investigations did not include geo-environmental testing and therefore no historical data is available. The assessments in the ES will be based on results of the recent, now completed investigations, Phase 1 and Phase 2A.	SoCG update, March 2021
A.20	Mitigation measures during construction	It is noted that the management of soils would be in accordance with the DEFRA Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites as stated in the 2019 PEI Report (9.8.4); however, it is considered that some discussion of the mitigation measures to be adopted during construction in relation to agricultural land should be stated. The agreement of this matter is pending receipt of the EMP.	Provisionally identified mitigation measures to be adopted during construction in relation to soil management and agricultural land are set out in Chapter 9 Geology and Soils of the 2020 PEI Report and provided in further detail in the EMP within the DCO application. It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the EMP is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.	SoCG update, March 2021
A.21	Contaminants	The potential contaminants listed in Table 9-13 (namely hydrocarbons) may present a nuisance to nearby residents, workers and	Chapter 9 Geology and Soils of the 2020 PEI Report provides an updated assessment of the effects of the scheme with regard to contamination.	SoCG update, March 2021

		<p>recreational users through odour. This should be discussed.</p> <p>The agreement of this matter is pending receipt of the EMP.</p>	<p>Based on gathered information through a desk study and completed intrusive ground investigations no significant hydrocarbon contamination that may result in odour nuisance is anticipated.</p> <p>Should significant hydrocarbon contamination be encountered during construction works, this will be dealt with in accordance with the EMP, which sets out procedures for dealing with unexpected contamination. This calls for completing risk assessments and implementation of appropriate health and safety measures.</p> <p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the EMP is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.</p>	
A.22	Agricultural land	<p>A full Agricultural Land and Soil Resources Report, along with a full Agricultural Land Impact Assessment will be completed</p> <p>The agreement of this matter is pending receipt of the ES.</p>	<p>A detailed Agricultural Land Classification survey is planned to be undertaken in September and October 2020, and will inform the full assessment of the effects of the scheme of agricultural land in the ES.</p> <p>Highways England notes that this matter may be agreed following the publication of the ES and the review of its contents by the Joint Councils.</p>	September 2020
A.23	Monitoring of soils and ALC Grade 3a and 3b land	<p>This section identifies monitoring associated with significant effects associated with land contamination and controlled waters only. As soils and ALC Grade 3a and 3b land has been assessed to have significant effects, monitoring associated with these effects should be identified or acknowledged as not required with associated justification.</p>	<p>In the latest draft of the ES, Highways England has added a monitoring requirement in relation to the temporary use of agricultural land during construction.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.24	Assessment of effects	<p>Consider if effects during construction should actually be greater than during operation due to the disturbance the construction will have</p>	<p>Chapter 9 Geology and Soils of the ES will report effects at construction stage because that is when the land is impacted (whether temporarily or</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

		on geology and soils compared to the operational stage (i.e. permanent loss of ALC Grade 3a and 3b occurs at construction stage and soil and groundwater contamination may pose a risk to the groundwater at construction stage but if remediation is complete at construction stage as suggested it should not be significant at the operational stage).	permanent). Any soil impacted temporarily during construction will be managed in accordance with the Soils Management Plan; this will be referenced in the ES chapter. The Management Plan will ensure that the soil will be returned at the same grade.	
10. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)				
A.25	Mitigation measures	<p>The Councils consider that there will not be much excess material from the site clearance stage of construction, and therefore the Councils query if the mitigation proposed for this should relate instead to the earthworks stage.</p> <p>Following review of the 2020 PEI Report, the Councils consider that there is still emphasis on mitigation for site clearance rather than earthworks where we feel the greatest effect and therefore requirement for mitigation is needed.</p>	<p>Essential mitigation related to earthworks will be outlined in section 10.9.10 of the Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste of the Environmental Statement. An earthworks surplus of 65,945m³ has been identified, comprising of clay, mudstone and limestone. Measures would be taken to reduce excess material to the point that no surplus material would remain after the required cut and fill construction operations. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highway alignment changes to reduce cut volumes; • changes to landscape earthworks cross section and slope design to increase placed fill volumes; • changes to cut slope design and cross sections at locations in deep cutting to reduce cut volumes; <p>utilisation of excavated limestone materials in pavement construction</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.26	Materials Monitoring Plan	<p>It is expected that the monitoring section in the ES would cover monitoring required under a Materials Management Plan (MMP) if it is thought this will be used for the scheme.</p> <p>It is strongly encouraged that any such MMP is prepared in such a way as to demonstrate how the proposal will be aligned with the local policy ambitions which are contained in</p>	<p>Regarding material assets, a Materials Management Plan (MMP) has been developed during the design process and development of the EIA, and will form Annex E of ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4). The MMP outlines how material resources would be managed, in accordance with best practice</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

		<p>the Gloucestershire WM-SPD, WCS (Policy WCS 2 – Waste Reduction) and MLP (Policy SR01 – Maximising the use of secondary and recycled aggregates).</p> <p>Following review of the 2020 PEI Report, the Councils consider that there still no detail on the stages required for a MMP. We need to be confident that these are fully understood, as part of the assessment of this scheme</p>	<p>requirements and the controls for material management and storage.</p> <p>Regarding waste, a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) has been developed during the design process and development of the EIA, and will form Annex H of ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4). The SWMP outlines the proposals for the identification, segregation, handling and storage of wastes identified as arising from the scheme.</p>	
11. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
A.27	Operational noise assessment	<p>The Joint Councils will provide further comment on the operational noise assessment upon review of the ES.</p> <p>Further comment will be provided once the ES has been reviewed.</p>	<p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the ES is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
13. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
A.28	Norman's Brook	<p>There is a concern regarding the potential impacts and specifically the potentially adverse significance of the realignment of tributary of Norman's brook and modifications to existing culvert capacities. Hydraulic modelling will be used to assess both the baseline flood risk and any changes to flood risk as a result of the scheme as well as to inform design. There is a potential for betterment as downstream flooding issues could be improved through engineered management of overland flows at the foot of Crickley Hill and it is recommended that opportunities for this are evaluated.</p> <p>The agreement of this matter is pending receipt of the ES.</p>	<p>The modelling has demonstrated that the proposed drainage strategy and tributary of Norman's Brook realignment does not detrimentally affect existing flood risk. This will be reported on in Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

A.29	Assessment methodology – fluvial flood risk	<p>Confirmation is required that the approach to hydrological and hydraulic modelling is adequate for both the purposes of assessing baseline flood risk as well as evaluating the potential impacts from culvert modifications and improvements, de-culverting where feasible and watercourse realignments, all of which may result in modifications to the interaction of overland flows on the floodplain as well as in-channel hydraulics. It is recommended that the approach to modelling considers whether a 1D-2D method is most appropriate to achieve a robust assessment and a like-for-like appraisal of baseline against design.</p> <p>The agreement of this matter is pending receipt of the ES.</p>	<p>The modelling approach is considered to be appropriate and has recreated our understanding of existing flood risk. The modelling has allowed for the representations of hydraulic structures to be included and accurately model their operation across a number of events. This will be reported on in Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
14. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
A.30	Zero-carbon targets	<p>It is agreed that the assessment should be carried out in line with the requirements of the NN NPS, and that this assesses significance in the context of the established UK carbon budgets. This does not currently include the 100% reduction set out in the Climate Change Act. Agreement of this matter is pending subject to receipt of the ES.</p>	<p>Highways England recognises the concern raised about the scheme within the context of concerns about global warming, and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced on 27 June 2019.</p> <p>Highways England is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget period.</p> <p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the full ES is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

A.31	Significance of effect	<p>It is agreed that the assessment should be carried out in line with the requirements of the NN NPS, and that this assesses significance in the context of the UK carbon budgets. However, it is still not clear how the level of significance will be determined, and how a 'material impact' on the carbon budgets will be defined. Will the effect on climate be found significant if emissions exceed a certain percentage of the budget, for example? How will this be established?</p> <p>The Councils consider that this matter will remain a matter outstanding until the ES is issued or clarification on the questions posed are provided.</p>	<p>Highways England recognises the concern raised about the scheme within the context of concerns about global warming, and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced on 27 June 2019.</p> <p>Highways England is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget period. This assessment will be reported in the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the A417 Missing Link DCO application, and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the scheme. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with DMRB methodology. An assessment of the scheme's compliance with the NPSNN will be provided in the Case for the Scheme submitted with the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
17. Traffic and transport				
A.32	M5 Junctions 10 and 9	<p>Since this process has started the Government have announced that Homes England will provide funding for the M5J10 scheme and that the M5 J9 will be moving forward to the stage of the Business Case. Has the impact of these schemes been taken into account on the A417 scheme?</p> <p>The modelling and evaluation of M5 J9 and M5 J10 has moved on significantly in the last year, and we would accept the inclusion of M5 J10 in the Do Minimum. The Joint Councils would however seek clarification and reassurance from Highways England that the latest layouts have either a) been</p>	<p>The Do Minimum traffic model includes the M5 Junction 10 improvements. This scheme has been included from the Stage 2 model following discussions with GCC, at the point of inclusion in the model the scheme was at the Co-Development Stage.</p> <p>The M5 J9 improvements are not included in the Do Minimum model currently as this scheme is not at an appropriate level for inclusion in the uncertainty log and thus the model. Appendix E of the ComMA will provide a full list of GCC and/or local committed development schemes and the M5 J9 and will be listed as Hypothetical/Foreseeable and therefore not included in the model. Even</p>	SoCG Update, March 2021

		<p>included in the new model runs, or request a view as to whether the revised layouts would materially impact on the modelling results.</p>	<p>though it has moved forward to the Business Case stage, it is still not at a sufficient stage for inclusion in the Do Minimum model.</p> <p>The uncertainty log that sets out the schemes included, in particular the local GCC ones, can be reviewed and discussed to ensure those schemes that are at the relevant stage are included in the Do Minimum model.</p> <p>The M5 J10 scheme is included in all the DM models and has been carried over from PCF Stage 2.</p> <p>The current scheme included for the M5 J10 is similar to Option 2 from the M5 Junction 10 Improvement Scheme Technical Appraisal Report. The difference being the road connecting the A4019 to the B4634 connects to the A4019 west of the junction rather than the east as outlined in the Technical Appraisal Report.</p> <p>GCC provided drawings of the J10 improvement scheme design on 13 April to Highways England to enable an assessment to be carried out of the impact of the layout on the modelling results.</p>	
18. Crossings of the A417				
A.33	Ecological connectivity of crossings	<p>A summary of all steps taken to maximise the biodiversity value of all planned underpasses and bridges etc. would be helpful as a table in the EIA/ES. Where no or limited measures for biodiversity are proposed on crossing structures then the EIA/ES must justify why it is considered not reasonable to deliver ecological connectivity and biodiversity gain on them.</p>	<p>The design of the scheme has been iterative and has sought to maximise opportunities for biodiversity, including on crossings. ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity will set out the provision of species crossings for the scheme and the information, including ecology surveys, that has informed this design. Furthermore, the Design Summary Document will set out how Highways England has taken a landscape-led approach to the design, including how the design and appearance of crossings has been determined. These documents will be available as part of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
20. Draft Development Consent Order				

A.34	Securing of mitigation, compensation and enhancement proposals.	<p>It is crucial that the mitigation, compensation and enhancement proposals included within the Development Consent Order (DCO) and its accompanying documentation are delivered by the scheme. A clear mechanism should be in place to ensure that the vision of the scheme is delivered in full so that the landscape and biodiversity elements of the scheme are not diluted by any potential engineering or other project cost increases.</p> <p>The Joint Councils note the Highways England position and the Council's will continue to review and comment on the design drawings, management plans and draft DCO throughout the DCO process.</p>	<p>This is noted. The DCO application will include the mitigation and enhancement measures which are designed into the scheme and Highways England would be required to deliver these should the DCO application be granted. The scheme is costed based on the design of the scheme including mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>It is recognised that this matter remains outstanding until the draft DCO is available to the Joint Councils for review. This will be published as part of the DCO application.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
22. Environmental Management Plan (EMP)				
A.35	Long term management of habitat creation	<p>The Councils consider that the long-term management of areas of habitat creation is crucial to the success of biodiversity net gain. Clarity on how these areas will be managed and by who is sought, including how long-term management will be secured/monitored if land is handed back to original landowners.</p> <p>It is unclear if the LEMP will only refer to land retained for management by Highways England and whether there is other land that will go back to other landowners to manage and how that will be secured in a certain way if necessary to meet biodiversity/landscape objectives etc.</p>	<p>A LEMP will be submitted with the DCO application and will set out how the landscape design and ecology mitigation measures including habitat creation shall be delivered and managed.</p> <p>Following completion of construction, the main works contractor shall undertake management and monitoring of newly created habitat according to the agreed LEMP for an initial five-year period. Following the establishment period, after the first five years monitoring will consist of annual checks with recommendations made to ensure the maintenance is adjusted to suit the establishing planting and habitats.</p> <p>The LEMP would be subject to a process of ongoing review and amendment during the lifetime of the scheme to ensure it remains relevant. Review requirements shall follow Highways England's 'Landscape Management Handbook'. This states that the landscape and ecological</p>	SoCG update, March 2021

			<p>management plans should be updated annually and formally reviewed every five years.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with certain landowners in relation to the potential use of section 253 agreements in order to manage areas of long-term essential mitigation. The LEMP (which is updated as the scheme progresses) could include details of these if they are in place at the time of writing. Similar agreements for long-term maintenance may be reached with other parties but Highways England will assume responsibility until such agreements are in place.</p>	
A.36	Vegetation clearance	<p>During construction it would be useful to understand the proposed extent of vegetation clearance required within the DCO Boundary required for temporary works. In addition, it would be useful to identify important blocks of vegetation or individual trees within the DCO Boundary where commitments could be made to retain and protect during the construction phase to reduce short-medium term landscape and visual impacts during operation.</p> <p>No information on the extent and nature of habitats/features that may/will need to be retained has been provided to date. If we have missed this information in the recent consultation documents then Highways England should point to where this is. Otherwise it is falling to the LEMP production for the DCO stage to reveal these details which the Joint Councils consider is not ideal.</p>	<p>Vegetation clearance will be sensitively timed with regard to breeding birds, hibernating reptiles and Roman snails. Methods of vegetation clearance will be undertaken following specifications within protected species licences. Areas of retained vegetation will be shown within the environmental master plan and protection measures detailed within the LEMP. This information will be available upon DCO submission.</p>	SoCG update, March 2021
A.37	Lighting during construction	<p>The Joint Councils seek to understand if there will be any control of lighting resulting from construction works or works compounds, given the potential impacts of this during a lengthy construction period.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the 2020 PEI Report sets out the provisionally identified methods of controlling lighting during construction, however this will be provided in more detail in the ES and EMP submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>	September 2020

A.38	Further surveys	It is expected that the need for repeat surveys at certain locations is reviewed before works on affecting these (directly or indirectly) commence, e.g. on potential new badger setts and bat roosts. This should be built into the EMP for the scheme alongside avoidance/mitigation measures.	The EMP will provide details of commitments such as pre-construction ecology surveys. This will be available upon submission of the DCO application.	SoCG update, March 2021
A.39	LEMP (Landscape & Ecological Management Plan)	The proposed LEMP which is part of/linked to a wider EMP must include short and long-term aftercare/monitoring provisions for structures and associated landscaping that are essential ecological linkages for key species being able to cross the highways corridor safely. The EMP we presume will be more focused on the construction phase but the LEMP must cover all phases and not omit the operational phase when it is submitted as part of the ES.	The EMP provides the framework for recording environmental risks, commitments and other environmental constraints and clearly identifies the structures and processes that will be used to manage and control these aspects. The LEMP sets out how the landscape design and ecology mitigation measures shall be delivered and managed for the scheme. An EMP and LEMP will be submitted with the DCO application, however both are iterative documents which would be developed further as the scheme progresses following the receipt of development consent, during the construction and end of construction project stages.	SoCG update, March 2021
23. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)				
A.40	Construction impacts on traffic	A copy of the draft CTMP has not yet been provided. It is recognised that discussions between Highways England and the Joint Councils will need to take place regarding the permitted routes that construction traffic will be able to use. The mechanisms to undertake repairs to local roads damaged by construction traffic should be made during these discussions	The outline CTMP submitted with the DCO application will contain details on monitoring of existing routes for construction traffic. Inspection would be carried out prior to construction and an inspection would be carried out following completion of construction to assess the impact of construction traffic on the road network. It is considered this matter can be further discussed once the Joint Councils have reviewed the CTMP upon submission of the DCO application.	Joint Councils' response to supplementary consultation (p28, 12 November 2020)

Appendix C Landowner Position Statement with GCC

This document will be submitted early in the examination

Appendix B Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency

Table of contents

Pages

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3	Status of this SoCG	2
2	Consultation	3
2.1	Role of the Environment Agency	3
2.2	Summary of consultation	3
3	Topics covered in this SoCG	11
4	Matters agreed	12
5	Matters outstanding	23
5.1	Principal matters outstanding	23
5.2	Matters outstanding	23
Appendix A	Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B	Matters to be determined	ii

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with Environment Agency since the Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG	11
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between Environment Agency and Highways England	12
Table 5-1	Matter outstanding between the Environment Agency and Highways England	23

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and the Environment Agency in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters which have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the Environment Agency is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with the Environment Agency. Discussions will be aided by the Environment Agency being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.5 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.
- 1.1.7 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of the Environment Agency in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.

1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of the Environment Agency

- 2.1.1 The Environment Agency (EA) is a non-departmental public body sponsored by DEFRA with responsibilities relating to the protection and enhancement of the environment in England.
- 2.1.2 The EA is a prescribed consultee as defined under section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act).

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with the EA during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 The EA has been a member of a Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group; see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with the EA since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with the EA since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with Environment Agency since the Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
8 March 2019	Meeting	Highways England Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern raised over construction of deep road cuttings through shallow aquifers which could intercept shallow spring systems and cut off their flow pathways making them dry out over time. Particular potential issue through the proposed deep cutting at the top of Crickley Hill and the Shab Hill junction
4 June 2019	Meeting	Highways England Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widening the highway near the tributary of Norman's Brook may encourage culverting (not favoured) Monitoring minor watercourses for local impacts Note changes in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) factors for climate change (UK Climate Projections 'UKCP18' changes the % climate change allowance) will need to be included in the FRA Conceptual groundwater model only possible Ground water monitoring: 2 years of GW monitoring is not a strict requirement. It is guidance which the EA apply to quarry owners, publicly could be challenged for not having this data. However, sufficient data will be held by the end of the DCO determination Construction phase permitting of deep cutting dewatering, effluent treatment, and discharge. This will be focus for pre-construction period 2020, recognise that this will be complex and time / resource heavy
18 June 2019	Joint Landscape Strategy meeting	Highways England Technical Working Group (TWG) member organisations including, the Environment Agency	<p>The joint landscape vision was presented. Concerns were raised regarding the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to restore grassland areas currently being damaged by visitor pressure e.g. at Crickley Hill Opportunity to improve current low-grade arable land to mosaic of calcareous grassland scrub and hedgerow around Stockwell area Woodland creation opportunities to connect woodland areas at Ullen Wood - Emma's Grove, at east of scheme around Kennels and at south of scheme to connect Birdlip to Beech Woods Tree species for planting - there is conflict between native species planting and selecting for climate resilience. Also, conflict with the Cotswold Conservation Board (CCB) tree specification guidance

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation impacts are important- we should consider enhancement of the mountain biking track at Fly-Up to divert users from the nearby sensitive Beech Woods area and Crickley Hill, currently being damaged • We should consider a landmark of some type to off-set the loss of the Air Balloon pub • Consider innovative drainage solutions (Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)) at south-east end of scheme, to mitigate groundwater impacts to Bushley Muzzard
2 July 2019	Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including the Environment agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to the scheme • 2019 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report update • Opportunities mapping • TWG terms of reference • Working group technical discussions
4 July 2019	Meeting	Highways England Environment Agency	<p>Meeting to discuss water resources and ecology. Discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCO Boundary and space for appropriate mitigation • Water Features Survey - Next steps • Baseline data collection (Insufficient baseline data collection >1year may result in objection) • Aquatic invertebrate sampling • Flow monitoring • Groundwater monitoring • Water quality monitoring • River Habitat Survey • Tufa Habitat Survey
30 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including the Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities mapping feedback • 2019 PEI report update • Landscape update – approach and sketch designs • Working group technical discussions • Overview of Statements of Common Ground • General freshwater ecology • Follow up call arranged to specifically discuss freshwater ecology sampling methodology

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
15 August 2019	Email	Highways England to Landscape officers/representatives at statutory body organisations, including Environment Agency	Highways England landscape specialist emailed the landscape representatives to share figures of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and indicative viewpoint locations. The landscape specialist asked for feedback on the viewpoints.
18 August 2019	Email	Highways England to the Environment Agency	Provided draft ZTV for landscape and visual chapter of PEI report.
20 August 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including the Environment Agency	The following matters were discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Update on design approach and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions
30 August 2019	Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including the Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macroinvertebrate sampling and use of standard methodology (EA Operational Instruction 018_08) • Freshwater ecology survey and assessment
27 September 2019	Letter and email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England sent a formal notification of the statutory consultation to the EA via letter and email. This included a copy of the section 48 notice and an electronic copy of the consultation materials including the PEI report. A deadline of 23:59 on 8 November 2019 was provided to the EA to submit their formal response to the consultation.
30 September 2019	Meeting (freshwater ecology survey and assessment)	Highways England TWG member organisations including the Environment Agency	Specific macroinvertebrate sampling techniques.
1 November 2019	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Issue of the drainage strategy report for EA review and comment.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
8 November 2019	Formal response to statutory consultation	Environment Agency	Comments on 2019 Preliminary Environmental Information Report focusing on ground and surface water and the associated ecology, habitats and receptors that rely on them.
22 November 2019	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England to the Environment Agency – issue of catchment plans and schedules associated with the drainage strategy report.
6 December 2019	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Raised concerns over lack of water quality monitoring data.
11 December 2019	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England acknowledged Environment Agency's concerns and passed on information to the project team.
3 April 2020	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	<p>Environment Agency provided comments on drainage strategy in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tufa • Spring flows and flow pathways • Surface water and groundwater monitoring • Embankment structures • Deculverting • Water quantity across hydrograph
28 May 2020	Phone call	Highways England Environment Agency	Follow up phone call to check in with stakeholder and advise of DCO delay, and forthcoming emailed letter advising of this.
28 May 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Letter emailed to advise of delay to DCO submission and further design and development work.
16 July 2020	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Environment Agency apologised for not reviewing the latest drainage information sent on 27 April and link has expired. Queried whether there is a need to review it given upcoming TWG.
16 July 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England advise that further design and drainage information would be issued in the near future which would supersede information sent on 27th April. Advised no need to provide comment on pack of information on 27th April but sent re-activated link so the Environment Agency could review anyway. Noted that previous comments from Environment Agency not addressed in that version but that they will be provided in the next update.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG members and Walking Cycling and Horse Riding TWG members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update following delay to programme, setting out the key changes to the design and the amended timescales Invited questions from stakeholders during the session
22 July 2020	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Environment Agency forwarded an email thread to another team member in Highways England detailing the Environment Agency's concerns on the lack of water quality monitoring.
22 July 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England advised that as part of the SoCG meeting, a list of information previously requested will be shared. The information that Highways England also hope to share in advance of the planned supplementary statutory consultation.
6 August 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update to scheme design Assessment progress to date and outline of future programme Discussion on progress of outstanding issues to be agreed in SoCG
28 August 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Email containing a link to the first tranche of information sharing for consultees. It was explained that the information was Work in Progress, Draft and Confidential and should only be shared within their organisation where there is legitimate reason to do so.
30 September 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Email containing a link to second tranche of technical information for review and comment including updated drainage strategy and drawings, water monitoring information, as well as and Work in Progress 2020 PEI report chapters.
13 Oct 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England to Environment Agency	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email, in accordance with section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 12 November 2020.
27 October 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	<p>Email sending a package of updated flood risk and hydraulic modelling information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A draft version of the Flood Risk Assessment which will form an appendix of the ES An updated Technical Note on the Crickley Hill stream hydraulic modelling A copy of the Tracer Test note produced by Mott Macdonald/Sweco in 2019

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
28 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental collaborative planning organisations including the Environment Agency	A meeting to discuss Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the DEFRA Metric in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme. Covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the change by habitat area within the DCO Boundary the BNG calculation (using the current DEFRA metric, due to be updated in Dec 2020) some commentary on the BNG metric and discussion on why the scheme scores lower than expected given biodiversity delivered feedback from stakeholders on ideas to improve on biodiversity gain
13 November 2020	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Environment Agency's response to the supplementary statutory consultation.
15 December 2020	Email	Highways England to Environment Agency	Reissue of information by email: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water monitoring information Drainage strategy drawings and schedules Updated flood risk assessment note, Technical Note D02 on Hydraulic Modelling and Tracer Test note
1 February 2021	Emails	Environment Agency to Highways England	Emailed comments on the flood risk and drainage information, and comments on the 6 August Statement of Common Ground Meeting Notes, along with a letter setting out additional comments on the draft SoCG.
1 March 2021	Technical meeting and emails	Highways England Environment Agency	Emailed technical queries from the Environment Agency in advance of meeting, share of PowerPoint Presentation from Highways England, and technical meeting held to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation on groundwater levels monitoring results and interpretation, with an initial overview of outcomes of the hydrogeological impact assessments; and surface water and springs monitoring scope and overview of initial results Discussion on the rationale for selecting surface water monitoring points Agree process for future sharing and discussion of ongoing groundwater data and model refinement
10 March 2021	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Email to confirm that the technical meeting on 1 March was successful and that comments on the draft SoCG would follow before 19 March 2021.
21 March 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Environment Agency	Meeting to discuss the latest draft SoCG and matters outstanding, agreeing approach and draft contents ready for an update and reissue for comments in April 2021.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
30 April 2021	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Environment Agency's response to the draft SoCG.
11 May 2021	Email	Environment Agency to Highways England	Environment Agency's response to the draft SoCG.

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Project Description (Chapter 2 of the ES)
	3.	Consultation
Relevant ES Chapter	4.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	5.	Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)
	6.	Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)
	7.	Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)
	8.	Climate Change (Chapter 14 of the ES)

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between Environment Agency and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1	The Environment Agency agrees with the need for development in helping to address the current situation of poor road safety and daily congestion and that the solution should reflect the special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	Email, 30 April 2021
1.2	The Environment Agency agrees with the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme that will deliver a safe and resilient free-flowing road whilst conserving and enhancing the special character of the nationally important protected landscape of the AONB that the new route passes through	Email, 30 April 2021
1.3	The Environment Agency agrees that the scheme supports the delivery of Paragraph 2.2 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) addressing a critical need to improve national networks to address road congestion and provide safe, expeditious and resilient networks that better support social and economic activity.	Email, 30 April 2021
2. Project Description		
2.1	The Environment Agency generally agrees with the form of the scheme to address the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme.	Email, 30 April 2021
2.2	The Environment Agency agrees that the existing A417 should be de-trunked and repurposed for its entire length and supports that some lengths will be converted to a route for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	Email, 30 April 2021
3. Consultation		
3.1	Highways England and the Environment Agency agree that the detail of design will be discussed and agreed between Highways England, its contractor and Gloucestershire County Council should the scheme progress to construction. Both parties are committed in principle to ongoing engagement throughout the detailed design stage to help discuss and agree detailed matters pertinent to the natural environment.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of ES)		
4.1	<p>The Environment Agency agree that Highways England is seeking to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme.</p> <p>Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
4.2	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that Tufa habitats on site will be lost due to scheme construction but that compensation measures will be implemented across the site.</p> <p>The Environment Agency and Highways England understand Tufa habitat surveys were completed in 2020 and the results, impact assessment and details of mitigation / compensation being considered at this preliminary design stage and will be presented in the ES. The mitigation commitments set out in an Environmental Management Plan will be secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application. Engagement will continue throughout the detailed design stage to help ensure appropriate mitigation / compensation.</p> <p>The Environment Agency generally agree to the approach subject to appropriate mitigation being secured and undertaken through the DCO process.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
4.3	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree impacts on Tufa forming springs should be considered and that these will be included and assessed within the ES. The Environment Agency's position on the approach to mitigation or compensation is to be determined as recorded in Appendix B to this SoCG at entry A.2.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
4.4	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that wherever possible opportunities are provided for ecological enhancement, including SuDS, fish barrier removal, opening of culverts (especially the tributary of Norman's Brook), re-connection of habitats and natural flood management (NFM). Where appropriate these are included and assessed within the ES.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
4.5	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the Severn Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and migratory fish assemblages will be included within the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening. The HRA screening will be provided with the ES at DCO application. Highways England will include consideration of relevant fish species such as European Eel <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> in the assessment.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4.6	The Environment Agency and Highways England generally agree the consideration of the impacts and appropriate mitigation for otters takes into account the location of the scheme and the boundary of the Severn and Thames watersheds and the need for otters to be able to move through the landscape away from watercourses, as well as alongside and in proximity of watercourses.	Email, 30 April 2021
4.7	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that consideration of the impacts on water voles has been considered in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity.	Email, 30 April 2021
4.8	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree macroinvertebrate surveys are generally appropriate and that sampling will use standard methodology (EA Operational Instruction 018_08), as discussed in a meeting on freshwater ecology survey and assessment 30/08/19.	Email, 30 April 2021
4.9	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand a hydrogeological impact assessment has been undertaken to understand the potential impacts on springs, associated surface watercourses and groundwater resources and receptors. This will be presented as part of the ES Chapter 13.	Email, 30 April 2021
4.10	The Environment Agency and Highways England generally agree the spatial extent of the baseline study area is sufficient. The initial surface water and ground water survey study area was 1km and an extension of the study area beyond the 1km buffer was considered necessary to capture potential impacts to receptors beyond the standard study area. This was considered particularly important where dewatering is likely to impact receptors upstream and downstream of the study area where underlying geology may result in groundwater connectivity across a wider area. Consequently, a risk-based approach has been taken to the extension of the study area based on assessment of impact pathways and has been kept under review as the understanding of complex interactions has evolved. Following review, tributaries to the River Churn and the headwaters to the River Churn, up to 1.1miles (1.8km) north of the scheme, were included in the study area due to their local significance. Where there are considered to be potential gaps in the baseline surface water and ground water monitoring (to be determined), these are addressed in Appendix B under A1.	Email, 30 April 2021
4.11	The Environment Agency and Highways England generally agree that the ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity has considered impacts on the groundwater dependent features identified within the zone of influence of the scheme.	Email, May 2021
5. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)		
5.1	The Environment Agency generally accepts the baseline study area, methodology and assessment.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.2	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that areas of fill/made ground have been targeted with ground investigation and soil sampling to identify potential hazards. The results will be presented within the ES.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.3	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that there should be a clear commitment to maintain high levels of pollution prevention and spill response/containment and decontamination throughout the project, including measures to manage sediment, through settlement ponds or other measures. High levels of pollution prevention will be implemented, and measures will manage sediment, and a spill response plan will be put in place and tested.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.4	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the risks posed by piling on pathway creation will be considered within the ES and will also be evaluated in a Foundation Works Risk Assessment.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.5	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the location of springs originating within landslide deposits have been identified through the water feature survey undertaken. The origin of these springs has been identified through geological and desk study review and ground investigations to create a conceptual model. The hydrological characteristics of springs originating from landslide deposits will be identified through surveys (flow and rainfall) that continue to be undertaken, with results to be shared on a regular basis in discussion and agreement between both parties.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.6	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree care will be taken to not reactivate landslip deposits causing instability of deposits leading to slope failure. This issue is considered in the design and mitigation measures being developed as will be presented in the ES.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.7	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree a ground and surface water management plan as a part of the Environmental Management Plan will consider surface water catchments and aquifers in water management as part of dewatering design.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.8	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree preliminary interpretations of draft Phase 2A ground investigation data (including boreholes and geophysical surveys) have been used to infer revised fault locations. Information from further ground investigation obtained at Phase 3 ground investigations at the detailed design will be used to further constrain the locations of faulting.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.9	Highways England agree the Environment Agency will be consulted on the detailed arrangements for the reuse, recycling, or disposal of bulk construction material. Also, discussions on appropriate permit requirements and use of clean material in construction or land spreading off site. This will be undertaken in accordance with an agreed Material Management Plan (MMP) for the scheme.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.10	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that the spillage assessment undertaken for surface water outfalls has concluded that the risk would be acceptable with no mitigation measures. However, the design assumption used is that Highways England trunk roads have pollution control devices and Gloucestershire County Council outfalls do not have pollution control devices except for high risk roads. Treatment measures for routine run off is part of the ongoing assessment/design update.	Email, 30 April 2021
5.11	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that data is being collected to allow setting out control and trigger levels for monitoring during and post construction to validate introduced mitigation measures. The Environment Agency also understands that some areas of the scheme are still not represented by groundwater monitoring locations so the setting of control and trigger levels will not be possible for these areas until monitoring is in place / data has been collected for an appropriate length of time.	Email, 30 April 2021
6. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)		
6.1	The Environment Agency generally accepts the baseline study area, methodology and assessment.	Email, 30 April 2021
6.2	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree once a Contractor has been appointed, engagement will be undertaken to ensure Environmental Permitting requirements are undertaken and solutions developed to ensure conformity with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and minimise delays.	Email, 30 April 2021
6.3	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree only material suitable for use will be used in the scheme. Verification testing will be undertaken and requirements for this will be set out in the earthwork's specification.	Email, 30 April 2021
6.4	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree consideration of commercial waste streams will be included within the ES, although the amount of domestic and commercial waste produced is likely to be minimal.	Email, 30 April 2021
6.5	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree materials to be used for temporary vehicle parking areas will be verified as suitable for use in line with the Environmental Management Plan.	Email, 30 April 2021
6.6	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 2.1). The REAC forms the record of the scheme's specific environmental actions and commitments to be implemented and managed through all stages of the Proposed Development. This is secured through a legal requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO). The REAC will contain commitments including those on permits for waste operations and audits/inspections on waste management.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)		
7.1	The Environment Agency generally accepts the baseline study area, methodology and assessment.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.2	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required and watercourses modelled will be within close proximity to the proposed layout and include climate change allowances. The Environment Agency agrees in principle with the outcomes of the FRA.	Confirmed by EA in PEI report response 12/11/20
7.3	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that numerical modelling of the groundwater regime will not be undertaken given the complexity of the study area and its interaction with the proposed scheme. The Environment Agency and Highways England agreed that the groundwater regime would be understood using conceptual modelling backed up by robust data monitoring in surface water and groundwater (including surveillance monitoring of major springs).	Email, 30 April 2021
7.4	The Environment Agency agrees with the preliminary construction assessment that there will be an adverse effect on groundwater flows, as stated in the Statutory Consultation Response 08/11/19.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.5	The Environment Agency agrees that scheme elements regarding sustainable drainage will primarily be dealt with by the Lead Local Flood Authority, as indicated in the Statutory Consultation Response 08/11/19	Email, 30 April 2021
7.6	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree baseline water environment data will comprise water quality, groundwater levels, water flows in watercourses and spring outflows.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.7	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that cutting off/creating barriers to groundwater flow must be avoided, where possible. The proposed mitigation will include a requirement for preparation of a protocol, which will set out principles associated with voids treatment, where large fissure zones and more open void features within the limestone bedrock are encountered during construction. Minimum requirements will be outlined in the ES.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.8	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand drainage design will include the HEWRAT assessment outputs.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.9	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment will be provided with the ES at DCO submission. The assessment will include local and site-specific quantitative assessments and will consider features within the footprint and zone of influence of the scheme and will also consider impacts on catchments of individual springs.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7.10	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand the Environmental Management Plan will present standard pollution prevention measures. At this stage it is not possible to derive site specific mitigation methods, this will be undertaken at detailed design.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.11	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the ES will consider the requirement to complete a local Foundation Works Risk Assessment for each structure or area of ground improvement works. This will be undertaken as part of the detailed design and will be secured through the Environmental Management Plan so as to ensure the water environment is not unacceptably impacted.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.12	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the Environmental Management Plan will indicate main work activities, construction risks and mitigation proposals. Impacts will be addressed within the assessment section of the ES chapter.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.13	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree an abstraction licence application will incorporate a site-specific Hydrogeological Impact Assessment. This will be completed at the detailed design stage. The ES will consider the potential risk associated with dewatering activities based on available information.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.14	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand it is not expected that interceptors will be used but pollution control measures will be determined through assessment and in accordance with LA113 and CG501.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.15	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand there are no plans to re-use existing soakaways as the principle outfall for the scheme's mainline and junctions. There may be opportunity to re-use existing soakaways on low use local roads being reconfigured and adopted by GCC, or the detrunked and decommissioned sections of the A417 being repurposed as a walking, cycling and horse-riding route.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.16	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the ES will consider a study area beyond 1km buffer to capture potential impacts on receptors where underlying geology may result in groundwater connectivity across wider area.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.17	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the scheme will adopt good practice and endeavour to implement best practice where possible. Treatment and control measures will generally be determined in accordance with the assessment process in LA 113. The water quality and flow control proposals shall adopt SuDS principles and, where appropriate, the preferred hierarchy of discharge first to ground then to surface water bodies. Wherever possible, enhancements to the water environment will be delivered through proposed drainage solutions.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7.18	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree surface water and ground water monitoring will be extended to the construction and post construction phases. Ongoing discussions will help to agree an appropriate scope for future monitoring and sharing of information.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.19	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that the scheme will deliver a realigned watercourse that has a comparable habitat value to the existing watercourse. This will be quantified using appropriate measures (such as total stream length, cross-sections, etc) and qualitatively described using characterisation of the physical habitat created (e.g. flow types, channel morphology, sediment type).	Email, 30 April 2021
7.20	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that by and large best efforts have been made to collect sufficient hydrogeological data across the proposed scheme alignment. The assessments have been undertaken with a conservative approach based on reasonable worst-case scenario.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.21	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that Highways England have shared the monitoring scope and locations with the Environment Agency.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.22	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment has characterised the springs based on their origin and where possible linking the springs to a particular geology contact and groundwater level. It has included local and site-specific quantitative assessments of impacts on groundwater levels and flows from the scheme cuttings and these will be presented in the ES. The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment further considered groundwater dependent features identified within the zone of influence of the scheme and also considered impacts on catchments of individual springs. Baseline data collection and surveillance monitoring of major springs is currently being undertaken. Where spring specific significant effects have been identified through the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, further monitoring or surveillance will be outlined in the ES.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.23	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that trigger values will be developed prior to the construction of the scheme using baseline data and Environmental Quality Standards (EQS). Exceedances of these values will result in an investigation which could include additional mitigation being proposed and corrective action and further monitoring being undertaken, as appropriate.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.24	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that surface water and groundwater monitoring during pre-construction and construction stages of the scheme will be undertaken. Post-construction (operational) monitoring and maintenance requirements will be developed at detailed design, after examination, where considered to be required. The approach will be confirmed with the Environment Agency.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7.25	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that a walkover assessment of fish habitat suitability and connectivity with the wider catchment has been undertaken. Fish population surveys have not been undertaken as significant effects to the fish population are not expected by Highways England Pre-Construction fish surveys of the tributary of Norman's Brook are proposed to confirm presence/absence of notable fish species which the assessment currently assumes to be present. Mitigation will include the translocation of all fish species (if present) prior to dewatering activities and in-stream works and the sections of new channel will be designed to cater for the needs of all species considered likely to be present. Wherever possible, enhancements to the water environment and associated species will be delivered through proposed drainage solutions and the realigned watercourse. All works will ensure conformity with the Water Framework Directive.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.26	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that drainage will be incorporated beneath embankments which will intercept and collect springs discharging within the footprint of the scheme. and the drainage will direct flows into the surface watercourse within the same catchment for example, realigned tributary to Norman's Brook or headwater of the Churn. The detail of the drainage proposal will be developed at the detailed design stage.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.27	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that Phase 3 borehole investigations will be undertaken in the construction preparation stage. Information obtained from these investigations, together with monitoring results obtained from ongoing groundwater monitoring of Phase 2A (data obtained on completion of the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment), will be applied into the detailed design and any detailed hydrogeological impact assessments that may be required to obtain abstraction licences.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.28	The Environment Agency and Highways England generally agree with the approach to the ground investigations of Crickley Hill and Shab Hill junction.	Email, 30 April 2021
7.29	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that the water feature surveys have been completed with low flows generally observed across locations Further surface water, surveillance monitoring of major springs and groundwater monitoring is being undertaken and available results will be reported in the ES. In areas of known or suspected springs, the scheme design will accommodate springs and groundwater discharges and will ensure that any intercepted groundwater or springs will be kept within their respective catchments to maintain the existing water balance.	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7.30	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that access to land parcels between Air Balloon roundabout and the proposed Shab Hill Junction was delayed due to land access constraints. All parcels have now had boreholes installed and groundwater monitoring is continuing, to achieve a minimum of 12 months data (post-installation) at each hole.</p> <p>For further information on scope of monitoring, please see section 7.38.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
7.31	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment has considered groundwater dependent features identified within the zone of influence of the scheme and also considered impacts on catchments of individual springs. Any potential impacts on groundwater flows would be further mitigated by implementing the voids protocol, as set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The EMP will set out procedures and measures for treatment of voids that would reduce impact on groundwater flows.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
7.32	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree the hydrogeological conceptual models, as presented in the ES, will be refined at detailed design. This will include any new data obtained from additional investigations including site specific ground investigations, groundwater monitoring and surveillance monitoring of major springs. The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment presents the latest iteration of the hydrogeological conceptual models used to inform the impact assessment. The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment will be submitted as part of the ES accompanying the DCO application.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
7.33	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that the scheme design aims to maintain the groundwater regime, which is critical to ensure slope stability within the Crickley Hill area, and to maintain the surface water flow regime to as close to the current water regime as possible. The realigned Norman's Brook tributary will be recharged by the existing tributaries.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
7.34	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England generally agree with the approach to some flow monitoring using telemetric systems. Telemetric systems are being used at three locations across the scheme within three separate catchments, additional manual measurements are being undertaken at all flow monitoring locations.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021
7.35	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England agree that the scheme passes through the edge of a groundwater Source Protection Zone for the Thames Water Baunton public water supply. The impacts of the road scheme on this designated groundwater protection zone will be assessed in the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, part of the ES and appropriate mitigation identified, as appropriate.</p>	Email, 30 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7.36	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment completed as part of the ES has been based on 12 months of baseline groundwater monitoring data across the majority of holes, obtained up to October 2020. Baseline groundwater monitoring is set to continue until June 2021 and this data will be shared with the EA for discussion. Highways England anticipate that the data used for the assessment will be sufficient.	Email, 11 May 2021
7.37	The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that baseline monitoring of surface water and spring water quality and quantity is being undertaken from August 2020 onwards, for an initial 12 months. The scope of ongoing monitoring (to collect pre-construction baseline data) is currently being defined and, subject to contractual arrangements, will continue on immediately from baseline monitoring at these locations, or as soon as possible afterwards.	Email, 11 May 2021
7.38	<p>The Environment Agency and Highways England understand that after June 2021, it is intended that monitoring will continue in selected locations to obtain pre-construction baseline. The scope of boreholes subject to ongoing monitoring (to collect pre-construction baseline data) is currently being defined and, subject to contractual arrangements, will continue on immediately from baseline monitoring at these holes, or as soon as possible afterwards. Ongoing discussions will help to agree the appropriate scope for pre-construction monitoring and sharing of information.</p> <p>Subject to contractual arrangement with ground investigation contractor, the data collection will immediately continue on from baseline monitoring. Information obtained from any monitoring post October 2020 will be applied into the detailed design and any detailed hydrogeological impact assessments that may be required to obtain abstraction licences. The data will also inform pre-construction baseline.</p>	Email, 11 May 2021
8. Climate Change (Chapter 14 of the ES)		
8.1	The Environment Agency and Highways England agree a 40% allowance for climate change is the correct figure for surface water, as requested in the EIA Scoping Response 12/06/19, in accordance with the current climate change allowances for planning published on the Gov.uk website. It is understood that this figure may change in future when/if the climate change allowances are updated.	Confirmed by EA in PEI report response 12/11/20

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 There are no principal matters outstanding between Highways England and the Environment Agency, subject to the determination of the matters identified in Appendix B where the position of the Environment Agency is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES).

5.2 Matters outstanding

5.2.1 There are currently no matters outstanding between Highways England and the Environment Agency.

5.2.2 Table 5-1 is presented below to accommodate any matters that may become outstanding during the course of the examination of the DCO application.

Table 5-1 Matter outstanding between the Environment Agency and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Environment Agency position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1.	No matters identified			
2. Project Description				
2.1.	No matters identified			
3. Consultation				
3.1	No matters identified			
4. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
4.1	No matters identified			
5. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
5.1	No matters identified			
6. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)				
6.1	No matters identified			
7. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
7.1	No matters identified			
8. Climate Change (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
8.1	No matters identified			

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Environment Agency
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of the Environment Agency is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B-1.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with the Environment Agency during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by the Environment Agency being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B-1 Matter to be determined between the Environment Agency and Highways England

Ref	Matter	Environment Agency Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
9. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
A.1 (This issue is listed under the biodiversity section, but it also relates to road drainage and the water environment)	Surface water and groundwater monitoring	<p>The Environment Agency has continued concerns about whether there will be gaps in the available data (due to land access issues and whether there are sufficient monitoring points in the right locations), and whether data will have been recorded for a sufficient length of time. The Environment Agency understands the collection of data is ongoing.</p> <p>It is understood that the Hydrogeological impact assessment (HIA) will include data up to the point at which it was written (approximately October 2020). Data collection is ongoing and needs to continue. If data collected after this point indicates any significant change to the HIA, the Environment Agency expects appropriate mitigation measures to be incorporated into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>Surface water and ground water monitoring and sampling results will continue to be</p>	<p>A conservative, worst-case scenario approach has been taken to the development of appropriate mitigation measures reported in the ES and is considered adequate for the baseline data collected. Ongoing monitoring is expected to validate the findings of the baseline data and mitigation is not expected to require amendment.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring and sampling results will continue to be updated and data will be shared with the Environment Agency.</p>	May 2021

Ref	Matter	Environment Agency Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>updated and data should be shared to help verify the impact assessments and mitigation proposed in the ES Chapter 8.</p> <p>The Environment Agency understands that it is intended that monitoring will continue in selected locations to obtain pre-construction baseline. It is important that contractual arrangements do not prohibit the on-going collection of data, and that appropriate monitoring locations are selected for pre-construction baseline to ensure sufficient data are gathered in order to protect the water environment. If there are problems in future with ongoing and inadequate data gathering this could impact the project delivery and timetable.</p>		
A.2	Tufa springs / tributary to Norman's Brook / proposed drainage solutions	<p>The Environment Agency requests development of detailed habitat mitigation strategy should include more explicit reference to mitigation of impacts on the water environment including habitats permanently lost and directly and indirectly impacted upon, including whether the necessary mitigation and/or compensation can be secured within the red line boundary of the site. The Environment Agency would like to continue to be involved in the mitigation and compensation measures identified and to be updated throughout the project lifecycle.</p>	<p>A tufa spring with associated designated habitat was identified in one location and this will be lost due to the scheme construction. Other locations where calcium carbonate deposits (described as "tufa") have been recorded are located within the stream channel or are associated with another spring, will also be lost. The morphology and characteristics of the realigned watercourse will replicate the existing and therefore potentially facilitate calcium carbonate deposition within the stream channel. The streams currently feeding into the tributary to Norman's Brook will continue discharging to the realigned watercourse. Drainage solutions will be implemented to intercept spring water and convey it into the realigned stream along its course. A focus for detailed design would be to ensure that groundwater transferred is discharged in the riparian zone, creating springhead habitat</p>	March 2021

Ref	Matter	Environment Agency Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			<p>adjacent to the realigned channel where appropriate, where tufa could form if the conditions are suitable. As the tufaceous formation development is a complex process requiring a combination of optimal conditions with respect to levels of saturation of groundwater, water flow, biological conditions, etc, it is uncertain how the drainage will impact these processes. Therefore, we are working towards the compensation options we found on site. This will involve small scale interventions to increase the value of the existing tufa deposits e.g. Bushley Muzzard SSSI by creating more favourable conditions for tufa habitat development.</p> <p>Tufa habitat surveys have been completed in 2020 and the results, impact assessment and details of any compensation required will be included in the ES included in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity. Full results of surveys are included in Appendix 8.24 and 8.25.</p> <p>Subject to appropriate mitigation being secured and undertaken through the DCO process.</p>	
14.Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
A.3	Landscape led approach / de-culverting of watercourses	The Environment Agency strongly support the intention that the proposed scheme will seek to deculvert existing sections of culverted watercourse and minimise the introduction of new culverted sections of the watercourse wherever possible. There are other lengths of culverted watercourse that could be opened up as part of a mitigation package or as part of a landscape led approach to net gain.	<p>The total length of culverted watercourse along Crickley Hill Stream between Grove Farm and the A417 is unchanged versus the baseline.</p> <p>The opening up of the Crickley Hill Stream culvert is not essential mitigation and hence will not form part of the scheme design.</p> <p>Based on collaborative discussions, the other lengths in question are outside of the DCO Boundary and there is not a mechanism to acquire</p>	March 2021

Ref	Matter	Environment Agency Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
			<p>the land given that it is not expected to be essential for the scheme. However, the opportunity to open up the culvert will be considered through the environmental designated funds project which seeks to deliver environmental enhancements associated with the strategic road network, including restoring waterbodies which have been modified by historical development of roads. Those discussions will continue outside of the scope of this scheme and this DCO application.</p>	
A.4	Topographic divide	<p>The Environment Agency state that by changing the gradient slope of Crickley Hill, during construction the spring line will be intercepted and excavated into on this slope therefore leading to an increased reliance on dewatering and drainage which will be required above and beyond any that the existing current road scheme has.</p>	<p>The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment will evaluate potential impacts on groundwater resources and receptors from cutting into the Crickley Hill. A technical meeting was held on 01/03/21 to discuss groundwater issues in relation to the scheme, including the impact of the cutting on the springs. This will be reported within the ES.</p> <p>Highways England considers this matter to be agreed with the Environment Agency subject to review of the assessments.</p>	March 2021
A.5	Dewatering and drainage	<p>The Environment Agency is concerned that by changing the gradient slope of Crickley Hill, that during construction that the spring line will be intercepted and excavated into on this slope therefore leading to an increased reliance on dewatering and drainage which will be required above and beyond any that the existing current road scheme has.</p>	<p>The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment will evaluate potential impacts on groundwater resources and receptors from cutting into the Crickley Hill. A technical meeting was held on 01/03/21 to discuss groundwater issues in relation to the scheme, including the impact of the cutting on the springs. This will be reported within the ES.</p> <p>Highways England considers this matter to be agreed with the Environment Agency subject to review of the assessments.</p>	March 2021

Ref	Matter	Environment Agency Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
A.6	Crickley Hill Stream	Environment Agency anticipate that the opening up of Crickley Hill Stream culvert is not expected to be essential mitigation and hence is unlikely to form part of the scheme design. Until the full assessment at ES/DCO, the EA cannot confirm what will be considered essential mitigation.	Highways England do not believe that the opening up of Crickley Hill Stream culvert will be required as part of essential mitigation.	May 2021

Appendix C Draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England

Table of contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3	Status of this SoCG	2
2	Consultation	3
2.1	Role of Natural England	3
2.2	Summary of consultation	3
3	Topics covered in this SoCG	11
4	Matters agreed	12
5	Matters outstanding	23
5.1	Principal matters outstanding	23
5.2	Matters Outstanding	23
Appendix A	Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B	Matters to be determined	ii

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with Natural England since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG	11
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between Natural England and Highways England	12
Table 5-1	Matter outstanding between Natural England and Highways England	23
Table B-1	Matters to be determined between Natural England and Highways England	ii

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Natural England in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters that have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of Natural England is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with Natural England. Discussions will be aided by Natural England being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.5 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.
- 1.1.7 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of Natural England in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken
 - Section 3 presents the topics covered in this SoCG
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter
- 1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.

1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of Natural England

- 2.1.1 Natural England is an executive non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Natural England is the government's advisor to protect England's nature and landscape for people to enjoy and for the services they provide.
- 2.1.2 Natural England's role in relation to the DCO process derives from the Planning Act 2008 and secondary legislation made under the Planning Act 2008. The roles and responsibilities of Natural England under the Planning Act 2008 fall into the following categories:
- As one of the prescribed consultees under section 42 of the PA 2008 that applicants are required to consult before submitting a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) application.
 - As one of the consultation bodies that the Planning Inspectorate must consult before a scoping opinion is adopted in relation to any Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and as a prescribed consultee for the environmental information submitted pursuant to the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2009.
 - As a statutory party in the examination of DCO applications.
 - As a statutory nature conservation body under the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various amendments) (England & Wales) Regulations 2018 (Habitats Regulations) in respect of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).
 - As a consenting and licensing body/authority in respect of protected species and operations likely to damage the protected features of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) pursuant to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (WCA 1981) and in relation to European protected species under the Habitats Regulations.

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with Natural England during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 Natural England has been a member of a Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group, the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group, and has been party to collaborative planning sessions; see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with Natural England, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with Natural England since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set out in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with Natural England since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
18 June 2019	Joint Landscape Strategy meeting	Highways England Technical Working Group (TWG) member organisations including Natural England	Technical meeting matters discussed including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to restore grassland areas • Opportunity to improve current low-grade arable land to mosaic of calcareous grassland scrub and hedgerow • Woodland creation opportunities • Tree species for planting • Recreation impacts • The potential for landmarks • Drainage solutions (Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) SUDS)
26 June to 2 July 2019	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	Natural England suggested that broad bridges with steep banks should be used.
26 June to 2 July 2019	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	Natural England expressed concern over groundwater feeding in to the SSSI and stated that they need to be involved in this.
2 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TWG terms of reference • Opportunities mapping • Working group technical discussions
23 July 2019	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) • Cumulative Impacts of further development in Gloucestershire and impacts on designated areas • De-trunked A417 • Surfacing materials • The then proposed Green Bridge

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
30 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisation including Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities mapping feedback • 2019 PEI report update • Landscape update – approach and sketch designs • Working group technical discussions • Overview of Statements of Common Ground
15 August 2019	Email	Highways England to Landscape officers/representatives at statutory body organisations, including Natural England	Highways England landscape specialist emailed the landscape representatives to share figures of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and indicative viewpoint locations.
20 August 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including TWG Member Organisations including Natural England	The following matters were discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Update on design approach and Landscape an Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions
27 September 2019	Email and letter	Highways England to Natural England	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to Natural England, in accordance with section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 8 November 2019.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
8 October 2019	Walking Cycling Horse rising Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Natural England	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The severance of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and the sensitivity given to PRoW • The consideration of disabled ramblers • The usage and attractiveness of current bridleways • The impact re-routing the national trail will have on national trail funding • Re-routing the PRoW and the creation of new routes • The education of users to ensure bridleways remain segregated • The design specifics of the then proposed green bridge • The opportunity to have an underpass included within the Gloucestershire Way • The opportunity for the provision of a car park which includes electrical charging points • The opportunity to have a circular route which incorporates the re-purposed A417 • The opportunity to have resting points between the then proposed green bridge and the Golden Heart Inn
8 November 2019	Emailed letter	Natural England to Highways England	Natural England provided formal comments in response to the statutory consultation, including comments on the 2019 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report
28 January 2020	Site visit	Highways England Natural England	<p>Site visit to explore viewpoint locations within the LVIA study area. Key viewpoint locations were visited to gain a better understanding of the subtleties of the available visibility across the study area, particularly at Crickley Hill, Barrow Wake and the Peak.</p> <p>This resulted in some viewpoints being micro sited to afford a clearer view of the scheme, with agreement on new/additional viewpoint locations.</p>
5 February 2020	Statement of Common Ground	Highways England Natural England	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme and programme; • Agree the principle of the development, and Highways England's approach to the biodiversity assessment • Headline conclusions of the HRA screening, and the evidence that will be calling upon for the Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment (SIAA)

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
3 March 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Natural England	Highways England provided an update on the scheme and sought feedback from the TWG members on the draft Public Rights of Way Management Plan. The group also discussed the WCH Statement of Common Ground.
1 April 2020	Statement of Common Ground	Highways England Natural England	The following main matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme and programme • Headline conclusions of the Stage 2 HRA (SIAA) • Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) • Protected species licensing and Letter of No Impediment
5 August 2020	Statement of Common Ground Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update and design changes (revised scheme for consultation) • Restart of the SoCG process following the announcement of the scheme design and revised timetable • Scene-setting of key issues to be resolved over coming weeks • Agreement of issue-specific meetings to be set up
12 August 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Natural England,	Walking/Cycling/Horse-riding (WCH) TWG/SOCG meeting which provided an update on how the design changes in the scheme have resulted in changes to the PRow network. Feedback was sought from the group and Q&A on the proposals. The next steps were outlined including the issue of the draft updated PRow management plan, the upcoming statutory consultation and the SoCG process.
4 September 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters we discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team provided information on the design changes in relation to the increased gradient of Crickley Hill, the Cotswold Way crossing, Gloucestershire Way crossing, B4070 to Birdlip/Barrow Wake improvements, Cowley junction and replacement common land • Natural England to follow up to provide feedback prior to statutory public consultation on 14 October 2020 • The slides were shared with Natural England by email after the meeting

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
23 September 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Natural England	Minutes were circulated to all invitees 9 October 2020. The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geological enhancements at Crickley Hill
29 September 2020	Email	Highways England to Natural England	Email to Natural England to provide the slides from the four collaborative planning sessions held with CCB, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and National Trust over the past six weeks to discuss some specific elements of the A417 Missing Link scheme and invite Natural England to a meeting to discuss the scheme design in more detail on 21 October 2020.
13 October 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England to Natural England	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to Natural England, in accordance with Section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 12 November 2020.
15 October 2020	Email	Natural England to Highways England	Email containing some reflections on the A417 update provided in the meeting on 23 September and information on the approach that Natural England would like to see adopted in relation to geological exposures associated with roads.
21 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail of the A417 Missing Link scheme and the outcome of the four sessions recently held with the CCB, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and the National Trust Explanation of reasons behind scheme decisions taken to date Landscape-led elements, bridge crossing proposals and proposals at Barrow Wake car park Opportunities to improve mitigation for habitat connectivity around the Gloucestershire Way crossing Concerns regarding the scheme delivering its objective to be landscape-led. The suitability of steel as the primary material used for the Cotswold Way crossing New proposals at Barrow Wake car park Concerns about the roundabout adjacent to the SSSI <p>Natural England requested to be consulted with early and throughout the design process to improve outcomes.</p>

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
28 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental collaborative planning organisations including Natural England	A meeting to discuss Biodiversity Net Gain and the DEFRA Metric in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme. The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change by habitat area within the DCO Boundary • The BNG calculation (using the current DEFRA metric, due to be updated in Dec 2020) • The BNG metric and why the scheme scores lower than expected given biodiversity delivered • Stakeholder ideas to improve biodiversity gain
11 November 2020	Geology and soils meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for geological mitigations and enhancements at Crickley Hill and Shab Hill Meeting minutes were circulated to those present.
11 November 2020	Email	Highways England to Natural England	Email containing details of the discussion on 11 November 2020, with a summary of proposed enhancement and mitigation measures. Requested feedback on the proposed measures.
11 November 2020	Formal response to supplementary statutory consultation	Natural England to Highways England	Letter provides Natural England's overarching comments on the revised A417 missing link scheme, responses to the consultation questions, and detailed comments on the 2020 PEI report and survey information provided to date.
13 November 2020	Email	Natural England to Highways England	Email containing confirmation that Natural England reviewed notes from their discussion, and at present has nothing to add.
24 November 2020	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	Meeting with biodiversity specialists to agree approach to Roman snail mitigation and licence at draft stage. Further correspondence to agree times for future meetings on other species in the New Year.
1 December 2020	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	Meeting to discuss Natural England's comments on the consultation information and PEI report LVIA. Minutes were circulated to attendees 22 December 2020.
27 January 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design changes • Priority outstanding matters • Agreeing broad content of SoCG following design changes

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
22 February 2021	Email	Highways England to Natural England	Shared draft SoCG document for comments
23 March 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Natural England	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of matters agreed • Priority outstanding matters • Agreeing updated content of SoCG following latest draft shared 22 February
31 March 2021	Meeting	Highways England Natural England	Tufa compensation at Bushley Muzzard SSSI
22 April	Email	Natural England to Highways England	Comments on draft SoCG document
11 May 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Natural England	Page turn of final draft document

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Project Description (Chapter 2 of the ES)
Relevant ES Chapter	3.	Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)
	4.	Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)
	5.	Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)
	6.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	7.	Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)
	8.	Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)
	9.	Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)
	10.	Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)
Other topics	11.	Crossings of the A417
	12.	Gradient change
	13.	The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake
	14.	Common Land
	15.	Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding, including disabled users

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between Natural England and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1	Natural England acknowledges the need for development in helping to address the current situation of poor road safety and daily congestion and that the solution should reflect the special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	Email, 22 April 2021
1.2	Natural England agrees with the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme that will deliver a safe and resilient free-flowing road whilst conserving and enhancing the special character of the nationally important protected landscape of the AONB that the new route passes through.	Email, 22 April 2021
1.3	Natural England agrees with Highways England's stated vision of a landscape-led scheme. As stated in their previous response to the scheme in November 2019, they support the vision of delivering a road scheme while conserving and enhancing the special character of the AONB; reconnecting landscape and ecology; bringing about landscape, wildlife and heritage benefits, including enhanced residents' and visitors' enjoyment of the area; improving quality of life for local communities; and contributing to the health of the economy and local businesses.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
2. Project Description (Chapter 2 of the ES)		
2.1	Natural England is pleased to see that a number of aspects of the scheme are seeking to support the statutory purpose of the Cotswolds AONB by seeking to enhance or restore key landscape features and other environmental assets.	Response to Statutory Consultation on the 2019 PEI report (08 November 2019)
3. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)		
3.1	Natural England agrees with the selection of Alternative 2 (the "parallel option") (relating to the A416 side road). This option performed the best in terms of environmental opportunities and therefore went the furthest towards delivering the vision of a landscape-led scheme.	Response to Statutory Consultation on the 2019 PEI report (08 November 2019)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)		
4.1	Natural England's remit with regards to air quality relates to the environmental effects on designated sites. Highways England have conducted the detailed assessment that was recommended by Natural England, in line with their own guidance which was updated in 2019.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
4.2	<p>Natural England generally agree with the draft assessment conclusion. The majority of SSSIs (and local sites) will receive a decrease in nitrogen as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Natural England agree that there will be a significant adverse effect on the ancient woodland at Ullen Wood and that is unavoidable with the proposed route. The following compensation approach has been discussed and is reported within Chapter 8 of the ES:</p> <p>A total of 2.1ha of ancient woodland at Ullen Wood is predicted to be degraded as a result of nitrogen deposition, because it will receive more than 0.4kg N/ha/yr increase as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>To compensate, the ES and environmental masterplan includes 2.1ha of woodland planting adjacent to Ullen Wood in areas that will receive less than 0.4kg N/ha/yr increase as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>See A.2 at Appendix B for the latest position to be determined.</p>	<p>Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)</p> <p>Meeting 27 January 2021</p>
5. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
5.1	Natural England agree with the methodology used to undertake the LVIA based upon the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA107 Landscape and Visual Effects, Rev 0 and further guided by the Landscape Institute's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (GLVIA3). It accepts the approach used and is satisfied that it will deliver a robust assessment of the likely landscape and visual effects arising from the scheme's construction and operation.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.2	Natural England welcome the inclusion in the LVIA chapter of an assessment of the likely effects of the scheme on the special qualities of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CAONB). NE welcomes this additional assessment for the evidence and clarity it provides and believes it will greatly assist in the determination of the scheme. In addition, Highways England has amended how the assessment has presented so as to not amalgamate the judgements on individual special qualities.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.3	Natural England agrees that the landscape baseline used to inform the LVIA is appropriate. Natural England advises that Landscape Character Types (LCT) of the CAONB Character Assessment (2002), as listed in Table 7-13 (p.30) and illustrated in Figure 7.4 (sheets 1 and 2), are the most suitable for assessing the scheme's likely effect and is pleased therefore to see that these form the basis of the assessment	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.4	Natural England agrees that the method used to assess the likely effects of the scheme on the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB is suitable; essentially a narrative description followed by a concluding judgement.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.5	Natural England agree with the conclusion that the following special qualities can be scoped out of the assessment - distinctive settlements, developed in the Cotswolds vernacular, high architectural quality and integrity.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.6	Natural England agree with the location and classification of the viewpoints used in the assessment and considers them to be appropriate to the scale of the scheme, the complexity of the landscape and the high quality of the visual amenity afforded by the landscape within which the scheme is located.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.7	Natural England agrees with the method used to define the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV).	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.8	Natural England agrees the landscape assessment methodology used to assess the significance of landscape effects likely to be brought about by the scheme is appropriate. They are content with the methods used to define the sensitivity of landscape receptors and magnitude of likely landscape effect.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.9	Natural England agrees the visual assessment methodology used to assess the significance of visual effects likely to be brought about by the scheme is appropriate. They are content with the method used to define the sensitivity of visual receptors and magnitude of likely visual effect.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.10	Natural England note that there are no references to sequential visual effects on users of the Cotswold Way National Trail and Gloucestershire Way long distance path in the PEI report. Additional commentary on sequential views has been added to the ES Chapter 7 LVIA and they are satisfied that this is now covered.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.11	Natural England agrees to how the judgments on the significance of effects will be made and described.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.12	Natural England agrees the extent of the LVIA Study Area is appropriate for the scale and nature of the scheme.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.13	Commentary on the significance of effects on visual receptors - Natural England agrees with the preliminary judgements.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
5.14	Natural England welcomes the extensive lengths of new hedgerows and dry-stone walls which have been included in the design of the scheme.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
6. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)		
6.1	Natural England understands that Highways England is not required to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain given the scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. Natural England agree that Highways England has worked hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing Priority Habitats (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006), which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme. Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.	SoCG meeting on 27 January 2021
6.2	Natural England are pleased with the scope of surveys and that their initial recommendations regarding surveys were followed including use of the Altringham module for infrastructure sites.	Response to Statutory Consultation on the 2019 PEI report (08 November 2019)
6.3	Natural England generally welcome the extensive survey effort undertaken and the measures proposed to mitigate for impacts on bats.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
6.4	Natural England agrees that the ecological impact assessment methodology is appropriate for assessing the ecological effects of the scheme.	Email, 22 April 2021
6.5	Natural England generally agrees with the draft assessment conclusions including proposed mitigation and enhancement measures.	Email, 22 April 2021
6.6	Natural England generally agrees that the scheme should not be lit.	Response to Statutory Consultation on the 2019 PEI report (08 November 2019)
6.7	Natural England welcome the fact that land managers will be able to move cattle across the Cotswold Way crossing, as this will make grazing both sides of Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI easier.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
6.8	Natural England welcome the proposed woodland planting and wood pasture near to Ullen Wood, and across the rest of the scheme the priority should be on grassland restoration with any woodland planting forming part of a mosaic.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
6.9	Natural England welcomes the creation the areas of calcareous grassland which are incorporated into the design of the scheme. This will provide significant landscape enhancement through the recreation of a grassland habitat which was once common in this area.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
6.10	Natural England is satisfied that protected species such as bats, badgers and barn owls have been given thorough consideration.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
6.11	Natural England and Highways England agree that licenses are required for bats, badgers and Roman snails. The licence methods are referred to in Annex D Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) of ES Appendix 2.1 EMP. Natural England and Highways England agree further surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to inform any specific Natural England licensing requirements and survey effort will be discussed with a species advisor as appropriate.	Email, 22 April 2021
6.12	Natural England agree in principle to the badger licence method statement and that licences will be sought.	Email, 22 April 2021
6.13	Natural England and Highways England agree with the mitigation measures proposed for bats, and licences will be sought.	Email, 22 April 2021
6.14	[REDACTED]	Email, 22 April 2021
6.15	Natural England and Highways England agree a non-licensed approach can be taken to great crested newts. eDNA surveys (where water samples are analysed) will be carried out in Spring 2021 for ponds that have not yet been fully surveyed due to slight changes in the DCO Boundary bringing them into the 500m buffer zone. However, the ponds exhibit poor habitat suitability for great crested newt and it is considered unlikely that they support a breeding population of this species. No physical works to the ponds are proposed and works to terrestrial habitats within 250m are very minor. There is no reasonable likelihood that further surveys would identify impacts to great crested newt that would result in additional significant residual effects.	Email, 22 April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
6.16	Natural England is satisfied about the approach and conclusions of the draft HRA, as confirmed on 1 st April 2021. Highways England have subsequently made a commitment to provide additional precautionary mitigation with Cotswold Beechwoods SAC, such as signage/ interpretation boards, which Natural England has confirmed is welcome.	Email 1 April 2021
6.17	Natural England and Highways England agree that it is not possible to mitigate the loss of the tufa habitat impacted by the scheme but that compensation measures at other tufa springs should be undertaken, subject to further discussion and agreements between both parties.	Email, 22 April 2021
7. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)		
7.1	Natural England agree with the detailed soils analysis, in particular to identify any Best and Most Versatile agricultural land that would be lost to the scheme (grade 3a).	Response to Statutory Consultation on the 2019 PEI report (08 November 2019)
7.2	Natural England agree the scheme would enhance the existing sensitive geological exposures of the Leckhampton Member at the affected locations within Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI. Enhancement measures would include lowered slope angles and vegetation clearance where exposures have previously been concealed on the north side of the A417.	Emailed confirmation f on 13 November 2020 following meeting on 11 November 2020
8. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)		
8.1	Natural England generally agree with the assessment methodology and draft conclusions of assessment.	Email, 22 April 2021
9. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		
9.1	Natural England generally agree with the assessment methodology and draft conclusions of assessment.	Email, 22 April 2021
10. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
10.1	Natural England generally agree with the assessment methodology and draft conclusions of assessment.	Email, 22 April 2021
10.2	Natural England agree with the proposed diversion of the Cotswold Way National Trail. It welcomes the inclusion of a bridge across the new A417 carriageway for users of the Cotswold Way National Trail, the location of which minimises the need for a major realignment of the trail. The Cotswold Way National Trail was deliberately routed to afford the walker some of the best landscape and wildlife experiences available, and they consider this provide enhancement to its users. They welcome the fact that land managers will be able to move cattle across the bridge, as this will make grazing both sides of Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI easier.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020) Email, April 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
10.3	<p>Natural England and Highways England agree that during the construction phase a number of PRow will require either the establishment of temporary diversionary routes or in some cases temporary closure.</p> <p>The Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Annex F of ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan, Document Reference 6.4) clearly sets out how routes would be managed during construction and where new routes or diversions would be implemented before or during construction to minimise or avoid adverse impacts on users accessing existing and new routes.</p> <p>For the new Cotswold Way and Gloucestershire Way crossings, it is intended they are put in place prior to mainline construction to help maintain access during construction. Natural England and Highways England agree that for the Cotswold Way National Trail and the Gloucestershire Way long distance footpath temporary closure(s) would not be an appropriate measure to allow the construction works to proceed safely and that diversionary routes need to be identified and agreed with the Cotswolds Way Trail Manager and Gloucestershire County Council at the detailed design stage, when those diversions will be agreed alongside clear way-marking, and will be clearly communicated via the National Trail website and other platforms to be agreed.</p> <p>Due regard will be had to the advice of the Cotswold Way Trail Manager and representatives of local access groups to help ensure that suitable diversionary routes are identified.</p>	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
10.4	<p>Natural England agrees that as part of the scheme, Highways England is proposing to divert the existing National Trail over the A417 by way of a new Cotswold Way crossing near Emma's Grove.</p> <p>Natural England agrees that the statutory mechanism for the creation and management of a National Trail is set out in sections 50A to 55 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 ("the 1949 Act") and that a National Trail can only be varied in accordance with section 55 of the 1949 Act.</p> <p>Highways England in consultation with, and approved by, Natural England and the Cotswold Conservation Board will make statutory proposals for the diversion of the Cotswold Way National Trail, and will seek approval for them by the Secretary of State for Transport under section 52(2) of the 1949 Act.</p> <p>A report, prepared by Highways England in consultation with Natural England, will demonstrate that the proposals are appropriate and necessary in order to facilitate a nationally significant infrastructure project and improve connectivity for users of the Cotswold Way National Trail. It will set out that pursuant to section 55(2) of the 1949 Act, should the Secretary of State be minded to grant the DCO for the scheme, it is expedient for the Secretary of State to direct by way of their decision on the DCO application that the Cotswold Way National Trail shall be varied in accordance with the report.</p>	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
10.5	Natural England agreed making use of the Golden Heart Inn as a feature of public routes would be beneficial to the scheme and support the provision of additional car parking areas near the Golden Heart Inn and Stockwell Lane to help redistribute public access in the area away from the County Park and SSSIs.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
10.6	Natural England agrees with the proposed stopping up, diversions and new sections of public rights of way as set out within the draft Public Rights of Way Management Plan to improve access for all users. A separate Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) Technical Working Group (TWG) Statement of Common Ground helps detail any further points (matters agreed and outstanding). They are generally supportive that there would be a benefit to the PRow network.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
10.7	Natural England agrees with the proposals for the Gloucestershire Way diversion and Gloucestershire Way crossing.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
10.8	Natural England agree it will engage with Highways England about surfacing, signage and enclosures associated with PRow at the detailed design stage, when appropriate.	SoCG meeting 27 January 2021
10.9	Natural England agree with how the design of the scheme has sought to mask Shab Hill Junction from the wider landscape of the High Wolds and High Wold Valleys LCTs, for instance through the use of landscape bunds and tree planting. Natural England welcomes these aspects of the scheme and considers them to be of an appropriate size and extent to hide the junction. We note that until the mitigation planting matures there will be a detrimental effect on the Coldwell Bottom Valley and agree that this will lower the perceived tranquillity of this part of the LCT until these trees have matured. Confirmation that the junction will not be lit is welcomed as this will help maintain the dark skies currently associated with the High Wold landscape.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
10.10	Natural England welcome the area of wood pasture which will be created in the land between the existing A436 in the direction of Seven Springs) and Leckhampton Hill road. The woodland planting intended for the land between the junction and the new carriageway of the A417 is also welcomed.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
11. Crossings of the A417		
11.1	Natural England agrees there are proposed sufficient crossings of the A417 as part of the scheme. In particular, including the Gloucestershire Way crossing to help carry the long distance path, and the Cotswold Way crossing across the new A417 carriageway for users of the Cotswold Way National Trail.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
11.2	Natural England agrees with the proposals for the Gloucestershire Way crossing, to incorporate a 25m width of calcareous grassland habitat to help address fragmentation of the SSSI, in addition to its required functions for species connectivity, landscape integration and diversion of the Gloucestershire Way. They welcome and fully support this design which, in addition to the 25m of calcareous grassland habitat, also includes two 3m width hedgerows, a 3.5m bridleway and a 1.5m maintenance strip.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
11.3	Natural England agree with the proposed greening of the Cowley Lane and Stockwell overbridges, including the use of native species-rich planting. The design is considered to be of high quality and in keeping with the character of the AONB.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
11.4	Natural England welcomes the creation of the Air Balloon Way for the increased access and recreational opportunities this will provide for.	Correspondence between Highways England and Natural England on 18 December 2020
12. Gradient Change		
12.1	Natural England welcomes the change in the proposed gradient. Reducing the gradient means that less soil and rock needs to be removed, therefore reducing impacts on Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI, geology, woodland at Ullen Wood and Emma's Grove, reduced cutting depth and less soil needing to be disposed of.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
13. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake		
13.1	Natural England have requested that Barrow Wake car park is removed or relocated entirely. Natural England accept that the reduction, removal or relocation of the Barrow Wake car park is outside the scope of the consenting of the scheme and it is not owned as part of the strategic road network by Highways England. Gloucestershire County Council who own the car park intend to undertake an options assessment that would likely involve consultation with interested parties and the public in due course, and could result in changes in the future subject to the outcome of that assessment. Highways England has offered Gloucestershire County Council and other relevant stakeholders including Natural England help to inform or facilitate any discussions about any changes that might be proposed at the car park. Highways England will also ensure the detailed design of the scheme is able to accommodate the existing car park arrangement, or a future scenario if appropriate.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
14. Common Land		
14.1	Natural England is in favour of the principle of replacing the Common Land lost to the scheme and has no issues with the proposals, welcoming the fact that more Common Land will be re-provided than lost.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
15. Improvement for walking, cycling and horse riding, including disabled users		
15.1	Natural England agree the proposals will benefit walkers, cyclists and horse riders overall, and in particular welcome the proposed creation of "The Air Balloon Way" new multi-purpose trail, particularly with the provision of new parking areas for its users.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

- 5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between Natural England and Highways England are summarised below.
- 5.1.2 Natural England's main concerns are the proposals regarding Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England recommend the closure of the car park within Barrow Wake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and its restoration to calcareous grassland to reduce increased footfall on Barrow Wake SSSI. Natural England wish to see the complete closure of the car park, ground levels rationalised and the land restored to calcareous grassland, with an understanding that this would contribute towards offsetting the net loss of biodiversity resulting from this scheme. Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI is a core reservoir for biodiversity and Natural England state that the scheme should do everything possible to protect the site, enhance the site and use it as a pool from which species can expand across the landscape, aiding the recovery of nature.
- 5.1.3 Notwithstanding the matter agreed at 6.17 of Table 4-1 Natural England expresses concerns about the losses of tufa habitat as a result of the scheme, and considers the current proposals for compensation to be insufficient.
- 5.1.4 This is subject to the determination of the matters identified in Appendix B where the position of Natural England is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES).

5.2 Matters Outstanding

- 5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters which remain under discussion by the parties. It sets out the latest position of each party in relation to each matter outstanding, and the latest date of that position.

Table 5-1 Matter outstanding between Natural England and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1	No matters identified			
2. Project Description				
2.1	No matters identified			

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
3. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
3.1	No matters identified			
4. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
4.1	No matters identified			
5. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
5.1	No matters identified			
6. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
6.1	Biodiversity Net Gain	Notwithstanding the matters agreed at Table 4-1, Reference 9.1, Natural England express the need for the project as a whole to achieve a neutral or better biodiversity net gain score when applying the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric calculator.	<p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity, in line with the nature recovery network strategy for the area.</p> <p>Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme.</p> <p>Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.</p>	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
6.2	Barrow Wake roundabout – light spill	Natural England disagree with the design in this area because headlights from vehicles using this roundabout after sundown could cause a lighthouse effect.	A Cotswold stone wall would be provided on the western side of the roundabout and Barrow Wake carpark to minimise the lighthouse effect of cars travelling round the roundabout. It is acknowledged that this may not completely screen vehicles but there is currently scrub and trees in this location which also provides a buffer to break up the light spill.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)
6.3	Barrow Wake roundabout – habitat loss	Natural England disagree with the design in this area because the proposed access roundabout will require land take within the SSSI. Although they understand that this would not significantly impact features for which the site is notified, this loss of land would still need to be compensated for. Natural England considers that this is a step in the wrong direction for the conservation of this site. It means we would lose the ability to return some secondary woodland to limestone grassland, which might otherwise have been a possibility.	The creation of a roundabout on the B4070 Barrow Wake Road would not result in the loss of any calcareous grassland, the main qualifying feature of the Barrow Wake SSSI unit. There would however be a loss of approximately 500m ² (0.05ha) of road verge habitat either side of the current underpass structure. Existing vegetation in these locations comprises young to semi-mature trees, such as ash, hazel, willow and hawthorn, with ruderal species. This habitat is not considered to be high value habitat within the designated area. Impact to mature trees has been avoided where possible, although where ash trees are present the management of ash die back will need to be considered with regard to retention of these trees. Similarly, a limited area of up to 1m wide on the western edge of the B4070 Barrow Wake Road adjacent to the proposed roundabout would be impacted to enable the rerouting of utilities and to provide a working area for the building of a stone wall required to mitigate for light spill from traffic. Vegetation in these locations is scrub and broadleaved trees. The impact of these works on mature trees will be minimised wherever possible.	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>A total loss of approximately 1,400m² (0.14ha) of calcareous grassland and wooded habitat within the SSSI would be compensated for by the creation of calcareous grassland in a greater quantity than that lost. This would be part of a larger area of replacement Common Land as shown on ES Figure 12.4 Special category land (Document reference 6.3), totalling approximately 10,534m² (1.053ha) and comprising of the existing A417 carriageway and areas of existing verge habitat, both trees and grassland, to be retained. The existing carriageway would be used for the Air Balloon Way route and habitat creation. The Common Land replacement therefore includes the conversion of approximately 3,600m² (0.36ha) of hardstanding to calcareous grassland, of which approximately 1,000 m² (0.1ha) is currently hardstanding within the SSSI boundary.</p> <p>The conversion of approximately 0.36ha of hardstanding to calcareous grassland as part of Common Land replacement, including 0.1ha within the SSSI boundary, would result in a permanent addition to the area of calcareous grassland within and adjacent to the Barrow Wake unit of the SSSI. This would positively affect the integrity of this resource once established.</p> <p>The habitat compensation for the loss of the habitat within the SSSI together with the additional calcareous grassland created for Common Land would represent a minor beneficial impact upon the SSSI.</p> <p>Details are provided in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity.</p>	

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
6.4	Recreational Pressure on SSSI	<p>Natural England disagree with Highways England that the scheme would not adversely impact on the SSSI as a result of increased recreational activity. The location of the existing car park within Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI has the potential to lead to conflicts with the management of this sensitive site, particularly if its use is increased as a result of the proposed scheme or others. Based on the current proposals, visitors will use the Barrow Wake car park as an access point for the Air Balloon Way. Footfall on Barrow Wake SSSI is likely to increase as a result, particularly as people move to the ridgeline to enjoy the views. This is likely to cause increased trampling and erosion, damaging the calcareous grassland. Closure of the car park would remove this issue. Natural England is concerned that the proposals will increase recreational pressure on the Crickley Hill part of the SSSI.</p>	<p>Recreational pressure is assessed within the ES Chapter 8 and with the implementation of the major alternative recreational routes provided by the scheme and the provision of segregated routes, signage and other measures to deter public access from sensitive features, any damage to habitats from impacts such as increased trampling and degradation of vegetation would not affect the integrity or key characteristics of the SSSI. Habitat degradation from increased recreational pressure would represent a minor adverse impact upon Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity has taken into account the proposals for walking, cycling and horse riding set out in ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health and Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan (Public Rights of Way Management Plan).</p> <p>In response to the concerns expressed, a previously proposed footpath from the Air Balloon Way and Barrow Wake Car park has been removed to avoid impact on SSSI habitat where musk orchids are known to be.</p> <p>The proposed Air Balloon Way has been revised to help reduce recreational activity through people navigating through the car park and SSSI. A further footpath (89) has been removed from the SSSI to reduce recreational activity within the SSSI.</p> <p>Signage, enclosures and interpretation boards to promote routes away from areas of SSSI would be provided to educate people of the sensitivity of habitat, and help reduce or avoid potential adverse impacts.</p>	Response to Supplementary Consultation on the 2020 PEI report (11 November 2020)

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
6.5	Tufa habitat	<p>Natural England disagrees that the proposed compensation for the loss of tufa habitat will be sufficient.</p> <p>Natural England also has concerns about the lack of diverse vegetation of tufa systems as a marker for unfavourable condition since these low diversity systems frequently support a range of nationally scarce invertebrates, the more so when <i>Palustriella commutata</i> is the dominant plant. As such the hydrology of those flushes remains an important factor. Natural England advise that the invertebrates in this location should be sampled.</p>	<p>Highways England agree that it is not possible to mitigate the loss of the tufa habitat impacted by the scheme but that compensation measures at other tufa springs should be undertaken, subject to further discussion and agreements with Natural England.</p> <p>As is set out in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity, to compensate for the loss, off-site restoration of existing tufaceous formations in degraded condition will be undertaken. The methodology and results for the assessment of compensation options are provided within ES Appendix 8.25 Tufa-forming springs: selection of potential compensation sites (Document Reference 6.4) and full compensatory measures are included in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4).</p>	Email, 22 April 2021
7. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
7.1	No matters identified			
8. Materials (Chapter 10 of the ES)				
8.1	No matters identified			
9. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
9.1	No matters identified			

Ref.	Matter	Natural England position	Highways England position	Date of the position
10. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
10.1	Barrow Wake car park	Notwithstanding the matter agreed at 21.1, Natural England recommend the closure of the car park within Barrow Wake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and its restoration to calcareous grassland to reduce increased footfall on Barrow Wake SSSI. Natural England wish to see the complete closure of the car park, ground levels rationalised and the land restored to calcareous grassland, with an understanding that this would contribute towards offsetting the net loss of biodiversity resulting from this scheme. Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI is a core reservoir for biodiversity and Natural England state that the scheme should do everything possible to protect the site, enhance the site and use it as a pool from which species can expand across the landscape, aiding the recovery of nature.	The reduction, removal or relocation of the Barrow Wake car park is outside the scope of the consenting of the scheme and it is not owned as part of the strategic road network by Highways England. Gloucestershire County Council who own the car park intend to undertake an options assessment that would likely involve consultation with interested parties and the public in due course, and could result in changes in the future subject to the outcome of that assessment. Highways England has offered Gloucestershire County Council and other relevant stakeholders help to inform or facilitate any discussions about any changes that might be proposed at the car park. Highways England will also ensure the detailed design of the scheme is able to accommodate the existing car park arrangement, or a future scenario if appropriate.	Email, 22 April 2021
11. Crossings of the A417				
11.1	No matters identified			
12. Gradient change				
12.1	No matters identified			
13. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake				
13.1	No matters identified			
14. Common Land				
14.1	No matters identified			
15. Improvements for walking, cycling, horse riding and disabled users				
15.1	No matters identified			

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Natural England
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of Natural England is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B-1.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with Natural England during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by Natural England being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- B.1.1.3 It is also important to recognise that Natural England would continue to be engaged by Highways England throughout the detailed design process, given their interest in the detailed design and appearance of key features of the proposed scheme to be determined following the appointment of a contractor. This will include but not be limited to the detailed design and appearance of the Cotswold Way crossing and the Air Balloon Way.

Table B-1 Matters to be determined between Natural England and Highways England

Ref	Matter	Natural England Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
1.Principle of development				
A.1	Constructing a new road in the AONB	Natural England are yet to agree whether the scheme meets the policy tests set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks and to meet with its stated vision. This will require reviewing the full suite of DCO application documents.	Highways England will set out how the scheme meets the policy tests set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks, and its stated vision, in the Case for the Scheme.	22 April 2021

Ref	Matter	Natural England Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
4.Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
A.2	Air quality impact on designated sites	<p>Natural England acknowledge there will be adverse impacts on areas near Ullen Wood, Leckhampton Hill and Charlton Kings Common. This SSSI is already above its critical load and the scheme will generate a small further increase. They recommend the inclusion of measures to reduce or offset these impacts, for example planting tree shelter belts or managing the woodland in ways that offset the impact of air pollution.</p> <p>Natural England have discussed the approach to mitigation, compensation and enhancement for Ullen Wood, and defer confirming their final position until the matter has been clarified with the appropriate Natural England panel(s).</p>	<p>An aim of the scheme is to improve air quality and reduce pollution caused by congestion. The effects of the scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality and ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity. Appropriate mitigation measures will be set out in the ES to reduce or offset identified adverse effects.</p> <p>As set out in matter 4.2 of Table 4.1, Natural England agree that there will be a significant adverse effect on the ancient woodland at Ullen Wood and that is unavoidable with the proposed route. The following compensation approach has been discussed and is reported within Chapter 8 of the ES:</p> <p>A total of 2.1ha of ancient woodland at Ullen Wood is predicted to be degraded as a result of nitrogen deposition, because it will receive more than 0.4kg N/ha/yr increase as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>To compensate, the ES and environmental masterplan includes 2.1ha of woodland planting adjacent to Ullen Wood in areas that will receive less than 0.4kg N/ha/yr increase as a result of the scheme.</p>	27 January 2021

Ref	Matter	Natural England Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
5.Landscape and Visual effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
A.3	Design, Mitigation Measures and Enhancement Measures	<p>Natural England would like to see a clear explanation of how the design of the scheme goes beyond the requirements of DMRA LA 107, 'to deliver a excellence in design quality which responds to the needs of people and places' in order that the statutory purpose of the Cotswold AONB (to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the designation) has been taken account of in the evolution of the scheme's design and in so doing has resulted in enhancements set out.</p> <p>They suggest that consideration should be given to presenting all information relating to mitigation measures and enhancement in tabular form in order that the distinction between what is required by DMRA LA 107 and the additional measures needed to address the policy tests set out in 5.150 -3 and 5.137 can be readily understood.</p>	Distinction has been made between embedded, essential and enhancement in terms of planting and other measures in the ES, which will be supported by a Design Summary Report to address policies within the NSPNN. That document will be submitted as part of the DCO application.	22 April 2021
7.Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
A.4	Impact on designated geological features	Highways England identifies potential impacts to the geological interests and also recognises the potential for new exposures to be created. While it does indicate where mitigation would be required, Natural England consider clarity as to the nature and feasibility of mitigation may require further ground investigations to be carried out. As a consequence, there remains a degree of uncertainty with regard to the final impact on the designated geological features.	With appropriate mitigation (such as improving existing designated rock exposures and allowing access for Natural England during construction), construction of the scheme is not considered to result in a significant effect on the designated geological features at Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI or tufa deposits (see ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, Document Reference 6.2), and Figure 9.5 Designated Geological Sites (Document Reference 6.3)). A temporary physical barrier would be constructed to protect the identified	22 April 2021

Ref	Matter	Natural England Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>As a general comment, Chapter 9 identifies potential impacts to the geological interests and also recognises the potential for new exposures to be created. While it does indicate where mitigation would be required, the nature of that mitigation is not clear. Clarity as to the nature and feasibility of mitigation may require further ground investigations to be carried out. As a consequence, there remains a degree of uncertainty with regard to the final impact on the designated geological features. Natural England agree that it is unfeasible to commit to specific details until further ground investigations have taken place.</p>	<p>exposures of the Leckhampton Member within the Crickley Hill SSSI (as shown on ES Figure 9.5 Designated geological sites (Document Reference 6.3)). This would be considered by the contractor in their temporary works design. The scheme could result in beneficial impacts through the generation of new exposures within the faces of the rock cuttings proposed in the vicinity of the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI. This would provide an opportunity to obtain new information on geological formations present within the designated geological site. Other proposed cuttings along the scheme (for example in the area of Shab Hill junction), could also open new rock exposures as new geological features or attributes. The impact of the wider scheme on the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI geology has been detailed in ES Appendix 9.6 Geodiversity at Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI (Document Reference 6.4). Due to implications of health and safety, long-term access to new exposures shall not be provided by Highways England.</p>	

Appendix D Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England

Table of contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
1.2 Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3 Status of this SoCG	2
2 Consultation	3
2.1 Role of HBMCE	3
2.2 Summary of consultation	3
3 Topics covered in this SoCG	9
4 Matters agreed	10
5 Matters outstanding	12
5.1 Principal matters outstanding	12
5.2 Matters outstanding	12
Appendix A Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B Matters to be determined	ii

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with HBMCE since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG	9
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between HBMCE and Highways England	10
Table 5-1	Matters outstanding between HBMCE and Highways England	12

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE), more commonly known as Historic England, in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters that have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of HBMCE is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with HBMCE. Discussions will be aided by HBMCE being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.5 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.
- 1.1.7 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of HBMCE in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

- 1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.
- 1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.
- 1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of HBMCE

- 2.1.1 HBMCE was established with effect from 1 April 1984 under Section 32 of the National Heritage Act 1983. The general duties of HBMCE under Section 33 are as follows:
- i. "...so far as is practicable:*
- 1. to secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England;*
 - 2. to promote the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of conservation areas situated in England; and*
 - 3. to promote the public's enjoyment of, and advance their knowledge of, ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England and their preservation".*
- 2.1.2 HBMCE is a statutory consultee providing advice to local planning authorities on certain categories of applications for planning permission and listed building consent, and is also a statutory consultee on all Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Similarly, HBMCE advises the Secretary of State on those applications, subsequent appeals and on other matters generally affecting the historic environment. It is the lead body for the heritage sector and is the Government's principal adviser on the historic environment.
- 2.1.3 Status in relation to the application –
- Statutory consultee under section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 ('the Act').

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with HBMCE during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 HBMCE has been a member of a Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group (TWG); see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with HBMCE, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with HBMCE since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set out in Table 2-1

Table 2-1 Consultation with HBMCE since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
7 June 2019	Stakeholder meeting	HBMCE Highways England	An introductory meeting for the next stages of the A417 scheme. The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HBMCE's scoping response • Compounds and spoil storage areas not included in archaeological desk study and subsequent surveys • Suggestion that new drystone walls should be created as landscape enhancement • HBMCE's particular concerns including Crickley Hill, Emma's Grove barrows and unknown archaeology
18 June 2019	Joint Landscape Strategy meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including HBMCE	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint landscape vision • Improving setting of Emma's Grove (thinning existing woods around these monuments) and improving connectivity in terms of views and access between Emma's Grove, Crickley Hill and the Peak Camp
2 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Cotswold District Council (Archaeology Officer) and HBMCE HBMCE	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to the scheme • 2019 Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEI report) update • Opportunities mapping • TWG terms of reference • Working group technical discussions
30 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG member organisation including Gloucestershire County Council (Heritage Officer) and HBMCE	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities mapping feedback • 209 PEI report update • Landscape update – approach and sketch designs • Working group technical discussions • Overview of Statements of Common Ground
15 August 2019	Email	Highways England to landscape officers/representatives at statutory	Highways England landscape specialist emailed the landscape representatives to share figures of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
		body organisations, including HBMCE	indicative viewpoint locations. The landscape specialist asked for feedback on the viewpoints.
20 August 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group (TWG) Meeting	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG Member Organisations including HBMCE and Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Officer	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Landscape update on design approach and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions
17 September 2019	Site walkover and scheme orientation visit	Highways England TWG member organisations including HBMCE and Gloucestershire County Council	General discussion regarding scheme design. Discussed assets beyond 1km which could potentially experience setting impacts- agreed to consider Leckhampton Camp in the ES.
27 September 2019	Letter	Highways England HBMCE	Highways England formally notified HBMCE of the statutory consultation taking place between 27 September 2019 and 8 November 2019, in accordance with S42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. The deadline for receipt of responses (11.59pm on the 8 November 2019) was set out in the letter, which was also sent by email.
8 November 2019	Email	HBMCE to Highways England	HBMCE submitted a formal response to statutory consultation.
24 January 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England HBMCE and Gloucestershire County Council	The current position regarding archaeological surveys was presented. The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and location of trenches • Datasets used to establish baseline • ES to be based on existing baseline data (desk based and partial geophysics) • Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted as part of Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Construction)

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk to construction programme if archaeological potential is not sufficiently understood Proposed GI and the scope of the archaeological watching brief and geoarchaeological interpretation
14 February 2020	Email	HBMCE to Highways England	Response to Highways England email proposing that trenching could be re-arranged to move trenches from proposed landscape areas and relocated within the footprint of the scheme in order to increase sample percentage.
28 May 2020	Email/phone call	Highways England HBMCE	Highways England wrote to HBMCE via email to explain that the A417 DCO submission would be postponed to 2021 to enable Highways England to undertake further design and development work of some elements of the scheme. The letter reiterated the commitment to the scheme, and funding for the scheme as announced in RIS2, as well as a commitment to continued stakeholder engagement. Highways England also phoned HBMCE to convey this message.
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG members and Walking Cycling and Horse Riding TWG members	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update following delay to programme Key changes to the design and the amended timescales
22 July 2020	Email	Highways England to TWG member organisations including HBMCE and GCC	Request that the SOCG meeting with HBMCE on 30 July include GCC Heritage Team and HBMCE's Science Advisor. Was agreed at meeting in January that these meetings would be undertaken jointly with GCC and HBMCE. Highways England replied to confirm invitation could be extended.
30 July 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England HBMCE and Gloucestershire County Council officers	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic environment Scheme update Key design changes <p>Meeting minutes and slides were provided on 18 August.</p>
24 August 2020	Email	Highways England HBMCE	Email seeking a meeting regarding communications on the upcoming A417 consultation, key messages, and support of campaigns.
28 August 2020	Email	Highways England to HBMCE	Email containing a link to a first tranche of information sharing for consultees. It was explained that the information was Work in Progress, Draft and

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
			Confidential and should only be shared within their organisation where there is a legitimate reason to do so.
4 September 2020	Email	Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Email containing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that specific palaeoenvironmental sampling was not planned to be undertaken • Information regarding lidar interpretation • Draft interpretation shapefiles for information shared
10 September 2020	Email	Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Email containing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latest versions of shapefiles • Confirmation that trenches had to be moved • Confirmation that Highways England is committed to undertaking a full programme of mitigation in advance of construction, and all parties will be fully involved in defining that work
18 September 2020	Email	Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Email to share Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation.
30 September 2020	Emails	Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Emails to share latest survey results and drawings with trench numbers attached.
9 Oct 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England HBMCE Gloucestershire County Council archaeologist	HBMCE SoCG meeting with attendance from GCC officers.
13 Oct 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England HBMCE	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to HBMCE, in accordance with Section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 12 November 2020.
12 Nov 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	HBMCE	HBMCE submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
28 January 2021	Email	Highways England Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Emailed latest version of the Statement of Common Ground for comments.
28 January 2021	Email	HBMCE to Highways England	Email from HBMCE containing:

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters Discussed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS) and Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) • Information regarding the results of the evaluation and geoarchaeological works, mitigation areas and levels of mitigation
1 February 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England HBMCE	Update on progress of evaluation and feedback on the DAMS/OWSI
15 February 2021	Emails	Highways England Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Emailed geophysics update from Highways England, and emailed comments on draft SoCG from HBMCE.
29 March 2021	Email	Highways England Highways England to HBMCE and GCC archaeologist	Emailed draft SoCG for comments
28 April 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England HBMCE	Update on project progress including likely programme for delivery of archaeological reports. Discussion and agreement on the position of the SoCG that will be submitted for DCO

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Consultation
Relevant ES Chapter	3.	Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)
	4.	Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4.1 below shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between HBMCE and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1.	HBMCE generally agrees with the need for development in helping to address the current situation of poor road safety and daily congestion and that the solution should reflect the special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	Email, April 2021
1.2.	HBMCE generally agrees with the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme that will deliver a safe and resilient free-flowing road whilst conserving and enhancing the special character of the nationally important protected landscape of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) that the new route passes through.	Email, April 2021
1.3.	HBMCE generally agrees with the form of the scheme to address the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme.	Email, April 2021
2. Consultation		
2.1.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that the detail of design will be discussed and agreed between Highways England, its contractor and GCC should the scheme progress to construction. Both parties are committed to ongoing engagement throughout the detailed design stage to help discuss and agree detailed matters pertinent to the historic environment.	Email, April 2021
2.2.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that a multidisciplinary approach should continue to be adopted to enable areas of archaeological potential to be identified. As part of this process an archaeological watching brief has been maintained on geotechnical investigations and will be subject to specialist paleoenvironmental review to inform the mitigation strategy.	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
3. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)		
3.1.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that the Desk-Based Assessment should be undertaken using best practice advice (CIFA 2014, Standard and Guidance for the Historic Environment: Desk-Based Assessment).	Response to statutory consultation 8 November 2019

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
3.2.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that due to the (limited) nature of trial trenching, some archaeological sites will not be identified at this stage. There is also the possibility that some early prehistoric sites will not be identified and assessed as they may be buried under colluvium (hill wash).	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
3.3.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that a sufficient distance should be provided between the cutting of the scheme and Emma's Grove to protect the Designated Barrows. The edge of cutting lies at a distance of 52m from the edge of the scheduled area at its nearest point and will not encroach further towards the barrows.	Response to Statutory Consultation 8 November 2019
3.4.	Highways England and HBMCE agree that noise assessment in relation to the heritage assets should be provided. Changes in noise levels compared to the current situation have been reviewed for the 2020 PEI report and have informed the assessment of impacts for heritage assets in the ES. <i>NB:</i> it should be noted that the detail of this won't be agreed until review of the ES, as outlined in Appendix B, reference A.3.	Emails, September 2020
4. Population and Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
4.1.	HBMCE agree with the inclusion of the Gloucestershire Way and Cotswold Way crossings to maintain connectivity, including to features of the historic environment.	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between HBMCE and Highways England are:

- HBMCE does not consider that sufficient information has been submitted to provide a clear understanding of the nature and full extent of the potential impacts on the historic environment as required either by the EIA regulations, National Policy Statements or the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Notwithstanding a need for further information once the ES and Environmental Management Plan are published, it is HBMCE's position that the scheme will have a significant environmental impact, in EIA terms, on the historic environment, and that it will cause impacts on a number of designated heritage assets of national importance.

5.2 Matters outstanding

5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters which remain under discussion by the parties. It sets out the latest position of each party in relation to each matter outstanding, and the latest date of that position.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between HBMCE and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	HBMCE position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1	No matters identified.			
2. Consultation				
2.1	No matters identified			

Ref.	Matter	HBMCE position	Highways England position	Date of the position
3. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
3.1	Baseline information including surveys.	HBMCE disagree that the baseline is sufficient because it is disjointed and lacking in information.	<p>Highways England considers that the baseline information is sufficiently robust and follows the methodology in DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment.</p> <p>The baseline information consists of a detailed desk based archaeological assessment. Following this, field surveys were undertaken in the form of a geophysical survey and trial trenching. These located archaeological remains within the DCO Boundary with a high degree of accuracy and support the Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation.</p>	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
3.2	Methodology and Statements of Significance	HBMCE disagrees that the DMRB methodology is sufficient and expresses concerns that the Statements of Significance looks at assets as individuals and does not provide sufficient discussion on the significance the setting makes and interrelationships with other assets. The ES should include a section on setting assessments as a narrative following HBMCE guidance (Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets - HBMCE).	Highways England considers that the statements of significance identify the key relationships and aspects that contribute to the significance of each asset, and where there are interrelationships between assets or asset types, these have been described. Highways England has reviewed HBMCE Guidance Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 and does not consider that a tabular format is inherently less able to describe setting than a narrative, as is provided.	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
3.3	Methodology and the NPS, NPPF and EIA policies and regulations	<p>HBMCE disagree that the assessment fulfils the requirements of the NPS and NPPF polices and EIA regulations. It recommends that to fulfil the requirements the methodology should go beyond that set out in DMRB to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more holistic approach to the landscape • Improved baseline information • Better integration and cross reference to other disciplines 	<p>ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage follows the methodology in DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage and its associated appendices which include the surveys undertaken to characterise the archaeology present within the proposed DCO Boundary, fully meet the requirements of the NPSNN and EIA Regulations.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme provides an assessment of the scheme against the requirements of the NPSNN, this will be available for HBMCE to review.</p>	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	HBMCE position	Highways England position	Date of the position
3.4	Methodology and Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)	HBMCE disagree that the methodology sufficiently predicts potential archaeological sites within the scheme.	Geophysical survey and trial trenching have been undertaken which have located archaeological remains within the DCO Boundary with a high degree of accuracy. The HLC is intended to provide an overview of the broad make-up of the landscape surrounding the proposed scheme and to establish areas where particular historical land uses are still legible within the modern landscape. It was not intended to predict the presence of archaeological sites within the DCO Boundary, nor is it considered that it would be effective for this.	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
4. Population and Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
4.1	No matters identified.			

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	HBMCE
Name	Melanie Barge
Position	Planning Group Inspector
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of HBMCE is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B-1.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with HBMCE during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by HBMCE being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B-1 Matters to be determined between HBMCE and Highways England

Ref	Matter	HBMCE Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
Consultation				
A.1	Consultation with local government archaeological advisors.	HBMCE considers that the assessment of non-designated archaeological remains should be addressed in further consultation with local government archaeological advisors, and without review of the trenching or geophysical report, cannot assess whether or not this has been adequate.	Highways England has consulted with the County Archaeologist (County Archaeological Service) throughout the pre-application stage of the project to help inform the assessment, and Highways England considers that the assessment of impacts on non-designated heritage assets is robust.	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
A.2	Geoarchaeological assessments	The results of the Geo-archaeological monitoring of geotechnical investigations, boreholes and test pits, are not yet available. This information will feed into requirements for specific locations and transects where purposeful geo-archaeological investigation may be required. For example, to resolve unknowns such as Prehistoric deposits and features obscured by colluvium.	No geoarchaeological assessment was undertaken for the Phase 1 geotechnical investigations. Highways England will engage fully with HBMCE to design a comprehensive geoarchaeological programme as part of the pre-construction archaeological mitigation strategy. The cultural heritage assessment in ES Chapter 6 has been undertaken in consultation with other environmental disciplines, and where potential	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020

Ref	Matter	HBMCE Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		<p>Greater integration and enhanced communication between the cultural heritage team and other specialist teams is required; geology, hydrology, and landscape teams. Some locations such as Nettleton Bottom have been flagged up as wet/ waterlogged this should be cross-referenced with potential for archaeology; in particular palaeoenvironmental deposits.</p>	<p>impacts on heritage assets have been identified these have been described in the ES. In cases where no impacts are predicted in relation to other topics, no reference has been made to those topics.</p>	
A.3	Potential impact on heritage assets	<p>HBMCE considers that the proposed scheme has the potential to impact on a number of designated and undesignated Heritage Assets across a wide area (as listed in their response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020).</p> <p>The impact of the scheme is difficult to assess with the level of information currently provided. At this stage without some of the assessment work and results from the ground investigations it is too early to assign levels of significance to the non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Appropriate values should be placed on some of the sites and this is difficult to assess as they have not been dated and their full significance is not known. This may change at a later date once further archaeological work has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Impacts and effects upon the assets listed by HBMCE have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage describes the value of heritage assets within the study area and assesses the impact of the proposed scheme upon them. Highways England is confident that the level of value assigned to each is correct and that the results of the assessment reported in the ES are robust.</p>	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020
A.4	Prehistoric pits and enclosure	<p>The undesignated archaeology (known and unknown) will provide information about the use and development of the landscape and farming across the plateau. The modern landscape we now appreciate and protect as the Cotswolds AONB only exists through our past exploitation of that land to sustain and support ourselves. It will be important to fully understand that development and relationship to be able to understand the impacts of this scheme on</p>	<p>Highways England considers that ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage presents a robust account of the assessment cultural heritage impacts and includes the areas of interest identified by HBMCE.</p>	Response to statutory consultation 12 November 2020

Ref	Matter	HBMCE Position	Highways England position	Date of the latest position
		those assets and the modern landscape. Many of the assets within this protected landscape are interconnected and that connection needs to be fully assessed to understand their significance. To better understand the designated assets there needs to be a good understanding of the buried archaeology and the non-designated assets as a whole.		

Appendix E Draft Statement of Common Ground with Cotswolds Conservation Board

Table of contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3	Status of this SoCG	2
2	Consultation	3
2.1	Role of Cotswolds Conservation Board	3
2.2	Summary of consultation	3
3	Topics covered in this SoCG	11
4	Matters agreed	12
5	Matters outstanding	17
5.1	Principal matters outstanding	17
5.2	Matters outstanding	17
Appendix A	Signing Sheet	ii
Appendix B	Matters to be determined	iii

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with Cotswolds Conservation Board since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG	11
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between Cotswolds Conservation Board and Highways England	12
Table 5-1	Matters outstanding between Cotswolds Conservation Board and Highways England	17
Table B-1	Matters to be determined between CCB and Highways England	iii

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters which have been agreed
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of CCB is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with CCB. Discussions will be aided by CCB being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.5 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided as early as possible in the examination.
- 1.1.7 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of CCB in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.
- 1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.

1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of Cotswolds Conservation Board

- 2.1.1 Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) is an independent statutory body that works to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was established by Parliamentary Order in 2004 and is one of two Conservation Boards in England. CCB is comprised of 37 board members drawn from local authorities, parish councils and appointments made by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).
- 2.1.2 CCB has two statutory purposes:
- To conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Cotswolds AONB
 - To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB
- 2.1.3 While having regard to these two purposes, CCB seeks to foster the social and economic wellbeing of local communities within the AONB.
- 2.1.4 Conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area is also the statutory purpose of an AONB designation. Under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), Highways England, as a public body, has a duty to have regard to this purpose.
- 2.1.5 CCB is a prescribed consultee as defined under section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act).

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with CCB during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 CCB has been a member of the Strategic Stakeholder Panel, a Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group and the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group, and has been party to collaborative planning sessions; see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with CCB, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with CCB since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set out in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with Cotswolds Conservation Board since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
March 2019	Letter	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England and MPs	Following the announcement by Highways England that Option 30 was the Preferred Route, the CCB wrote to Highways England and MPs to highlight the impact of Option 30 with regard to landscape and scale of impact.
April 2019	Letter	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England	CCB wrote to Highways England. The letter highlighted earlier responses provided by CCB in 2018 and queried the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That earlier concerns were not addressed • The lack of any further consideration of tunnels • The inadequacy of a small green bridge • The lack of net environmental gain within the scheme
2 May 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred route announcement – review and feedback • Status update on the technical working groups • Technical partner and programme update • Programme/governance update • Preliminary design and what to expect
12 July 2019	Meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCB response to Scoping Opinion • Joint landscape vision • Route selection • Alternative link road to Birdlip • Draft viewpoints for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Depth of cutting
20 August 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG Member Organisations including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Landscape update on design approach and LVIA • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
4 September 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress update Technical working group update Public consultation details Highways England provided a preview of the scheme proposals forming part of the consultation materials.
27 September 2019	Letter	Highways England to Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England wrote to Cotswolds Conservation Board to notify the Board of the statutory consultation taking place between 27 September and 8 November 2019, in accordance with section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. The letter invited the Board to provide comments by 8 November 2019.
8 November 2019	Letter	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England	CCB provided a formal response to the statutory public consultation held between 27 September and 8 November 2019.
17 February 2020	Email	Highways England to Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England issued the first draft Statement of Common Ground to Cotswolds Conservation Board ahead of the planned meeting on 25 February 2020.
25 February 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First draft of the SoCG The process of progressing the SoCG. Minutes of this meeting were shared with the Board on 9 March 2020.
26 February 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on progress of the scheme update on governance, funding, programme and statutory consultation A roundtable discussion on consultation responses – key issues ahead of DCO submission Next steps – activity up to DCO submission and beyond
3 March 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An update of the scheme Draft Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan WCH Statement of Common Ground
6 March 2020	Email	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England	CCB provided Highways England with comments on the first draft of the SoCG as well as a timeline of consultation and engagement with Highways England since 2014.
10 March 2020	Email	Highways England to Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England provided CCB with a revised draft structure of the SoCG and sought comment.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
17 March 2020	Email	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England	CCB stated broad agreement with the new SoCG structure, and reiterated the key points of interest for the Board that would need to be captured in the SoCG.
5 May 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to review and update the matters in the SoCG.
20 July 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the progress of the scheme The change to the scheme's programme The updated designs following consultation in 2019
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG members and Walking Cycling and Horse riding TWG members	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update following delay to programme, setting out the key changes to the design and the amended timescales Invited questions from stakeholders during the session
28 July 2020	Meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to discuss CCB concerns and suggestions regarding the engineering design of the scheme.
12 August 2020	Walking Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England WCH TWG members including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> draft document given to members and comments on its structure and content were sought Next steps including date for next meeting
17 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key concerns of the design changes that were being taken to supplementary consultation in October 2020.
25 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public rights of way proposals Changes to Cowley junction Realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake Change in gradient

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
3 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme-wide connectivity, permeability and crossings strategy • Maintaining and improving functionality of the crossings • Cotswolds Way crossing • Gloucestershire Way crossing • Cowley and Stockwell overbridges
17 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental masterplan • Biodiversity net gain • Archaeology
7 October 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England provided an update to the SSP on the progress of the scheme including the upcoming supplementary statutory consultation.
13 October 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England to Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to CCB, in accordance with section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments by 12 November 2020.
28 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental collaborative planning organisations including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) • The change by habitat area within the DCO Boundary • The BNG calculation (using the current DEFRA metric, due to be updated in Dec 2020) • The BNG metric • Stakeholders on ideas to improve on biodiversity gain
11 November 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	Cotswolds Conservation Board to Highways England	CCB submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via emailed letter.
2 December 2020	Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England and the SSP members discussed key concerns and issues regarding the proposed crossings for the scheme, and identified if and how these concerns could be addressed.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
11 December 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of the scheme • Results from the recent consultation • A summary of the responses received • An update on next steps for the scheme
14 December 2020	Letter	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	Highways England wrote to the environmental stakeholders, including CCB, to outline a change in proposals following the crossings and integration strategy meeting which took place on 2 December 2020.
14 December 2020	Letter	Highways England Environmental bodies, including Cotswolds Conservation Board	CCB wrote to Highways England to confirm their full support for the proposed design changes outlined in Highways England's letter dated 14 December 2020.
21 December 2020	Meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to discuss the LVIA.
2 February 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to review and update the matters in the SoCG.
31 March 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to review and update the matters in the SoCG.
12 May 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England Cotswolds Conservation Board	Meeting to review and update the matters in the SoCG.

- 2.2.5 Highways England and CCB have also engaged regarding CCB's suggested tunnel options as an alternative design solution for the A417 Missing Link scheme. This has taken place since 2014 and a summary is provided below.
- 2.2.6 Tunnel options were previously considered because of the potential opportunities they could provide to reduce the impact of the scheme on some aspects of the environment, compared to surface route options.
- 2.2.7 In 2017, Highways England undertook an assessment of six route options, including four tunnel options and two surface options, that it had shortlisted from the initial 30 options that had been identified in 2016.
- 2.2.8 Highways England considered and discounted tunnel options during the options assessment carried out before making its Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019. Tunnel options were previously considered because of the potential opportunities they could provide to reduce the impact of the scheme on some aspects of the environment, compared to surface route options.
- 2.2.9 This assessment showed that the four tunnel options outperformed the surface options in most of the economy, social and environmental measures². However, the tunnels options were above the upper limit of the cost range (£500 million) and were outperformed by the surface options in terms of value for money³. The assessments also concluded that tunnel options would still have some adverse environmental impacts due to the requirement to build tunnel portals and link roads to the existing A417 and A436, as well as the more significant impacts during construction involving excavations.
- 2.2.10 Highways England made its Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019. In July 2019, in response to the EIA Scoping Report consultation, CCB asked Highways England to consider three tunnel options, which CCB has referred to as the 'Gold', 'Red' and 'Blue' options, as potential alternatives to Highways England's preferred route, Option 30⁴. CCB also recommended that Highways England should not rule out giving tunnel options further consideration if the financial envelope (budget) for the scheme were to increase.
- 2.2.11 However, Highways England indicated that it had already considered and discounted tunnel options (as outlined above) and, as such, did not address the Gold, Red and Blue options when considering alternative options in the EIA Assessment. This is further set out in Table 5-2, reference 2.1.
- 2.2.12 Highways England consulted on the proposed scheme in autumn 2019. At that stage, the scheme incorporated a 25m deep cutting up the Cotswold escarpment and would have involved approximately one million cubic metres of material being taken off site.

² Highways England (2019) A417 Missing Link [Scheme Assessment Report](#). Paragraph 4.7.22.

³ Highways England (2019) A417 Missing Link [Scheme Assessment Report](#). Paragraph 4.7.23.

⁴ CCB response to Highways England's EIA Scoping Report consultation response, June 2019.

- 2.2.13 When reviewing the proposed scheme, CCB identified that a cut and cover tunnel could potentially be incorporated into the scheme design, instead of the 25m deep cutting, at a similar cost. CCB recommended the inclusion of a cut and cover tunnel in its formal response to the statutory consultation (8 November 2019). CCB considered this cut and cover tunnel proposal to be a very different engineering solution to the tunnel options that had been previously considered and/or recommended.
- 2.2.14 Following the 2020 design changes, Highways England changed the proposed gradient of the road up the escarpment from 7% to 8%. This has resulted in the depth of cutting now being reduced to around 15m. As such, there is little requirement for material to be taken off site. CCB accepts that this has reduced the benefits of a cut and cover tunnel.
- 2.2.15 Although a tunnel would be CCB's ideal option, CCB has accepted that a tunnel does not form part of the proposed scheme.
- 2.2.16 Please refer to the Scheme Assessment Report and ES Chapter 3 Assessment for Alternatives for further information.

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of development
	2.	Consultation
	3.	Landscape-led approach
	4.	Policy and legislation (AONB)
Scheme design	5.	Crossings of the A417
	6.	Gradient change
	7.	Cowley junction
	8.	The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake
	9.	Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users
	10.	Other engineering design
Relevant ES Chapter	11.	Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)
	12.	Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)
	13.	Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)
	14.	Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)
	15.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	16.	Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)
	17.	Materials Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)
	18.	Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)
Other topics	19.	Brockworth bypass to Shab Hill junction (including A436 link)
	20.	Shab Hill to Cowley junction (including Birdlip link road)

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matter's reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between Cotswolds Conservation Board and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1.	The need for the scheme in principle is agreed by the Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) and the benefits of such a scheme include improved traffic flows and journey times; reduced congestion; reduced air pollution; and reduced numbers of accidents.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
1.2.	CCB agrees that the specific scheme which is proposed could potentially have a number of beneficial effects, in addition to the key transport and traffic benefits outlined above (matter reference 1.1). These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recreational opportunities provided by the re-purposed A417 • The improved crossing of the A417 for the Cotswold Way National Trail • The proposed reduction of traffic intrusion along the Cotswold escarpment • The proposed habitat creation. 	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 2
2. Consultation		
2.1.	Highways England has positively engaged with CCB and other key stakeholders. CCB has had a proactive role in assisting Highways England to enhance and refine the scheme.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
2.2.	Both parties agree to continue engagement regarding the detailed design of the scheme, as appropriate.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
3. Landscape-led approach		
3.1.	Relevant stakeholders (including Highways England and CCB) have agreed a landscape-led vision, design principles, objectives and sub-objectives.	Comments on first draft SoCG 06/03/2020
3.2.	CCB agrees that the agreed landscape-led approach to the scheme is particularly important due to the scheme's location within the Cotswolds AONB, the safeguarding of which is in the nation's interest.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
3.3.	CCB agrees with the stated vision of a landscape-led scheme, including the Design Principles and objectives.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 1

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
3.4.	CCB agrees with the vision of delivering a road scheme that both meets highways requirements and conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the AONB: reconnecting landscape, recreational access and ecology; bringing about landscape, wildlife and heritage benefits, including enhanced residents' and visitors' enjoyment of the area; improving quality of life for local communities; and contributing to the health of the economy and local businesses.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 1
4. Policy and legislation (AONB)		
4.1.	CCB agrees Highways England has a statutory duty to have regard to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Cotswold AONB under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) – (the 'duty of regard').	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
4.2.	CCB agrees that the scheme must be implemented within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) because the section of the A417 requiring the scheme ('the Missing Link') is located entirely within the AONB.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
4.3.	It is recognised that the Government-commissioned 'Landscapes Review' of National Parks and AONBs (2019) recommends that the Cotswolds AONB 'stands out as a leading candidate' for National Park status.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 1
5. Crossings of the A417		
5.1.	CCB agrees that a multi-purpose crossing (greened bridge) 'the Gloucestershire Way crossing' would provide a number of potential benefits and would be better than an ordinary footbridge. In particular, providing a traffic free crossing across the A417 for users of the Gloucestershire Way Long Distance Footpath and other recreational users would be a significant benefit. A greened bridge could also potentially provide for some degree of connectivity, in terms of landscape, and allow for some habitat creation.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 3
5.2.	CCB agrees that the Cotswold Way crossing will provide safer access for users of the Cotswold Way National Trail and better links to other trails than the current position.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 2
5.3.	CCB agrees that the Cotswold Way crossing is in the right location.	SSP meeting, 7/10/2020
5.4.	CCB and Highways England agree it is important that an approach to the detailed design of this crossing is considered that combines, where safe and practicable, all factors that contribute to the natural beauty of the National Landscape.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 3
5.5.	CCB agrees with the provision of the Gloucestershire Way crossing to incorporate a 25m width of calcareous grassland habitat to help address fragmentation of the SSSI, in addition to its required functions for species connectivity, landscape integration and diversion of the Gloucestershire Way. The CCB welcomes and fully supports this provision which, in addition to the 25m of calcareous grassland habitat, also includes two 3m width hedgerows, a 3.5m bridleway and a 1.5m maintenance strip.	Position statement response, 18/12/2020, page 1

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
6. Gradient change		
6.1.	CCB agrees that the increase in gradient from 7% to 8% will bring about positive change to the scheme. If the depth of cutting is reduced that should lead to a good outcome for wildlife, habitats and landscapes compared to the likely final result of the 2019 scheme.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 4
6.2.	CCB considers that east of the Air Balloon in the vicinity of Emma's Grove and Ullen Wood, the footprint of the scheme would be reduced as compared with the 2019 scheme. The potential benefits for the scheme from the change of gradient are greater here.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 4
7. Cowley junction		
7.1.	CCB and Highways England agree that due consideration will be given to the Roman settlement in this area, which is of significant cultural and historic value, and that should mean avoiding further harm.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 6
8. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake		
8.1.	Highways England acknowledges feedback received in response to public consultation, which has suggested the reduction, removal or relocation of the Barrow Wake car park. This change is outside the scope of the scheme and the car park is not owned as part of the strategic road network by Highways England. However, Highways England has offered the relevant stakeholders help to inform or facilitate any discussions about any changes that might be proposed to the Barrow Wake car park. Highways England will ensure the A417 scheme is able to accommodate the existing car park arrangement, or a future scenario where the car park is reduced or removed. CCB and Highways England have agreed to continue to engage on this matter as the discussions progress.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 6
9. Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users		
9.1.	CCB agrees with the potential benefits that the proposed re-purposing of the A417 could provide, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a new route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders • The proposed tree planting, native hedgerows and species-rich grassland • Enhanced tranquillity and air quality along this section of the High Wold and Cotswold escarpment 	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 14
9.2.	CCB agrees the scheme has the potential to significantly enhance access and recreational experiences. In particular, the principle of creating better linkages between the Cotswold Way National Trail and the Gloucestershire Way is welcomed and the repurposed A417 (the Air Balloon Way) will create more recreational opportunity.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 6
10. Other engineering design		
	No matters identified	

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
11. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)		
11.1.	CCB agrees that Alternative 2 for the A436 Link road performs better both economically and environmentally than Alternatives 1 and 3.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 7
11.2.	CCB agrees that Alternative 1 for the A436 Link Road would have significant adverse effects and it should not be brought back into consideration.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 12
11.3.	From a landscape perspective, CCB agrees an advantage of Alternative 2 for the A436 Link Road, compared to Alternative 1, is that it allows for a significant area along the top of the Cotswold escarpment, including adjacent to sections of the Cotswold Way National Trail, to become car free.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 12
12. Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
13. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
14. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
14.1.	CCB agrees with the methodology, including temporal scope.	March 2021 SoCG meeting
15. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)		
15.1.	CCB understands that HE does not have a statutory obligation to achieve biodiversity net gain (BNG) with the A417 road scheme, and agrees that Highways England has tried to avoid the unintended consequences of blindly applying the BNG metric, which would have potentially resulted in an undesirable outcome for landscape and biodiversity in this location.	Review of SoCG in March 2021
15.2.	CCB and Highways England agree to ongoing engagement throughout the detailed design stage, regarding the enhancement measures proposed as a result of the increased nitrogen deposition presence at Ullen Wood.	May 2021 SoCG meeting
16. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)		
16.1	CCB is happy that access to geological exposures is being explored.	Collaborative Planning session 4, 17/09/2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
17. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)		
17.1.	CCB agrees the need for some degree of cut-and-fill to achieve an alignment across undulating ground and that some surplus material can be useful in grading out embankments and screening the road.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 9
17.2.	CCB agrees that decreasing the amount of spoil by as much as one million cubic metres is another significant positive environment outcome, which would potentially avoid 50,000 lorry movements that would have been required to take the surplus material off site.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 5
18. Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)		
No matters identified.		
19. Brockworth bypass to Shab Hill junction (including A436 link)		
No matters identified.		
20. Shab Hill to Cowley junction (including Birdlip link road)		
20.1.	CCB agrees that some of the adverse effects of the scheme between Shab Hill junction and Cowley junction will be offset, to some degree, by the beneficial effects of closing and repurposing the existing A417 between the Air Balloon and Cowley junction.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 8

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) and Highways England are:

- The overall impact of the scheme on the Cotswolds AONB, and more broadly the environmental impact of the scheme and the outcome of the EIA, subject to review of the public DCO documents including the ES and Case for the Scheme. This includes whether they agree that the scheme fulfils the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), subject to review of the public DCO documents including ES and Case for the Scheme.
- The regard and consideration had of recommendations made by CCB relating to other design aspects of the scheme including junction location, vertical alignment and the link road designs.

5.2 Matters outstanding

5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters which remain under discussion by the parties. It sets out the latest position of each party in relation to each matter outstanding, and the latest date of that position.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between Cotswolds Conservation Board and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
	No matters identified.			
2. Consultation				
2.1.	Response to CCB's recommendations	CCB remains concerned overall at the relative lack of detailed evidence and reasoning as to why many of its previous recommendations (including those made prior to 2019) have not been taken forward. The CCB therefore wonders whether the recommendations have been given due consideration, or if so how much.	Highways England recognises CCB's recommendations. Highways England has engaged with CCB during the development of the scheme design, including consideration of the alternative proposal for the Birdlip link road prior to statutory consultation.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 2

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>However, in progressing the preferred route and Environmental Impact Assessment of the application design, Highways England has not carried out a detailed comparative assessment of all alternatives proposed by CCB as this would not be proportionate. Where appropriate, suggested alternatives have been carefully considered and discussed through focused meetings and presentations to explain why the design has been able to accommodate any changes or not to reflect the suggestions. For example, see section 11 of Table 4-1. Highways England will continue to engage with CCB on the matters raised regarding its recommendations as appropriate where they are relevant to the detailed design stage.</p>	
3. Landscape-led approach				
	No matters identified.			
4. Policy and legislation (AONB)				
	No matters identified.			
5. Crossings of the A417				
	No matters identified.			
6. Gradient change				
	No matters identified.			
7. Cowley junction				
	No matters identified.			
8. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake				
	No matters identified.			

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
9. Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users				
	No matters identified.			
10. Other engineering design				
10.1.	Significant adverse effect on AONB	CCB considers that the adverse effects on the sensitive High Wold landscape of the Cotswolds AONB could be further reduced through its recommendations relating to the Birdlip link road.	Prior to 2019 statutory consultation, through ongoing engagement with CCB, Highways England undertook an analysis of its recommendation for the Birdlip link road, which was shared iteratively with CCB. Highways England concluded that the alternative Birdlip link road did not improve on the scheme that was consulted on at the 2019 statutory consultation. Since the 2019 statutory consultation, Highways England has amended the design of the Birdlip link road to use more existing public highway and reduce the landscape impact of this element of the scheme. This is further set out in section 7.4 of the Consultation Report.	Consultation response 8/11/2019 Annex 1, page 8
11. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
12. Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
13. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
14. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
15. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
16. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
17. Material Assets and Waste (Chapter 10 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
18. Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
19. Brockworth bypass to Shab Hill junction (including A436 link)				
19.1.	Relocation of Shab Hill junction	<p>CCB recommends that Highways England considers relocating the proposed Shab Hill junction a few hundred metres further north than in the current proposal, at the southern end of the proposed cutting (i.e. in close proximity to the point where the Gloucestershire Way currently crosses the Birdlip Radio Station track).</p> <p>CCB considers that in this scenario, the A436, the roundabouts and the road connecting the roundabouts could potentially be largely at existing ground levels, with the A417 passing underneath in the cutting (and emerging not much above ground level at the dry valley where the Shab Hill junction is currently proposed)</p> <p>CCB considers this design option would significantly reduce visual and noise intrusion at Shab Hill Farm and Rushwood Kennels; noise pollution and visual impacts on the wider landscape; and adverse impacts on the head of the Upper Churn Valley. It would also allow for shallower gradients of the A417 and for the Gloucestershire Way to more closely follow its current route and provide a more pleasant walking experience on this route.</p>	<p>Concern about the elevated section of the proposed A417 in the vicinity of Shab Hill junction is noted. The proposed Shab Hill junction itself lies within a complex topographical area of the AONB, with undulating hillside. Geotechnical and engineering issues and solutions have governed the necessity for the proposed vertical alignment of the A417 mainline and junction configuration within this specific area.</p> <p>As designed in the scheme, Shab Hill junction would be located in a localised valley which would require filling, using excess excavated material won from other locations in the scheme. To mitigate the visual impact of this section of the route, landscape earthworks in the form of false cuttings would be provided. These landscape earthworks would act to provide visual screening and noise reduction.</p> <p>Moving the junction north, so that the junction is in cut, would lead to a significant increase in excavated volumes requiring</p>	<p>Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 3 and Annex 1, page 10</p>

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			disposal off site and would also increase cost considerably. The relocation would also require the demolition of two properties, Birdlip Radio Station and Rushwood Kennels. Depending on precise location, it could also affect the setting of Emma's Grove and Ullen Wood.	
19.2.	A436 link road	CCB recommends that Highways England gives further consideration to altering the alignment of the A436 link road to a lower contour line. This could help to reduce the gradient of the link road. This reduced gradient could reduce the need for a crawler lane, which, in turn, could further reduce the visual impact.	Lowering the alignment of the A436 link road, as proposed, would lead to a large increase in cutting depths and an associated increase in excavated volumes requiring disposal off site. This would also increase cost considerably. The relocation would have an adverse effect on the viability of Rushwood Kennels.	Consultation response 8/11/2019, page 3 and Annex 1, page 12
20. Shab Hill to Cowley junction (including Birdlip link road)				
	No matters identified.			

Appendices

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Cotswolds Conservation Board
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

B.1.1.1 There are some matters on which the position of CCB is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B-1.

B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with CCB during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by the CCB being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B-1 Matters to be determined between CCB and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Principle of Development				
A.1	Severance and land take	CCB questions whether the overall design and mitigation of the scheme addresses the extent of severance and land take within the context of a highly valued AONB.	Highways England has worked through collaborative planning sessions with CCB and other environmental groups to help share information and discuss opportunities for improvements, and has made design changes in response following the 2020 consultation. Please see the Statement of Reasons and Environmental Statement for more information.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 8
Landscape-led approach				
A.2	Interpretation of and ability to deliver a landscape-led scheme	CCB remains concerned regarding the landscape-led nature of the scheme, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England's interpretation of what 'landscape-led' means and the reflection of this in the agreed scheme vision How 'landscape-considered' is doing the minimum to comply with statutory obligations 	The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the Cotswolds AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 7

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		and would like to understand where budget and cost has impacted the 'perfect' landscape-led solution	integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features typical to the area, such as Cotswold stone walling, hedgerow, tree, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitat for rare and protected local wildlife. The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the scheme to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. Wider benefits of the scheme include improving access and recreational opportunities and improving access to cultural heritage sites. Please see the Case for the Scheme and Design Summary Report for more information.	
A.3	Landscape balance sheet	<p>CCB has requested that Highways England provide a 'balance sheet' showing the benefits and demonstrating how they substantially outweigh the impacts on the Cotswolds AONB. Particularly, it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly differentiate between the sensitivity of receptors and the magnitude of effect • Quantify the losses and gains in the length of dry stone walls (in the context of local distinctiveness) • Know and have identified the 'value added' aspects of the scheme in comparison to a traditional highways approach 	<p>Highways England will produce a Design Summary Report as part of the documentation to be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which will detail the design decisions made during the development of the A417 Missing Link scheme and how this compares with a 'traditional' highways scheme.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects follows DMRB LA 107 methodology to assess the likely landscape and visual effects of the scheme, and any gains to the baseline situation. It does include out a</p>	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 8

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			comparative assessment between different scenarios. The current roads form part of the baseline situation. The landscape section of the LVIA assesses likely effects on the landscape character of the area surrounding the scheme, including local distinctiveness and tranquillity, and on landscape features such as dry stone walls.	
Policy and legislation (AONB)				
A.4	Legislation and national policy	CCB is to determine whether it agrees with Highways England's assertion that the scheme fulfils the requirements of the NPSNN – including whether any detrimental effects have been moderated to the extent possible/reasonable.	Highways England considers that the scheme fulfils the requirements of the NPSNN, as a scheme which is of a high environmental standard and which includes measures to enhance the environment. The assessment of how the scheme complies with the NPSNN is provided in the Case for the Scheme.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 10
Crossings of the A417				
A.5	Detailed design	<p>CCB reserves comment on specific details of the proposed crossings until more information is available as part of the DCO application documents and through engagement as part of the detailed design stage. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the Gloucestershire Way crossing is in the best location for landscape connectivity (understanding that it's largely determined by assessing the optimal location for a statutory bat crossing) • The consideration to the design of the Cotswold Way crossing, with a particular focus on the view that it should be considered a gateway to the Cotswolds AONB 	Highways England remains committed to engaging with CCB during the detailed design stage of the scheme, to address the concerns and points raised.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 3

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Gradient change				
A.6	Change from current 10% to 8% gradient on Crickley Hill	<p>CCB reserves comment on specific details of the impact of the proposed change in gradient until relevant documentation is available as part of the DCO application. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The visual impact of the road itself and the gradient change in comparison to (a) the current road and (b) the 2019 road scheme The impacts of the gradient change more broadly, particularly to the west of the Air Balloon 	Taking into account feedback received to the 2020 public consultation, Highways England has identified in ES Chapter 7 and ES Chapter 11 where the changes made to the scheme design presented in the 2019 statutory consultation have resulted in changes to the landscape effects.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 5
The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake				
A.7	Impact of link road	<p>CCB reserves comment on the overall impacts of the realignment of the B4070 until the ES is available for review. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light and noise pollution Preference of the solution proposed in 2019 	Responding to the scheme's setting within the Cotswolds AONB, the scheme including Barrow Wake roundabout and approach roads would not be lit, to reduce the amount of light spillage to the Dark Skies area. In addition, the scheme design includes the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. A lower noise road surface is incorporated into the proposed scheme design. Stone walls are proposed along the road edge and Barrow Wake car park to reduce light pollution on the escarpment edge. The roundabout would also be situated in a localised cutting which would screen vehicle lights.	Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 6

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
10. Other engineering design				
A.8	Vertical alignment, scheme wide	CCB is not convinced that the proposed vertical alignment best meets landscape and other environmental considerations – especially when considered in relation to the Shab Hill junction and Cowley junction and whether minor roads and access should be aligned over or under the main carriageway.	<p>The proposed Shab Hill junction itself lies within a complex topographical area of the AONB, with undulating hillside. Geotechnical and engineering issues and solutions have governed the necessity for the proposed vertical alignment of the A417 mainline and junction configuration within this specific area. As designed in the scheme, Shab Hill junction would be located in a localised valley which would require filling, using excess excavated material won from other locations in the scheme. To mitigate the visual impact of this section of the route, landscape earthworks in the form of false cuttings would be provided. These landscape earthworks would act to provide visual screening and noise reduction. Moving the junction north, so that the junction is in cut, would lead to a significant increase in excavated volumes requiring disposal off site and would also increase cost considerably. The relocation would also require the demolition of two properties, Birdlip Radio Station and Rushwood Kennels.</p> <p>The vertical alignment of Cowley junction could be revised such that excavation in the vicinity of the Roman settlement was minimised; however, this would require an increase in height of the route over a considerable distance north of Cowley junction, requiring embankments likely in excess of 10m in height. This would result in an increase in likely significant adverse</p>	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 11

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>environmental impacts. The effect of the scheme on heritage assets is assessed and reported upon in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Highways England is proposing to undertake detailed archaeological excavation of the settlement prior to construction, to analyse the finds that are recovered from it, and then publish the results of the investigations. Discussions regarding mitigation are ongoing with Gloucestershire County Council and Historic England.</p>	
Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
A.9	Environmental Impact Assessment	CCB reserves comment on the EIA until the full Environmental Statement is available for review.		Consultation response 10/11/2020, page 8
Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
A.10	Impact on Cowley junction	CCB reserves comment on the proposed vertical alignment and layout for Cowley junction and its impact on the Roman settlement in the vicinity until this matter is determined with Historic England and Gloucestershire County Council.	<p>The vertical alignment could be revised such that excavation in the vicinity of the Roman settlement was minimised; however, this would require an increase in height of the route over a considerable distance north of Cowley junction, requiring embankments likely in excess of 10m in height. This would result in an increase in likely significant adverse environmental impacts. The effect of the scheme on heritage assets is assessed and reported upon in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Highways England is proposing to undertake detailed archaeological excavation of the settlement prior to construction, to analyse</p>	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 11

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			the finds that are recovered from it, and then publish the results of the investigations. Discussions regarding mitigation are ongoing with Gloucestershire County Council and Historic England.	
A.11	Approach to the EIA	<p>CGB reserves comment on the EIA until the Environmental Statement is available for review. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EIA should quantify the areas of potential loss of archaeology, including the loss of ploughzone archaeology due to soil handing requirements • The calculations for potential for improved physical preservation 	Impacts upon buried archaeological remains have been assessed and will be set out in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement. Mitigation measures, including the potential for preservation in situ, will be presented in the Outline Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 15
Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
A.12	Assessment and conclusions made in ES Chapter 7	<p>CGB reserves comment on Chapter 7 until the ES is available to review. However, matters raised with regards to this chapter include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visual impact of the proposed route from Brockworth bypass to Shab Hill junction, particularly between Cold Slad Lane and Shab Hill junction • A detailed topographical assessment applied to the whole route in order to determine the most appropriate landform • The need for a clear emphasis on changing uses and perceptions of the landscape 	<p>Highways England recognises the significance and sensitivity of the landscape. Highways England has taken a 'landscape-led' approach to the design of the A417 Missing Link scheme, in which the Cotswolds AONB landscape has been a primary consideration in every design decision made. This is set out and illustrated within the Design Summary Report, whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape is set out in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects of the Environmental Statement. These documents are submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has to include 'long-term commitments to aftercare, monitoring and maintenance activities', and the scheme that gets granted</p>	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 1

Ref.	Matter	Cotswolds Conservation Board position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			consent must be operated and maintained in accordance with that EMP. Any tree or shrub planted as part of the scheme that, within five years of planting, is removed or dies or is damaged, must be replaced.	
Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)				
A.13	Consideration of cumulative effects of the scheme on the Cotswolds AONB	<p>CCB reserves comment on Chapter 15 of the ES until it is available to review. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of cumulative effects of the scheme on the Cotswolds AONB – assessment on the different components but also the effects of the scheme in combination – particularly focused on the inter-relationship of human and natural factors, and on changing uses and perceptions of the landscape 	<p>An assessment of the cumulative effects of the scheme has been undertaken and will be reported in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement. It includes an assessment of the cumulative effects of the different components of the scheme itself and the cumulative effects of the scheme in combination with other developments. The following standards and guidance have been taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DMRB volume 11, section 2, LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring (section 3.19–3.22), which sets out a high-level methodology for assessing cumulative effects on highways projects; and Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17 cumulative effects assessment, which sets out a methodology, relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIP). 	Consultation response 8/11/2019, Annex 1, page 20/21

Appendix F Draft Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust

Table of contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3	Status of this SoCG	2
2	Consultation	3
2.1	Role of Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	3
2.2	Summary of consultation	3
3	Topics covered in this SoCG	12
4	Matters agreed	13
5	Matters outstanding	19
5.1	Principal matters outstanding	19
5.2	Matters Outstanding	20
Appendix A	Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B	Matters to be determined	ii
Appendix C	Landowner Position Statement with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	xiv

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Consultation with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1	Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG	12
Table 4-1	Matters agreed between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and Highways England	13
Table 5-1	Matters outstanding between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and Highways England	20
Table B-1	Matters to be determined between GWT and Highways England	iii

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (GWT) in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters which have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are those which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of GWT is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with GWT. Discussions will be aided by GWT being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).
- 1.1.5 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided during the examination.
- 1.1.6 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of GWT in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken with GWT since Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that the matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position, including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.
- 1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

¹Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

- 1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.
- 1.2.4 Appendix C includes the Landowner Position Statement with GWT.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.
- 1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.3.3 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust

- 2.1.1 GWT is the largest environmental charity solely focused on Gloucestershire. The Trust has a vision where each year there is more wildlife, more wild places and more people with a connection to the natural world. In delivering this vision, the Trust looks after 53 nature reserves, covering 1,052 hectares, and manages the county database of over 1,000 Local Wildlife Sites. The Trust's work is made possible by 40,000 active local supporters, including more than 27,500 members, representing five per cent of households in the county.
- 2.1.2 GWT owns two nature reserves that are wholly or partly within the DCO Boundary of the A417 Missing Link scheme. Crickley Hill is jointly managed and owned by the National Trust (NT) and GWT, whilst Barrow Wake is solely owned by GWT but managed in partnership with the NT. The two sites form a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), designated for its nationally important species-rich grassland, scrub and semi-natural woodland, with notable ancient trees.
- 2.1.3 This SoCG deals with issues that are relevant to GWT in its capacity as an affected landowner under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) and in its capacity as a local environmental organisation.

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with GWT during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 GWT has been a member of the Strategic Stakeholder Panel (SSP) and Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group. It has occasionally attended the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group (WCH TWG) when their availability and capacity has allowed. GWT has also been party to collaborative planning sessions; see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with GWT, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust since the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) in March 2019 is set out below, within Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
19 May 2019	Stakeholder meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative approach to ensure the scheme is the best it can be for wildlife • Working with NT and NE on a unified position around habitat impacts – a wider nature strategy for the area to be shared with Highways England • GWT offered to review habitat enhancement proposals to advise on design and delivery costing • The then proposed green bridge options and GWT's preference for option 3 • Enhancement at Fly-Up • Car park at lower Crickley Hill has an old quarry that could be used as a fill site for spoil and removal of car park to return to limestone grassland • MMSJV ecology survey technique – GWT considered the technique did not follow industry practice and therefore the data was not reliable • GWT raised concern on lack of terrestrial invertebrate baseline surveys • GWT requested that loss of Crickley Hill car parking income during the construction phase be compensated, otherwise this loss would severely undermine site management
18 June 2019	Joint Landscape Strategy meeting	Highways England, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust, National Trust, Natural England and Environment Agency	<p>Technical meeting matters discussed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to restore grassland areas • Opportunity to improve current low-grade arable land to mosaic of calcareous grassland scrub and hedgerow • Woodland creation opportunities • Tree species for planting • Recreation impacts • The potential for landmarks • Drainage solutions (SUDS)
30 July 2019	Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG member	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities mapping feedback • 2091 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report update • Landscape update – approach and sketch designs • Working group technical discussions • Overview of Statements of Common Ground

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
		organisations including GWT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the design process is deprioritising important ecological and biodiversity issues and opportunities in favour of aesthetics. Too much of a landscape architect-led approach • Invertebrate survey timings and approach • Evidence that biodiversity net gain can be delivered within the DCO Boundary for the scheme requested • Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) commissioned for impacts on European designated sites • GWT asked to be consulted on any work that redesigned the access and car park to Barrow Wake • GWT expressed concern on lack of hydrological data and an assessment of how this impacts biodiversity and the SSSIs
14 August 2019	Stakeholder meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWT vision of biodiversity net gain imperative and must be a commitment • Management of the land either side of the then proposed green bridge • The position of the then proposed green bridge • Ancient woodland • Veteran tree: • Landscape plan and landscape character • Nationally important species • GWT not being consulted on the redesigned access to and car park at Barrow Wake • Workshop feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Habitat creation – arable reversion – leave to re-wild ○ Drainage basins – wet basins not characteristic and unlikely to be achievable at north of the scheme ○ Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) /Masterplan ○ Species data – specialists (recorders) will upload their most recent biological records by December should HE require an update desk study.
20 August 2019	Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG Member	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Landscape update on design approach and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
		Organisations including GWT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working group technical discussions • Ecological survey • Sharing of Environmental Statement and final design
27 September 2019	Letter	Highways England, GWT	Highways England wrote to GWT to notify the Trust of the statutory consultation taking place between 27 September and 8 November 2019, in accordance with section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008. The letter invited the Trust to provide comments by 8 November 2019.
1 October 2019	Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and National Trust	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft proposed walking, cycling and horse riding routes • Consideration of anti-social behaviour in the environmental assessment • Bridleway on the green bridge • GWT recorded disappointment that proposals for WCH changes and enhancements had been developed without consulting landowners or ecology specialists. • Horse riding and cycling are not desired on GWT sites due to the impact on wildlife
4 November 2019	Formal response to statutory consultation	GWT to Highways England	GWT submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
13 January 2020	Letter	Highways England to GWT	Highways England sent a letter to GWT notifying them of the targeted landowner consultation, with a deadline to respond by 11 February 2020.
4 February 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General update • Connectivity at Shab Hill • Land bridge design • Progress on plans to deliver net gain • Progress on surveys of key threatened species using the landscape • Confirmation that DEFRA metric 2.0 will be used to calculate biodiversity net gain • GWT asked for plan showing how loss of irreplaceable habitats would be mitigated, but this was not available • Confirmation that bird exclusion netting will not be used on the scheme • GWT asked when Environmental Statement and final scheme design would be shared

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
10 February 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	GWT to Highways England	GWT submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
4 March 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWT disappointed to learn that stakeholders will not be consulted on a draft Environmental Statement or final design ahead of DCO submission • Biodiversity net gain – GWT concerned that stakeholders have not been consulted on this or provided with any information on how it will be achieved • Hydrological changes – Highways England confirmed that there are no predicted effects but need to provide GWT with more information • Ensuring that there are no significant Impacts on biodiversity sites • GWT asked how will key ecological connectivity be retained across the Shab Hill junction, no information provided • Habitat quantity, quality and functional invertebrate indicators could act as proxies for efficacy of ecological crossing points to be monitored if non-optimal solutions are selected • Concerns about loss of car-parking income at Crickley Hill during the construction phase • The location of the then proposed green bridge • GWT requested if ecological survey data can be shared ahead of DCO submission • GWT shared a copy of its draft Nature Recovery Network (NRN)
31 March 2020	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General update on programme and potential impacts from Covid-19 • Biodiversity net gain, connectivity and ecosystem functioning • Barrow Wake and roundabout changes • Loss of income at Crickley Hill
20 July 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England Strategic Stakeholder Panel member organisations, including GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on progress of the scheme • The change to the scheme's programme • The updated designs following consultation in 2019

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group	Highways England Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG members and Walking Cycling and Horse Riding TWG members	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update following delay to programme, setting out the key changes to the design and the amended timescales Invited questions from stakeholders during the session
17 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including GWT	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key concerns regarding the design changes that were being taken to supplementary consultation in October 2020
25 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including GWT	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public rights of way proposals Changes to Cowley junction Realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake Change in gradient
3 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including GWT	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme-wide connectivity, permeability and crossings strategy Maintaining and improving functionality of the crossings Cotswolds Way crossing Gloucestershire Way crossing Cowley and Stockwell overbridges
17 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including GWT	Highways England provided GWT and other environmental groups with a briefing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental masterplan Biodiversity net gain and ecological connectivity Archaeology
28 September 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including GWT	Highways England presented its strategy with regards to common land and the interface between this and impacts on the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSIs.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
29 September 2020	WCH TWG Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England WCH TWG members including GWT	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the draft SoCG document Process and timescales of updating the SoCG.
7 October 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England Strategic Stakeholder Panel member organisations, including GWT	Highways England provided an update to the SSP on the progress of the scheme including the upcoming supplementary statutory consultation.
13 Oct 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England GWT	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to GWT, in accordance with section 42(d) of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments by 12 November 2020.
28 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental collaborative planning organisations including GWT	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity net gain (BNG) and the DEFRA metric in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme The change by habitat area within the DCO Boundary The BNG calculation (using the current DEFRA metric, due to be updated in Dec 2020) The BNG metric why the scheme scores lower than expected given the biodiversity delivered Stakeholders ideas to improve on biodiversity gain GWT requested information on opportunities to contribute to BNG on land outside the DCO Boundary if stakeholders could leverage other funding GWT requested information on time-lag between loss of priority habitat and new habitat being established to adequate quality
11 Nov 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	GWT to Highways England	GWT submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
2 December 2020	Meeting	Highways England Strategic Stakeholder Panel member	Highways England and the SSP members discussed key concerns and issues regarding the proposed crossings for the scheme and identified if and how these concerns could be addressed. The priority issues raised by GWT were <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address SSSI severance with habitat bridge & stepping stones

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
		organisations, including GWT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a balance sheet for BNG, including opportunities to contribute to it in partnership outside of the DCO Boundary • Barrow Wake car park reversion to grassland to support BNG
11 December 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	Highways England Strategic Stakeholder Panel member organisations, including GWT	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of the scheme • Results from the recent consultation • A summary of the responses received • An update on next steps for the scheme <p>Highways England agreed to provide GWT with a framework plan to outline how biodiversity net gain could be achieved in the landscape and the barriers to this.</p>
14 December 2020	Letter	Highways England to environmental bodies, including GWT	Highways England wrote to the environmental stakeholders, including GWT, to outline a change in proposals following the crossings and integration strategy meeting which took place on 2 December 2020.
14 December 2020	Letter	GWT to Highways England	<p>GWT wrote to Highways England to confirm its full support for the proposed design changes outlined in Highways England's letter dated 14 December 2020.</p> <p>GWT reiterated its desire to see Highways England deliver biodiversity net gain in the landscape, which the design changes did not achieve. GWT also welcomed Highways England's commitment to an ongoing discussion around the reduction or removal of the Barrow Wake car park but queried why the proposed beneficial changes were outside of the scheme's scope when they were inside the DCO Boundary.</p>
8 February 2021	Letter	Highways England, GWT	Highways England sent a letter to GWT notifying the Trust as a landowner of additional targeted landowner consultation, with a deadline to respond by 9 March 2021.
20 January 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following priority outstanding matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity net gain – GWT requested an update on the framework plan for how BNG could be delivered • Barrow Wake car park restoration • Time lag between habitat loss/creation and remediation plans • Recreational impact of increased access to Crickley Hill • Construction impact on income and visitor experience at Crickley Hill • Design guarantees on connectivity and Gloucestershire Way crossing • Concerns over ecological value of design for repurposed A417 • Long-term monitoring and management plans

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensatory land and common land – GWT requested an update on where the land would be located, no updates having been received since 28/09/2020 • GWT had concerns that drafts of important documents were not being shared with stakeholders ahead of DCO submission. This limits the ability to identify and solve potential issues collaboratively ahead of DCO submission
18 March 2021	Statement of Common Ground meeting	Highways England, GWT	<p>The following priority outstanding matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity net gain – GWT was disappointed that a framework plan for how BNG could be delivered had still not been shared. • Time lag between habitat loss/creation and remediation plans • Recreational impact of increased access to Crickley Hill • Construction impact on income and visitor experience at Crickley Hill • Design guarantees on connectivity and Gloucestershire Way crossing • Concerns over ecological value of design for repurposed A417 • Long-term monitoring and management plans • Compensatory land and common land – GWT requested an update on where the land would be located, no updates having been received since 28/09/2020 • GWT had concerns that drafts of important documents were not being shared with stakeholders ahead of DCO submission. GWT expressed that this limits the ability to identify and solve potential issues collaboratively ahead of DCO submission

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Project Description
	3.	Consultation
Relevant ES Chapter	4.	Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)
	5.	Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Chapter 4 of the ES)
	6.	Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)
	7.	Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)
	8.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	9.	Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)
	10.	Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)
	11.	Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)
	12.	Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)
	13.	Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)
	14.	Consideration of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)
Other topics	15.	Environmental Management Plan
	16.	Crossings of the A417
	17.	Gradient change
	18.	Cowley junction
	19.	The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake
	20.	Common Land
	21.	Improvement for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matter's reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1	GWT agrees that the A417 Missing Link scheme is needed to improve road safety and should deliver benefits for journey times and reduce congestion. GWT wants to see a solution for the road scheme delivered within the Government's post-2020 Road Investment Strategy period.	04/11/2019 consultation response
1.2	GWT agrees Option 30 is the preferred surface route and is keen to work with Highways England to ensure the scheme protects the existing biodiversity sites and delivers biodiversity net gain through locally relevant enhancements for wildlife.	19/05/2019 Stakeholder meeting
2. Project Description		
2.1	Highways England commits to fulfilling the legal commitments as secured in the Development Consent Order (DCO), including environmental mitigation, within the cost allocation for the scheme as committed to in the second Road Investment Strategy.	Discussed in 04/03/2020 SoCG meeting
3. Consultation		
3.1	GWT agrees that proactive engagement has taken place with Highways England to date, both through the Strategic Stakeholder Panel and Technical Working Groups, as well as collaborative planning sessions. The approach to data has been professional and open to contributions from environmental stakeholders. The Trust hopes to see these discussions better reflected in scheme designs before the Development Consent Order application is submitted.	04/11/2019 consultation response
3.2	Both parties agree to the use of environmental stakeholders that have access to the best local ecological expertise to help co-design ecological solutions, including the continued engagement between Highways England and a Landscape and Ecology Technical Working Group during construction.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)		
4.1	GWT agrees that alternative 1 is not acceptable as it takes away one of the biggest opportunities for ecological restoration by creating limestone grassland habitat adjacent to Barrow Wake. Alternative 1 was discarded.	Discussed in 04/03/2020 SoCG meeting
4.2	GWT agrees alternative 2 is preferred because it avoids the damage to the SSSI and Local Wildlife Site (LWS) that would be caused by the other options. It also provides the best potential for relevant biodiversity net gain and reduced nitrogen deposition on the SSSI that could be realised by decommissioning the existing A417 between Barrow Wake and the A436 junction.	Discussed in 04/03/2020 SoCG meeting
4.3	GWT agrees alternative 3 is not acceptable because it could fragment the Ullen Wood LWS, potentially impacting bats and dormice. Alternative 3 has been discarded.	04/11/2019 consultation response
5. Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Chapter 4 of the ES)		
5.1	Both parties agree that local ecological data and knowledge must be sought to inform the scheme design, particularly in relation to invertebrates, tuffaceous vegetation, bats and fungi.	Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting
5.3	GWT confirms that it has reviewed the updated guidance (2016 CIEEM Guidelines Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal, 2nd edition of the new DMRB standards LA108 and LA118 which supersede IAN 130/10, and are more in line with the latest CIEEM's EclA guidelines) and accept this approach.	Discussed on 31/03/2020
5.4	Both parties agree a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be undertaken. Highways England confirms that the Stage 1 HRA screening was revisited and updated to reflect the latest scheme design, and also confirms that recreational pressure on the SAC is being taken into account as requested.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
5.5	GWT requests information on what action would be taken if it is not possible to provide compensatory badger setts within 250 metres without this being compromised by proximity to roads. HE confirmed that this will be covered in the ES. The artificial badger sett is within 250m of the main sett, as is the [REDACTED] culvert.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
5.6	Highways England agrees that landowner agreements will be in place before construction commences and translocation would largely take place in the summer 2023.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
6. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
7. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)		
8.1	GWT agrees that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project policy does not require Highways England to achieve biodiversity net gain. Highways England has worked collaboratively with GWT and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA biodiversity metric 2.0 tool and has agreed to focus on providing priority habitats that align with needs identified by the Nature Recovery Network, as part of this scheme.	Agreed in March 2021 SoCG meeting
8.2	GWT welcomes recognition of the important impact of habitat severance and the commitment to mitigate impacts, particularly by reconnecting the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI via a green bridge with at least a 25-metre width of calcareous grassland habitat.	Letter to HE 14/12/2020
8.3	GWT welcomes measures to reduce the risk of damage to the Ullen Wood Local Wildlife Site. If work in this area can be programmed to avoid the later spring flowering period that would be preferable.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 14
8.4	GWT supports the approach and commitment to not using exclusion netting to avoid conflicts with nesting birds.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 15
8.5	GWT welcomes the principle of selecting species based on native local provenance, but with consideration of their resilience to climate change and disease. GWT also supports some use of non-native trees, if evidence indicates that this is the only way of ensuring that created woodland habitat will reach maturity in the context of climate change.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 15
8.6	GWT is satisfied with the mitigation measures proposed for bats, subject to Natural England licences being obtained. If it is possible to stagger the loss of roosts so they don't all occur in the same year that would be preferable.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 15
8.7	GWT welcomes the additional mitigation measures for notable invertebrates.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 15
8.8	GWT welcomes the commitment to removing barriers and re-naturalizing watercourses.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 15
8.9	GWT welcomes steps that have been taken to protect the Ullen Wood Local Wildlife Site from damage and accepts that some pruning may be required.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 18
8.10	GWT welcomes the net gain of species-rich hedgerows.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 18

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
8.11	GWT welcomes the commitment to deliver a net gain of calcareous and neutral grassland and the measures proposed to ensure this retains local genetic diversity. This process can take a long time and has mixed success rates, so the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) should include monitoring and compensatory measures in the event that it fails.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 18
8.12	GWT is pleased that the legal obligations regarding impact on badgers have been addressed. As this is not a species of conservation concern it is not the best use of any funding available for enhancements, which should be directed towards priority habitats and ecological networks.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 19
8.13	Both parties agree the approach to mitigation at Emma's Grove (in that it will be treated as a priority habitat – lowland mixed deciduous woodland) is included in net gain calculations.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
8.14	GWT agrees with the proposed wildlife crossing points that have been designed to include minimum three-metre-wide grass verges on both and one side on either both or one side in order to maintain habitat connectivity across the new road for many species. A culvert designed for badgers has been located [REDACTED] and south of the [REDACTED] to mitigate fragmentation of known badger territories.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
8.15	GWT is pleased to hear there will be 'front loaded' habitat creation prior to construction i.e. translocation and habitat creation by the Birdlip quarry. The programme involves nine months of environmental works prior to construction start. Highways England agrees there is a strong driver for habitat creation in terms of landscape and noise reduction.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
8.16	GWT states that measures to avoid and mitigate impacts on bats must account for temporary lighting during construction. Lighting should be avoided around any roost sites and key foraging routes. Highways England agrees that construction stage lighting details will be provided within the LEMP which forms Annex D of Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The use of construction stage lighting will be minimised and reviewed on a constant basis by the appointed Ecological clerk of Works and project ecologist to ensure that it does not impact on bat roost sites and key foraging and commuting routes.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
8.17	GWT and Highways England agree that bird exclusion netting should not be used at any time for this scheme. All tree and hedgerow management will be detailed within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) which forms Annex D of Appendix 2.1 EMP.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
8.18	GWT welcomes that Highways England is looking at further enhancement opportunities to maximise biodiversity delivery within habitats associated with the scheme around Birdlip Quarry.	04/11/2019 consultation response
9. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
10. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
11. Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
12. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)		
12.1	GWT and Highways England agree that the impact of air pollution, including airborne particulates, NOx and heavy metals on both vegetation and invertebrate communities is sufficiently assessed and a costed mitigation and an avoidance plan should be produced. The EMP and Air Quality Management Plan is designed to mitigate the impacts of dust generated by the construction of the scheme.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
13. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
14. Consideration of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
15. Environmental Management Plan		
	No matters identified.	
16. Crossings of the A417		
16.1	Cotswold Way crossing – GWT agrees the need for a safer pedestrian crossing in this location.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 4
16.2	Gloucestershire Way crossing – GWT is supportive of a wildlife crossing in the Shab Hill area because evidence from the ecological surveys and the Nature Recovery Network indicates that this is required to provide connectivity for habitats and protected species.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 4
16.3	GWT is satisfied that the current Gloucestershire Way crossing design meets the legal obligations to mitigate the impact of the road scheme on protected species.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 4
16.4	GWT agrees with the provision of the Gloucestershire Way crossing to incorporate a 25m width of calcareous grassland habitat to help address fragmentation of the SSSI, in addition to its required functions for species connectivity, landscape integration and diversion of the Gloucestershire Way. GWT welcomes and fully support this design change which, in addition to the 25m of calcareous grassland habitat, also includes two 3m width hedgerows, a 3.5m bridleway and a 1.5m maintenance strip.	Page 1 of GWT position statement response, 18 December 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
16.5	GWT agrees with the removal of the original green bridge from the scheme designs.	Agreed in January 2021 SoCG #4 meeting
17. Gradient change		
17.1	GWT welcomes the environmental benefits this provides.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
18. Cowley junction		
18.1	GWT has no objections to the changes proposed at Cowley junction.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
19. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake		
19.1	GWT understands and shares the desire of local communities to tackle anti-social behaviour issues near Barrow Wake.	2020 consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
20. Common Land		
20.1	GWT is supportive of the proposals.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
21. Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users		
21.1	GWT supports the principle of increasing the equity of people's access to nature, but this support does not cover all proposals made by the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (GWT) and Highways England are:

- a) GWT is concerned that the scheme vision, design principles and sub-objectives do not explicitly commit to Biodiversity Net Gain. Also:
 - GWT express that it is crucial that the scheme does not cause further degradation or fragmentation.
 - The information provided in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (2020) indicates that the scheme as it stands is likely to deliver net biodiversity loss (when applying the DEFRA biodiversity metric 2.0 tool).
 - Whilst GWT accepts that nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs) do not require BNG, they are concerned that this does not adhere with Government policy and principles in the 25 Year Environment Plan and Environment Bill, or the recommendations of the Glover review.
 - GWT feels that it is unacceptable for an NSIP within a National Landscape is to result in biodiversity net loss. GWT is disappointed that despite repeated requests, strategic stakeholders have not been provided with a plan or the chance to co-develop options to avoid this as part of the DCO application documents.
- b) GWT disagrees with the conclusion that the café and parking business at Crickley Hill will not experience a significant adverse effect by the construction period.
- c) GWT considers that there will be an adverse impact on the ecological features of the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI because of increased recreational pressure during the operation of the scheme and its improved PRow network.
 - There is particular concern about improved access for cyclists and horse riders via the Cotswold Way bridge and the lack of monitoring or remediation plans if Highways England's assumptions are incorrect.
- d) GWT is disappointed that drafts of some key documents relating to ecological issues have not been shared with strategic stakeholders ahead of DCO submission. They express that this is a missed opportunity to collaboratively identify and solve potential issues ahead of examination. It also means that several matters remain outstanding or to be determined due to the lack of design assurance. Key concerns are:
 - The content of the published Environmental Statement subject to review of finalised assessments and conclusions;
 - Design for connectivity between the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI parcels via the Gloucestershire Way crossing;
 - Previous ecologically poor design of the A417 Air Balloon Way;
 - The location of compensatory land;
 - The EMP and LEMP; and

- Lack of remediation plans if habitat creation or translocation fails.
- e) GWT is concerned that no information has been provided about the time lag between habitat loss and the establishment of new habitat of equivalent quality. Information is also required on what area of priority habitat will become more fragmented and fall beneath minimum viable areas, either permanently or temporarily, because of the scheme. This is important to assess the level of extinction risk for threatened species that require priority habitats and, therefore, the suitability of the design, EMP and LEMP.
- f) It is imperative that the scheme demonstrates that it is truly landscape-led, repairing historic damage to wildlife habitats and improving ecological networks, rather than just minimising further damage.

5.2 Matters Outstanding

5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters that are outstanding between the parties, including that matter's reference number, and the date of the latest position.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
	No matters identified.			
2. Project Description				
2.1	Landscape-led vision	GWT disagrees with Highways England's objective to achieve a landscape-led vision without there being an explicit commitment to delivering biodiversity net gain (BNG).	<p>The vision for the scheme was created in partnership with environmental and strategic stakeholders, including GWT, in 2017.</p> <p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These new and improved habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity, in line with the nature recovery network strategy for the area.</p> <p>Whilst achieving BNG is not a requirement of NSIPs, Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the</p>	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 7

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA biodiversity metric 2.0 tool and has agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme. Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.	
3. Consultation				
	No matters identified.			
4. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
5. Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
5.1.	Use of policy and guidance	GWT disagrees with Highways England's approach to EIA in that it considers that the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) and the DMRB assessment methodology is being used as a back stop to justify excluding enhancements that would help deliver a landscape-led road scheme, including the ability to deliver a better and more up-to-date methodology that incorporates ecological networks (including the NRN). To assist in resolving this matter, GWT has requested a more specific breakdown of where the policies have been taken into account, with examples. There is concern that climate change	The NPSNN is the primary planning document against which the scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the scheme against the requirements of the NPSNN is set out in the Case for the Scheme submitted with the DCO application, which also includes an assessment of the scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy. Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available, and a range of enhancements have been included along the scheme. For instance, the design focusses on provision of priority habitats that are present within the Cotswold AONB. NE and GWT's vision for the scheme was	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 3

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		adaptation and biodiversity have not been well considered.	<p>to increase the area of lowland calcareous grassland. The current area of unimproved and semi-improved calcareous grassland within the DCO Boundary is approximately 4.5ha. A total of 75.16ha would be created following construction of the scheme. Whilst some of this area would be to compensate for the loss of SSSI calcareous grassland and mitigate the impacts of further fragmentation of SSSI habitat or loss of foraging habitat, the very large increase in calcareous grassland area exceeds that created for mitigation and is considered an enhancement.</p> <p>Furthermore, a 25m wide corridor of calcareous grassland will be provided across the Gloucestershire Way crossing, providing a continuous habitat link for calcareous grassland flora and fauna to disperse through the landscape. This is an enhancement in comparison to the existing A417 which has no such provision.</p>	
5.2.	Design conflicts across environment features and benefits	<p>GWT discourages a design approach that overlooks potential high value ecological enhancements due to the impact on landscape character, when changes to farming systems are likely to drive a change in landscape appearance anyway.</p> <p>GWT feels there needs to be a mechanism to resolve design conflicts between different environmental features and benefits e.g. biodiversity, access and landscape character.</p>	<p>There is no mechanism in the ES to detail this; however, all disciplines have been working closely together to provide a design as a joint approach.</p> <p>Landscape planting has been designed to provide ecological mitigation where required as well as delivering a design in context with the local landscape character.</p>	<p>04/11/2019 consultation response</p> <p>Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting</p>
5.8	Impact on Nature Recovery Network	GWT disagrees with the approach taken in that an assessment should have been undertaken of the scheme's impact on the Nature Recovery Network.	The impact assessment has followed new DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) standard LA 108 Biodiversity which supersedes standards used previously, and which aligns more with the latest CIEEM's EclA guidelines. Landscape design within the Environmental	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 18

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		GWT asks if the significance of the impact of habitat loss accounts for the impact on the Nature Recovery Network connectivity and resilience. It is important to take an oversight of the cumulative and landscape-scale impact of the losses rather than dealing with them individually. GWT feels that the some of the losses would have a moderate to large adverse impact in this landscape in the context of a wider ecological network view.	masterplan has considered the draft Nature Recovery Network Map provided by Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust in 2020. The significant of the impact of habitat loss takes into overall biodiversity resource and effects on integrity of the resource as per Table 3.11 of LA108. Whilst a quantitative assessment has not been undertaken, the ES has considered alignment to the Nature Recovery Network.	
5.9	Impact on terrestrial invertebrates	GWT strongly disagrees that the impact on terrestrial invertebrates is slight and not significant. The Trust's view is that the impact is moderate and significant due to the increased fragmentation of the core grassland ecological network, particularly between Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake. The importance of these sites for invertebrates is demonstrated by report <i>A417 Missing Link, Birdlip –Invertebrate Survey (Ecosia 2020)</i> . At present, Crickley Hill is one of only two known sites in Gloucestershire for the Wildlife & Countryside Act (WCA) Schedule 5 listed Pearl Bordered Fritillary butterfly and the population appears to be very small. This impact has not been mitigated at present by the scheme designs.	Impacts of fragmentation to terrestrial invertebrates have been assessed within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity. Impacts to terrestrial invertebrates within the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI have been assessed within the designated sites section (8.10.23) relating to habitat fragmentation. Due to the mitigation to be provided in the form of habitat stepping-stones the impact is assessed as negligible. However, the residual effect of all construction impacts associated with the scheme on the SSSI is considered to be moderate adverse and significant. Invertebrates within the rest of the scheme are assessed separately and the assessment remains slight and not significant.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 19
5.10	Terrestrial invertebrates (including Roman snails)	GWT disagrees with the conclusion on the impact on terrestrial invertebrates. Peer-reviewed scientific papers demonstrate the impact that road mortality can have on invertebrate populations and the impact of the fragmentation of the core grassland component of the Nature Recovery Network has not been addressed.	The impact assessment for invertebrates has been updated within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity as above.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 20

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
6. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
7. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
8.1.	Biodiversity net gain	<p>GWT considers that the scheme must deliver biodiversity net gain, with particular regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning with the Nature Recovery Network Fulfilling the requirements of the NPSNN to 'avoid significant harm to biodiversity interests' and 'take advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity' Loss of irreplaceable habitat must be avoided at all costs <p>As part of this, GWT considers a clear commitment from Highways England for the scheme to deliver measurable net biodiversity gain essential.</p> <p>At present, GWT objects to the proposal for biodiversity net gain to mainly be delivered through improvements in habitat quality and considers it unacceptable as it does not address the primary issue caused by the road, which is fragmentation of priority habitat and habitat loss.</p>	<p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These new and improved habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity, in line with the nature recovery network strategy for the area.</p> <p>Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA biodiversity metric 2.0 tool and has agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme. Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.</p> <p>The location and design of habitats has considered the draft Nature Recovery Network Map provided by Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust in 2020 and habitats required for specific</p>	<p>Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 2</p> <p>Discussed at SoCG meeting, 20/01/2021</p> <p>Discussed at SoCG meeting, 18/03/2021</p>

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>ecological mitigation as described within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity.</p> <p>Taking into account feedback received to the 2020 public consultation and consideration of the NRN in the wider context, Highways England has implemented a series of calcareous grassland 'stepping stones' either side of the Gloucestershire Way crossing to provide improved landscape and ecological connectivity between Barrow Wake and Crickley Hill including the SSSI.</p>	
8.2.	Crickley Hill	<p>GWT disagrees with the conclusion that there will be no likely significant effects on Crickley Hill as a result of increased recreational pressure during the operation of the scheme and its improved PRow network. There are particular concerns about increased access for horse riders and cyclists to Crickley Hill via the Cotswold Way crossing.</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential impact of new and diverted public rights of way and recreational pressures from walkers cyclists and horse riders on the SSSI during operation is assessed within Chapter 8 Biodiversity and concludes a minor adverse impact upon Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI which is slight and not significant. Highways England has carefully considered a request for monitoring of recreational activity on Crickley Hill Country Park and the SSSI before, during and/or post construction but does not consider this to be appropriate given the conclusions of the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (slight adverse and not significant).</p>	04/11/2019 consultation response
8.3.	Crickley Hill	<p>GWT is concerned that there could be an adverse impact on the open space and human health determinant during the construction phase through impacts to users at Crickley Hill.</p> <p>Displacing people to other open access natural sites will move pressure to areas such as the Cotswold Beech woodlands SAC which is already under threat from considerable visitor</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential impact of new and diverted public rights of way and recreational pressures on the SAC is provided within the ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations Assessment, which concludes no likely significant effects.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health considers the potential effects on the Country Park with visitor centre, café and waymarked</p>	04/11/2019 consultation response

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		pressure and would have implications for an HRA or the SSSI at Leckhampton Hill.	trails. The assessment concludes there would be a minor impact, with a discernible change in attributes and environmental quality during construction activities in close proximity, with minor loss of and alteration to key characteristics. Construction requires acquisition of some land which would not compromise the overall viability of the resource, and access to the resource would be maintained at all times.	
9. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
10. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
10.1.	Impact on Crickley Hill during construction	GWT disagrees with the assessment conclusion of a neutral impact on the Crickley Hill business model, especially during construction.	Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Population and Human Health considers the potential effects on the Country Park with visitor centre, café and waymarked trails. The assessment concludes there would be a minor impact, with a discernible change in attributes and environmental quality during construction activities in close proximity, with minor loss of and alteration to key characteristics. Construction requires acquisition of some land which would not compromise the overall viability of the resource, and access to the resource would be maintained at all times. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan Annex B (Document Reference 6.4)) identifies appropriate mitigation and phasing to help reduce adverse effects at Crickley Hill. For example, access to the facilities would be retained at all times. Highways England is committed to continuing to engage with all landowners and others	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 20 Discussed at SoCG meeting, 20/01/2021

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>affected to help identify and mitigate any potential adverse effects.</p> <p>Highways England has carefully considered a request for monitoring of recreational activity on Crickley Hill Country Park and the SSSI before, during and/or post construction but does not consider this to be appropriate given the conclusions of the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (slight adverse and not significant).</p>	
11. Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
12. Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
13. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
14. Consideration of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
15. Environmental Management Plan				
	No matters identified.			
16. Crossings of the A417				
	No matters identified.			
17. Gradient change				
	No matters identified.			
18. Cowley junction				
	No matters identified.			
19. The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake				

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
19.1	Impact on SSSI	GWT objects to the current proposal as it results in a net loss of area of the SSSI and priority habitat.	A small area of roadside trees at the current junction would be unavoidably lost due to the construction of the roundabout. Many of these trees are ash trees. Any SSSI land lost will be compensated for with replacement habitat. Although trees are lost, in agreement with GWT, replacement habitat will be calcareous grassland. This will be provided in the same area as the replacement common land adjacent to the existing SSSI and on land which is currently the A417.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
20. Common Land				
20.1	Habitat loss	GWT disagrees with the design to compensate loss of natural habitat within the SSSI until it can be assured about the location, scale and suitability of replacement common land and its relationship with SSSI compensatory habitat. The implications of this for the access routes is unclear and requires further clarification.	The area of land provided as compensation for loss of SSSI area is within the same area to provide replacement common land, located to the east of the Barrow Wake unit of the SSSI. The Air Balloon Way WCH route has been aligned adjacent but separate to the replacement land.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5
21. Improvement for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users				
21.1	Ecological connectivity of the Air Balloon Way	GWT disagrees with the preliminary design of the proposed Air Balloon Way as it does not provide meaningful ecological connectivity.	The Air Balloon Way will be 5m wide as part of the repurposed A417. This width is in accordance with the design guidance for the different users proposed. Highways England is committed to ongoing engagement throughout the detailed design stage to discuss and agree matters including maintenance, aesthetics, surfacing and enclosures etc. The remainder of the repurposed A417 will provide replacement common land and landscaping to help provide ecological connectivity and landscape integration.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 6

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of GWT is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table 5-2.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with GWT during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by GWT being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B-1 Matters to be determined between GWT and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Project Description				
A.1	Project timetable	<p>GWT has expressed concern over whether survey works will be completed in time for the DCO submission. GWT considers that flexibility must be given for the following points, and will provide an updated position once the ES is available to review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme to adapt to baseline information that becomes available after submission Adhere to enhanced environmental legislation and standards outlined in the Environment Act which should be in force before construction begins 	<p>The ES has been written using baseline information provided at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Update surveys for the purpose of protected species licence applications, along with pre-construction surveys, will be carried out as stated in the REAC table and LEMP.</p>	GWT 01/21 – can be moved to matters agreed once ES is available for review
Consultation				
A.2	Compensatory plan	<p>GWT has requested a compensatory plan to be developed and agreed with environmental stakeholders ahead of the DCO submission. In this, GWT requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details on how to address the loss of irreplaceable habitats, and Highways England to enable stakeholders to properly assess what it is proposing to deliver <p>GWT reserves comment until it has received evidence on where translocation has been achieved elsewhere in order to give a likelihood of success.</p>	<p>Highways England is following the mitigation hierarchy to avoid the loss of irreplaceable habitat such as ancient woodland and reduce the loss of veteran trees. There is unavoidable loss of three veteran trees for which there will be compensatory planting. The veteran tree at air balloon will now be retained.</p> <p>Method statements for reinstatement or translocation of grassland or hedgerows and hazel coppice will be developed at detailed design.</p>	<p>04/11/2019 consultation response</p> <p>Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting</p>

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
A.3	Alternative 2 for the A436 Link road	GWT has requested more information on what measures are being taken to mitigate the impact on the core ecological network in this location	Alternative 2 for the A436 Link road was the option taken forward for the preferred scheme. Impacts are addressed in ES Chapter 8.	04/11/2019 consultation response
A.4	Repurposed route from Birdlip to the Golden Hart	In its 2019 consultation response GWT asked for evidence of demand for the Air Balloon Way because it is a significant investment of scheme funds and provides very limited ecological benefits. This case for support and benefits generated has still not been provided.	<p>The economic case for the scheme, including the benefit to cost ration is summarised in the Case for the Scheme.</p> <p>The repurposed A417 between Birdlip and the Golden Heart forms part of the wider WCH strategy and links to the Cotswold Way, Barrow Wake car park, Emma's Grove and the Gloucestershire Way and thus is an important part of the WCH strategy of the scheme.</p> <p>It addresses existing barriers to movements by non-motorised users as part of the proposed wider enhancements to the PRow network, and provides a safe WCH route between key destinations including the Country Park, Birdlip and the Golden Heart Inn.</p> <p>As part of the repurposing, planting and landscaping will complement the WCH route, to help provide benefits for wildlife and landscape as well as people.</p> <p>The opportunity to repurpose the existing A417 has been supported by many stakeholders as set out in the Consultation Report.</p>	<p>04/11/2019 consultation response</p> <p>HE position as of 31/03/2020</p> <p>Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 13</p>
A.5	The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake	There is insufficient information regarding the impact of this decision on the SSSI, particularly as the roundabout would sit within the SSSI boundaries. GWT feels it is inappropriate to have included this change in the master plan before fully assessing the ecological impacts. It	The impact of the realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake will be detailed in Chapter 8 Biodiversity and Chapter 12 Population and Human Health of the ES.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 12

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		must not be included in the DCO submission documents unless an EIA has ruled out any significant negative impacts and it can be assured that there will be no net loss of SSSI area or condition.		
Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
A.6	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 4	<p>GWT reserves comment on Chapter 4 of the ES until it is available for review. Matters raised in relation to what is included in the assessment to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of habitat loss due to disturbance during construction and operation, through increased traffic and visitor pressure • Details on how conflicts between different environmental features and benefits will be resolved during detailed design • Detail on the significant area of high-quality grassland to be lost and how it affects the minimum viable areas and likelihood of species extinction • Clearly demonstrate where biodiversity net gain is going to be achieved and the methodologies to monitor it • Must assess the detrimental impacts on ecosystem functioning • An impact assessment for red data book fungi, including a site occupancy baseline • Detail on the impact of the loss of sections of important hedgerow on ecological connectivity. Outline how the loss of priority habitat within the SSSI will be managed • More detail on the baseline evidence and mitigation and enhancement measures 	<p>Information on these matters is included in Chapter 8 Biodiversity with the following exceptions;</p> <p>Whilst areas of habitat lost and gained are stated in terms of hectares or length of linear habitats, information on biodiversity net gain and the Defra metric is not included within the ES.</p> <p>Ecosystem function is considered as part of the assessment on integrity of the key characteristics of the resource in line with DMRB LA108.</p> <p>The species richness of the fungi recorded at Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI underline the biodiversity value of the habitats within the SSSI which is valued of national importance and assessed as such as part of the designated habitat.</p> <p>The wider trophic impact of mortality on invertebrates and fish has not been assessed. Fish translocation will be carried out based on pre-construction surveys and impacts are assessed as negligible.</p>	04/11/2019 and 11/11/20 consultation response

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the cumulative impacts of different actions on nationally threatened species • The evenness of impacts across generalist and specialist species • The wider trophic impact of direct mortality on invertebrates and fish • How the populations of specialised macroinvertebrate communities will be protected by creation of new outflows • Baselines for fungi, lichens and bryophytes • Impact on tufa habitat mitigation • What measures will be taken to ensure that populations of less mobile species do not go locally extinct during the interim period between loss and replacement of functional habitat • Whether the loss of priority woodland habitat can be reduced without impacting other ecological outcomes • More information to demonstrate that ground-nesting farmland birds will not be negatively affected by woodland planting and translocation of hedgerows • Barn owl migration routes to foraging habitat, specifically from the nesting site at Stockwell Farm • The evidence as to how the loss of calcareous grassland habitat affects the integrity of the SSSI • More information to demonstrate if loss of open habitat will have an adverse impact on any of the red and amber listed bird species 	<p>A clear and transparent process about how stakeholders including GWT will be engaged throughout detailed design will be shared with those stakeholders in due course, further to commitments from Highways England to work collaboratively where appropriate with stakeholders to help inform future detailed design and construction phases.</p>	

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information is needed on the conservation value of the macroinvertebrate communities 		
A.9	Fragmentation of the SSSI	GWT considers that, until it has reviewed the published DCO application documents, it cannot be satisfied that the scheme would not avoid or reduce the impact of habitat fragmentation across the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI, which is a key connection for the Nature Recovery Network, and if it continues unmitigated it will cause significant permanent damage to nature's recovery in Gloucestershire. This is the most significant habitat fragmentation impact that results from the scheme.	Highways England has introduced calcareous grassland habitat stepping stones in meadows either side of the Gloucestershire Way crossing and on the crossing itself to improve calcareous grassland connectivity for flora and fauna species, particularly invertebrates. Planting designs have been amended to extend calcareous grassland around the eastern and southern margins of Emma's Grove and woodland planting between Emma's Grove and Barrow Wake has been reduced to allow better connectivity of grassland habitat to the northern end of Barrow Wake.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 14 GWT 01/21– remains unsolved until design changes can be seen in DCO documents
A.10	Assessment of changes to farm subsidies	GWT requires further clarity on the consideration had on the impacts of changes to farm subsidy systems as the UK leaves the EU.	There is no mechanism in the ES to detail this; however, all disciplines have been working closely together to provide a design as a joint approach. Landscape planting has been designed to provide ecological mitigation where required as well as delivering a design in context with the local landscape character.	04/11/2019 consultation response Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting
A.11	Environmental assessment data sources	GWT states that environmental assessment data sources should include an assessment against the National Priority Habitat Inventory with a 2km buffer.	Chapter 8 of the ES states that 'The desk study identified five HPI within the study area. These are lowland mixed deciduous woodland, lowland calcareous grassland, lowland meadow all of which occur within the DCO Boundary. Traditional orchard and wood pasture and parkland are also present within 1.2 miles (2 kilometres) of the scheme'.	04/11/2019 consultation response

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.12	Assessment methodology	There is relatively little cross-referencing of themes between some chapters and in stakeholder consultations, which does not reflect the intricate interdependencies between different environmental considerations. GWT would like to see a more integrated approach to evidence, decision making and design	This information will be presented in the Design Summary Report, available as part of the DCO submission.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 3
A.13	Monitoring	<p>GWT has stated that the Environmental Statement and scheme design must clearly demonstrate where biodiversity net gain is going to be achieved and include methodologies to monitor this.</p> <p>GWT states that monitoring of key ecological and biodiversity receptors should continue until measurable net gain is achieved or the end of the Design year (whichever is sooner). Before operation begins, a funded mitigation plan should be in place to take appropriate action if biodiversity net gain fails to be achieved.</p>	<p>The EMP will provide details of the monitoring required for all mitigation measures.</p> <p>Some habitats will take longer to establish and reach target condition (woodland and calcareous grassland) and therefore long-term management plans will be included in the final stage of the EMP as a commitment expected from a DCO perspective.</p> <p>Habitats created and restored will form part of Highways England's estate and therefore it will be in control of their management in the long term.</p> <p>Highways England's approach to managing road verges is currently changing for biodiversity benefit which will be in support of the proposals for this scheme.</p>	<p>04/11/2019 GWT consultation response</p> <p>Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting</p> <p>Discussed at SoCG #4 meeting, 20/01/2021</p>
Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
A.14	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 5	<p>GWT reserves detailed comments on Chapter 5 of the ES until it is available for review. To date, matters raised regarding Air Quality are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for Local Wildlife Sites being receptors for air quality and an assessment of nitrogen deposition from any increased traffic in operational phase on the ecological receptors. the potential air quality impacts (NOx) on Local Wildlife Sites near to the new 	Local Wildlife sites within 200m of the Affected Road network have been assessed in accordance with DMRB LA105 with regard to nitrogen deposition and have been assessed from an ecological perspective within Chapter 8 Biodiversity.	GWT 01/21 – can be moved to matters agreed once ES is available for review

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<p>carriageway should be assessed in line with updated traffic data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection from airborne pollution to species rich grasslands, particularly particulates, should be in place. 		
Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
A.15	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 7	<p>GWT reserves comment on Chapter 7 of the ES until it is available to review. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Air Balloon Way – it should focus on limestone grassland restoration bounded by hedgerows, scattered scrub and standard trees of an appropriate species. Tree planting should predominately be limited to hedgerow trees The Air Balloon Way – what habitat connectivity will be created in each direction and how does this align with local ecological networks and the needs of threatened species? 	The planting design of the Air Balloon Way includes calcareous grassland and scattered trees or small copses and scrub. Although not provided as essential mitigation, this planted corridor will provide new foraging and community opportunities for species known to be present in the area.	
Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
A.16	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 8	<p>GWT reserves comment on Chapter 8 of the ES until it is available to review. Matters raised to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that the landscaping around the Shab Hill junction does not have the right balance of trees to open grassland habitat and the NRN indicates that a north-south corridor of limestone grassland habitat is required along the carriageway of Shab Hill junction A detailed assessment of the impact that the deep cutting will have on the hydrology of the surrounding land should be carried 	<p>Information regarding these points is included in Chapter 8 biodiversity.</p> <p>In relation to the first point, calcareous grassland is created where possible around Shab Hill, but tree species and hedgerows are required along the road alignment for mitigation purposes in order to deter bats and barn owl from flying across the road at grade.</p> <p>Detailed assessments of the impact on hydrology are considered in the Water chapter, and conclusions relating to Ground Water</p>	01/21 GWT - remains not agreed until LEMP and ES are available for review

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<p>out as changes could have an impact on the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the permeability of ecological corridors will be maintained during construction • The impact of lighting on bat foraging and migration corridors • How ground and surface water will be protected from pollution, particularly focusing on potential impacts to the Bushley Muzzard SSSI, River Frome Local Wildlife Site and white clawed crayfish (<i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i>) populations in the headwaters of the River Frome • The impact of noise on threatened species that are sensitive to this, such as reptiles and Schedule 1 breeding birds • Measures in place to avoid negative impacts on bat populations • More of the environmental budget allocated to measures for nationally threatened invertebrates, fungi, plants, lichens and bryophytes rather than just legally protected species • An evidence base for calcareous grassland of CG5 quality being established within three years • More details on underpasses to demonstrate they will provide ecological connectivity 	<p>Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems summarised in Chapter 8.</p> <p>Habitat creation in the form of stepping-stones of calcareous grassland and other multispecies habitat creation areas such as reptile habitat will benefit notable invertebrates as well as protected species.</p>	
A.18	Ability to deliver public body duties associated with SSSIs	At present, GWT considers that there is a lack of evidence and measures to demonstrate that legal issues have been avoided, including:	In accordance with the mitigation hierarchy measures to avoid impact to SSSIs have been taken and where this is not possible measures have been taken throughout the design process to reduce the impacts including those	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 13

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public body failing to minimise damage done to an SSSI • Or, if damage occurs, failing to restore an SSSI to its former state • The duty of statutory bodies to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs <p>Where statutory bodies propose to undertake or permit activities that could affect an SSSI and the activity cannot be avoided, it must be undertaken in a way least damaging to the SSSI.</p>	<p>of habitat loss, degradation, fragmentation and recreational pressure.</p> <p>Where SSSI habitat is unavoidably lost, compensatory habitat will be provided.</p> <p>The DCO will disapply the need to apply for a SSSI consent. The EMP will secure a commitment that work in SSSI will be subject to a method statement for works be agreed and signed off by Natural England. These will be provided at detail design stage.</p>	
A.19	Loss of bat roost sites	GWT states that any permanent loss of roost sites must be mitigated with a net gain of roost sites. The Environmental Statement should contain evidence that an artificial bat hibernation site is needed. As GWT has not seen relevant documents it cannot be assured of this yet.	Regarding the loss of roost sites, replacement roosts will be provided under a mitigation licence from Natural England. In addition, as part of the bat barn that will be provided for the loss of the lesser horseshoe and brown long-eared day roosts in Building 28, a cool tower will be included in the design. This feature is not being provided in compensation for the loss of existing bat roosts, as no confirmed hibernation roosts will be lost. This is part of a wider package of mitigation and enhancement for ecological network connectivity for bats.	04/11/2019 consultation response
A.21	Predicted changes in policy in advance of construction	From 2021, the UK post-2010 Biodiversity Framework will have been superseded. The new framework is likely to be based on the 25 Year Environment Policies (YEP) and the 2021-2030 ecosystem restoration framework being produced by the United Nations Environment Programme. Scheme design should pay due regard to this as they will be the current biodiversity policy frameworks by the construction period. Design, mitigation and	The ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity has been updated with current legislation and guidance, including consideration of the 27 Year Environment Policies (YEP).	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 13

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		management plans will need to adapt to align with the new policy approach.		
Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
A.22	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 11	GWT reserves comment on Chapter 11 of the ES until it is available for review. GWT has requested that the chapter should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of noise legislation, the Birds Directive and Wildlife and Countryside Act 	The effects of noise and vibration on ecological receptors have not been included in the Noise and Vibration chapter. However, the noise impact data from this assessment has been used in ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity. This is a requirement of the NPSNN.	01/21 GWT – remains not agreed until ES is available for review
Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
A.23	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 13	GWT reserves comment on Chapter 13 of the ES until it is available for review. GWT has requested that the chapter should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed hydrological modelling to demonstrate the scheme will not change local hydrology in a way that causes any degradation to designated biodiversity sites, national priority habitats or nationally threatened species 	Detailed assessments of the impact on hydrology are considered in the Water chapter, Chapter 13 and conclusions relating to Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems such as Bushley Muzzard SSSI are summarised in Chapter 8 Biodiversity.	
Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
A.24	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 14	GWT reserves comment on Chapter 14 of the ES until it is available for review. GWT has requested that the chapter should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of likely changes in the climate envelope of any habitats created as part of the mitigation and net gain measures and cross-referencing between Chapter 14 and Chapter 8 	Chapter 8 considers the use of some non-native tree species for resilience to climate change. Full species lists will be developed in future iterations of the LEMP. The end stage EMP will include long term habitat management plans to ensure habitats created continue to function as intended.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 21

Ref.	Matter	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Consideration of Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15 of the ES)				
A.25	Assessment and conclusions of ES Chapter 15	GWT reserves comment on Chapter 15 of the ES until it is available for review. Matters raised in relation to what is included in the assessment to date include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the cumulative impacts of different actions on nationally threatened species 	Chapter 15 considered all ecological receptors, both habitat and fauna.	
Environmental Management Plan				
A.26	Content of the EMP	GWT reserves comment on the EMP until it is available for review. It has requested that a detailed fish translocation plan is included. GWT has also requested that monitoring of key ecological and biodiversity receptors should continue until measurable net gain is achieved or the end of the Design Year (whichever is sooner).	The EMP (end of construction stage) including 'long-term commitments to aftercare, monitoring and maintenance activities' confirms that the authorised development must be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved EMP (end of construction stage). As part of this, all landscaping works must be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme. Any tree or shrub planted as part of the scheme that, within five years of planting, is removed or dies or is damaged, must be replaced.	04/11/2019 GWT consultation response Discussed on 04/03/2020 SoCG #2 meeting Discussed at SoCG #4 meeting, 20/01/2021
Gradient change				
A.27	Hydrological impacts of the change in gradient	GWT reserves comment until it has the evidence that demonstrates the change in gradient lessens hydrological impacts on the Crickley Hill part of the SSSI.	This information is provided within Chapter 13.	Consultation response, 11/11/2020, page 5

Appendix C Landowner Position Statement with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust

This document will be submitted early in the examination

Appendix G Draft Statement of Common Ground with the National Trust

Table of contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
1.2 Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3 Status of this SoCG	2
2 Consultation	3
2.1 Role of the National Trust	3
2.2 Summary of consultation	3
3 Topics covered in this SoCG	12
4 Matters agreed	13
5 Matters outstanding	20
Appendix A Signing Sheet	i
Appendix B Matters to be determined	ii
Appendix C National Trust's Landowner Position Statement	xxii

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Consultation with the National Trust since Preferred Route Announcement	4
Table 3-1 Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG	12
Table 4-1 Matters agreed between the National Trust and Highways England	13
Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between the National Trust and Highways England	20
Table B-1 Matters to be determined between the National Trust and Highways England	iii

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and the National Trust in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters which have been agreed
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environment Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 There are also a number of matters identified in the SoCG upon which the position of the National Trust is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the ES. These are set out in Appendix B, and Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in this Appendix with the National Trust. Discussions will be aided by the National Trust being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (following submission).
- 1.1.5 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.6 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided during the examination.
- 1.1.7 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of the National Trust in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.
- 1.2.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

- 1.2.3 Appendix B includes matters to be determined during the examination of the DCO application.
- 1.2.4 Appendix C includes the National Trust's landowner position statement.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the pre-application stage.
- 1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Role of the National Trust

- 2.1.1 The National Trust is Europe's largest conservation charity with more than five million members. Established over 125 years ago, its primary purpose is to promote the preservation of special places for the benefit of the nation. The National Trust has a statutory duty under the National Trust Acts to promote the conservation of these places.
- 2.1.2 The National Trust is the largest private landowner in the UK and also has the ability to declare its land to be held inalienably.
- 2.1.3 The National Trust is the Freehold owner of part of Crickley Hill Country Park and has a farm business tenancy and has rights of access relating to parts of the Country Park in the Freehold ownership of Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. In addition, the National Trust has a farm business tenancy on land at Barrow Wake which is in the Freehold ownership of Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. The National Trust and Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust jointly manage this land.
- 2.1.4 This SoCG deals with issues that are relevant to the National Trust in its capacity as an affected landowner under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) and in its capacity as a major conservation organisation.

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with the National Trust during the development of the scheme's design, including the optioneering process. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 The National Trust is a member of the Strategic Stakeholder Panel (SSP) and has been a member of the Landscape, Environment and Heritage Technical Working Group, the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group, and party to collaborative planning sessions; see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for more information.
- 2.2.3 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with the National Trust, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.4 The consultation with the National Trust since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set out within Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation with the National Trust since Preferred Route Announcement

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
2 May 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations including National Trust	The following matters were discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred route announcement – review and feedback • Status update on the technical working groups • Technical partner and programme update • Programme/governance update • Preliminary design and what to expect
13 June 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme. • Building connections and working together • The vision and purpose of the SSP • Next steps: shared objectives and ways of working
18 June 2019	Joint Landscape Strategy meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including National Trust,	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to restore grassland areas • Opportunity to improve current low-grade arable land to mosaic of calcareous grassland scrub and hedgerow • Woodland creation opportunities. • Tree species for planting • Recreation impacts • The potential for landmarks • Drainage solutions (Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS))
26 July 2019	Email	National Trust to Highways England	National Trust provided Highways England with a paper on the then proposed green bridge
15 August 2019	Email	Highways England to landscape officers/representatives at statutory body organisations, including National Trust	Highways England landscape specialist emailed the landscape representatives to share figures of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and indicative viewpoint locations. The landscape specialist asked for feedback on the viewpoints.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
20 August 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group Meeting	Highways England TWG Member Organisations including: National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from last TWG • Ecology update on surveys • Update on design approach and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) • Geology update on investigations/surveys • DCO process overview • Working group technical discussions
4 September 2019	Email	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England invited the National Trust to participate in the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding TWG and attend a meeting in September.
4 September 2019	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress update • Technical working group update • Public consultation details • Highways England provided a preview of the scheme proposals forming part of the consultation materials
27 September 2019	Letter	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England wrote to National Trust to notify them of the statutory consultation taking place between 27 September and 8 November 2019, in accordance with section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. The letter invited the Trust to provide comments by 8 November 2019.
1 October 2019	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group	Highways England TWG member organisations including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft proposed walking, cycling and horse riding routes • Consideration of anti-social behaviour in the environmental assessment • Bridleway on the then proposed green bridge
5 October 2019	Email	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England geologist shared minutes from a meeting held on 6 September with National Trust to discuss geological enhancements and mitigation. The geologist invited National Trust to attend a follow-up site meeting on 23 October.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
8 November 2019	Letter	National Trust to Highways England	National Trust sent Highways England their formal response to the statutory consultation.
21 November 2019	Email	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England provided a green bridge technical note which set out the principles of the design decisions for the then proposed green bridge and the overall thinking behind it.
13 January 2020	Letter	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England sent a letter to National Trust notifying them of the targeted landowner consultation, with a deadline to respond by 11 February 2020. This was followed by an email with the same content on 17 January.
16 January 2020	Meeting	Highways England National Trust	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the progress of the scheme to date and programme • The design and location of the then proposed green bridge • An overview of how the concept and locations for the then proposed green bridge were considered • National Trust gave a presentation on their position and preference for a wider wildlife bridge, providing examples of precedent bridges • National Trust desire to understand in more detail the potential impacts or benefits of bridge at different locations
30 January 2020	Meeting	Highways England National Trust	<p>The following matters were discussed regarding the then proposed green bridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Trust summarised their position on the bridge and in particular request for more detail on other locations of bridge and impacts • The policy context and purpose of the green bridge and how alternative locations were assessed during the design process, and that detailed assessment of all locations would not be possible • Highways England provided a draft sketch of an alternative location and set out at a high level how this would impact upon land, design, buildability, environment • Highways England set out a need for a clear position from National Trust very soon regarding their support or otherwise for scheme

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
11 February 2020	Letter	National Trust to Highways England	The National Trust sent a formal response to the 11 January – 11 February 2020 targeted consultation.
26 February 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of the scheme • Update on governance, funding, programme and statutory consultation • A roundtable discussion on consultation responses – key issues ahead of DCO submission • Next steps – activity up to DCO submission and beyond
3 March 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	Highways England TWG member organisations including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the scheme • Draft Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan • WCH Statement of Common Ground
6 March 2020	Meeting	Highways England National Trust	A meeting to discuss the then proposed green bridge proposals and respective positions of the parties. It was agreed that as an action of the meeting, Highways England and National Trust would ‘hot house’ on the issue to consider alternatives.
17 March 2020	Letter	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England sent a letter to the National Trust notifying them as a landowner of additional targeted landowner consultation, with a deadline to respond by 16 April 2020. This was followed by an email copy of the correspondence on 6 April 2020.
26 March 2020	Meeting	Highways England, National Trust	Two consecutive ‘hot house’ meetings were held as a collaborative session to consider alternatives to the then proposed green bridge, capture potential performance, benefits and disbenefits of each, and provide an indicative assessment of the potential for successful delivery.
27 March 2020	Meeting	Highways England, National Trust	

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
8 April 2020	Statement of Common Ground Meeting (SoCG)	Highways England, National Trust	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the draft SoCG • Process and timescales of updating the SoCG.
29 April 2020	Letter	National Trust to Highways England	Reconfirming National Trust position following meetings in March 2020 regarding the then proposed green bridge
20 July 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel meeting	<p>Highways England</p> <p>SSP member organisations, including National Trust</p>	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the progress of the scheme • the change to the scheme's programme • the updated designs following consultation in 2019
12 August 2020	Walking Cycling Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<p>Highways England</p> <p>TWG member organisations including National Trust</p>	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on how the design changes in the scheme have resulted in changes to the PRoW network • Next steps including the issue of the draft updated PRoW management plan, the upcoming statutory consultation and the SoCG process
17 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	<p>Highways England</p> <p>Environmental bodies, including National Trust</p>	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concerns the groups had following a briefing on the design changes that were being taken to supplementary consultation in October 2020
25 August 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	<p>Highways England</p> <p>Environmental bodies, including National Trust</p>	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Public Rights of Way proposals • changes to Cowley junction • realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake • change in gradient
3 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	<p>Highways England</p> <p>Environmental bodies, including National Trust</p>	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scheme wide connectivity, permeability and crossings strategy • maintaining and improving functionality of the crossings • Cotswolds Way crossing • Gloucestershire Way crossing • Cowley and Stockwell Farm overbridges

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
17 September 2020	Environmental Collaborative Planning Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental masterplan • Biodiversity Net Gain • Archaeology
28 September 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental bodies, including National Trust	Highways England presented their strategy with regards to Common Land and the interface between this and impacts on the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI's.
29 September 2020	Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Technical Working Group Statement of Common Ground Meeting	Highways England WCH TWG members including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft SoCG document • The process and timescales of updating the SoCG.
7 October 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	Highways England provided an update to the SSP on the progress of the scheme including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the upcoming supplementary statutory consultation
13 October 2020	Formal notification of supplementary consultation	Highways England National Trust	Highways England sent formal notification of the supplementary consultation via post and email to the National Trust in accordance with section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. This set out a deadline to submit comments of the 12 November 2020.
28 October 2020	Meeting	Highways England Environmental collaborative planning organisations including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the DEFRA Metric in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme • The change by habitat area within the DCO Boundary • the BNG calculation (using the current DEFRA metric, due to be updated in Dec 2020) • The BNG metric • Stakeholders ideas to improve on biodiversity gain.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
10 November 2020	Formal response to statutory consultation	National Trust to Highways England	The National Trust submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation to Highways England via letter.
2 December 2020	Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concerns and issues regarding the proposed crossings for the scheme.
11 December 2020	Strategic Stakeholder Panel Meeting	Highways England SSP member organisations, including National Trust	The following matters were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of the scheme • results from the recent consultation • a summary of the responses received • provide an update on next steps for the scheme
14 December 2020	Letter	Highways England Environmental bodies, including National Trust	Highways England wrote to the environmental stakeholders, including National Trust, to outline a change in proposals following the crossings and integration strategy meeting which took place on 2 December 2020.
18 December 2020	Letter	Highways England Environmental bodies, including National Trust	The National Trust wrote to Highways England to confirm their full support for the proposed design changes outlined in Highways England's letter dated 14 December 2020 but also highlighted the need to collectively challenge the negative biodiversity net gain position of the road scheme
05 January 2021	Email	Highways England National Trust	The National Trust responded to Highways England on recent dialogue advising their position with regards to the revised proposed inalienable land take and would wait to formally respond in next land acquisition consultation.
25 January 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting (SoCG)	Highways England National Trust	Highways England provided the National Trust with an overview of the draft SoCG document and sought comments on its structure and National Trust's principal matters outstanding. Highways England and National Trust discussed the process and timescales of updating the SoCG.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters discussed
8 February 2021	Letter	Highways England to National Trust	Highways England sent a letter to the National Trust notifying them as a landowner of additional targeted landowner consultation, with a deadline to respond by 9 March 2021.
8 March 2021	Formal response to statutory consultation	National Trust to Highways England	The National Trust submitted a formal response to the targeted landowner consultation to Highways England via letter.
19 March 2021	Statement of Common Ground Meeting (SoCG)	Highways England National Trust	<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the draft SoCG document and comments on its structure and National Trust's principal matters outstanding • Process and timescales of updating the SoCG

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the Topics considered within this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Consultation
Relevant ES Chapter	3.	Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)
	4.	Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)
	5.	Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)
	6.	Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)
	7.	Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)
	8.	Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)
	9.	Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)
	10.	Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)
	11.	Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)
	12.	Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)
	13.	Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)
Other topics	14.	Environmental Management Plan
	15.	Crossings of the A417
	16.	Gradient change
	17.	Cowley junction
	18.	The realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake
	19.	Common Land
	20.	Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users
	21.	Land

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matter's reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between the National Trust and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle of Development		
1.1	Both parties agree that measures are needed to address the safety and traffic flow issues on the 5km stretch of single carriageway between Brockworth bypass and Cowley Roundabout.	Covering letter, National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
1.2	Both parties agree the scheme will need to accord with paragraph 5.152 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), which states that there is a strong presumption against any significant road widening or the building of new roads in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) unless it can be shown that there are compelling reasons for the new or enhanced capacity and with any benefits outweighing the costs very significantly.	Covering letter, National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
1.3	Both parties agree the scheme will need to accord with the requirements set out in paragraph 5.153 of the NPSNN which states that for projects within an AONB, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the project will be carried out to high environmental standards and where possible included measures to enhance other aspects of the environment.	Covering letter, National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
1.4	Both parties agree the scheme will need to accord with the requirements set out in paragraph 5.154 of the NPSNN which states that the aim should be to avoid compromising the purposes of designation and the project should be designed sensitively.	Covering letter, National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1.5	The National Trust agrees with the 'landscape-led' approach for the scheme as stated in the agreed vision statement. The National Trust also agrees with the following aspects of the scheme vision: conserving and enhancing the special character of the Cotswolds AONB; reconnecting landscape and ecology; bringing about landscape, wildlife and heritage benefits; and enhancing visitor enjoyment.	Covering letter, National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
1.6	Both parties agree the scheme should have regard to the policies set out to meet the challenge of climate change, conserving and enhancing both the natural and historic environment stipulated in the revised February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Page 1 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
2. Consultation		
2.1	<p>Highways England agrees that to date, National Trust have raised key concerns in the following submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 Position statement • 2018 Non-Statutory Consultation response • 2018 Non-Statutory Consultation position statement • 2019 Preferred Route Announcement statement • 2019 Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report to Planning Inspectorate • 2019 July Green Bridge considerations paper • 2019 Statutory consultation response • 2020 Landowner land acquisition consultation responses (x3 – February, April and November) • 2020 Briefing note for the Access Bridges (collaborative document with CNL, GWT) • 2020 Supplementary statutory consultation response • 2020 Supplementary statutory consultation collaborative press release (with CNL, GWT) • 2021 Landowner land acquisition consultation response 	National Trust responses dated to Landowner land acquisition response (February 2021)
2.2	Both parties agree to continue to engage with one another during the detailed design stage of the scheme to agree things such as, but not limited to, surfacing and signage.	SoCG meeting 25/01/2021
3. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4. Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)		
4.1	Both parties agree a construction environmental management plan and a traffic management plan must be in place before construction commences and key stakeholders must have had the opportunity to feed into the drafting of these documents.	Page 9 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
5. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)		
5.1	Both parties agree that a clear scope for ecological receptors in terms of the habitats and the zone of influence is needed and that mitigation measures to reduce any adverse impacts will be fully considered. An assessment of the effects of the scheme on air quality in relation to human and ecological receptors is provided in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
5.2	Both parties agree that there needs to be an assessment of nitrogen deposition from any increased traffic in operational phase on the ecological receptors. An assessment of the effects of the scheme on air quality in relation to human and ecological receptors is provided in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
5.3	Both parties agree that the EIA should include an assessment of the effects of dust during construction and vehicle emissions during operation. The effects of dust during construction will be assessed and reported on in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
6. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
7. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
7.1	Both parties agree that lighting in the vicinity of Shab Hill junction should remain unlit, to reduce the amount of light spillage to the Dark Skies area.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
7.2	The National Trust agrees with the “Dark-Skies” approach taken to the scheme development in recognition of one of the key characteristics of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) landscape.	April 2021
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)		
8.1	The National Trust accepts that under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is not required to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain. Whereas the Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025 (RIS2) states a commitment to no net loss to biodiversity by 2020 and net gain by 2040 along the Strategic Road Network, and the 25 Year Environment Plan states that: “Current policy is that the planning system should provide biodiversity net gains where possible”. The National Trust agree that Highways England has sought to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available within the DCO Boundary. Highways England	March 2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	has worked collaboratively with the National Trust and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme. Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.	
8.2	The National Trust supports tree planting mitigation extending into Ullenwood.	Page 8 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
8.3	The National Trust agrees that the re-purposing of part of the existing A417 provides an opportunity for an ecological link across the landscape.	Page 9 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
8.4	Overall, the Trust agrees that the amount of calcareous grassland creation is a positive outcome for the scheme when incorporated with the other mitigation measures that Highways England is proposing as part of the scheme. National Trust are pleased to see that Highways England have worked to maximise habitat creation opportunities within the DCO Boundary and are seeking to create high distinctiveness (priority) habitats where possible.	Page 10 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
9. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)		
9.1	National Trust agrees with the conclusion that with the cutting being much reduced (compared to the scheme consulted on in 2019), it presents a lesser risk from a geological perspective, as it will avoid digging into less stable materials, has a reduced impact to the SSSI geological features (notable rock exposures), ancient woodland and Emma's Grove. Decreasing the amount of spoil by approx. 1m cubic tonnes is another significant environment outcome compared to the scheme consulted on in 2019 (potentially reducing 50,000 lorry movements that would have been required to take the waste material off-site).	National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
10. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
11. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
12. Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
13. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)		
	No matters identified.	
14. Environmental Management Plan		
13.1	Both parties agree mitigation must be implemented at every stage of the construction process for protected species and other wildlife and phased to have the best opportunity of success in starting the gradual process of restoring and re-connecting the landscape within which the road scheme sits.	Page 10 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
13.2	Both parties agree that a Construction and Traffic Management Plan must be produced. This is produced as part of the DCO submission and will be available at that time.	SoCG meeting, March 2021
15. Crossings of the A417		
14.1	The National Trust supports the provision of the Cotswold Way crossing in its location, and agrees that it should provide connectivity along the Cotswolds escarpment and providing a safe crossing point for walkers on the Cotswold Way, as well as for other non-motorised users and livestock movement between Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake.	Page 1 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
14.2	The National Trust agrees that the Cotswold Way crossing will enhance people's ability to physically connect Crickley Hill, Emma's Grove and Barrow Wake, that it will be a gain for landscape connectivity (compared to having no crossing in this location) and will present an opportunity to enhance people's understanding of the historic environment and landscape setting (subject to detailed scheme design).	Page 2 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
14.3	Both parties agree that the design, form and appearance of the Cotswold Way crossing should respond to the natural and built character of this part of the Cotswolds and should make a positive contribution to sense of place.	Page 1 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
14.4	The National Trust supports the provision of the Gloucestershire Way crossing in its location, to provide access connectivity for the Gloucestershire Way, and to provide vital connectivity within the landscape, with benefits for ecological networks, with particular regard to having 'splayed' ends as it joins the land on either side of the cutting, providing a funnel effect and will have benefits in terms of how it fits in with the local landscape and guide mobile wildlife across the crossing.	Page 2/4 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
14.5	The National Trust agree the Gloucestershire Way will enhance people's ability to physically connect with Crickley Hill, Emma's Grove, Barrow Wake and other notable sites, which will increase understanding of historical assets and how human activity has, over millennia created the living landscape we currently enjoy. This will certainly be a gain for landscape connectivity (compared to having no such crossing) and presents an opportunity to enhance people's understanding of the historic environment and landscape setting if the bridge is designed appropriately and sensitively.	Page 4 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
14.6	The National Trust agrees that a primary purpose of the Gloucestershire Way crossing is to provide an access route connecting the Gloucestershire Way and Cotswold Way National Trail.	Page 2 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
14.7	The National Trust agrees with the provision of the Gloucestershire Way crossing to incorporate a 25m width of calcareous grassland habitat to help address fragmentation of the SSSI, in addition to its required functions for species connectivity, landscape integration and diversion of the Gloucestershire Way. The National Trust welcomes and fully supports this design change which, in addition to the 25m of calcareous grassland habitat, also includes two 3m width hedgerows, a 3.5m bridleway and a 1.5m maintenance strip.	Page 1 of National Trust position statement response, 18 December 2020
16. Gradient change		
15.1	The National Trust broadly supports the design change with an 8% gradient proposed on Crickley Hill as consulted upon in 2020, compared to the 7% proposed in the Autumn 2019 consultation. The proposed change in grade would remove the extent of some harmful impacts, including visual impacts, effects on the water environment and in terms of wider environmental impacts. Because this reduced depth of excavation means less land/habitat loss, then this is considered to be beneficial	Page 4 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
17. Cowley junction		
16.1	Highways England made the decision to remove the connection between Cowley Village and Cowley junction via Cowley Woods from the scheme. The route will become a private access for local properties and for walking, cycling and horse riding, including for disabled users. Access restrictions (to Cowley village) will be finalised in the detailed design stage of the project, and will be carefully considered in agreement with the local authority and relevant property owners. In principle, the National Trust agree to the proposed change at Cowley junction.	Page 5 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
18. Realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake		
17.1	The National Trust is supportive of the revised design of the realigned B4070 as it is now using part of the existing highway. The proposed change would reduce both the length of new highway that is required and agricultural land take and therefore, on balance, may represent a beneficial change to the scheme.	Page 6 of National Trust response to Supplementary

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		Consultation, 10 November 2020
17.2	The National Trust supports the aspiration to address the known and persistent anti-social behaviours currently associated with the Barrow Wake car park and this revision will go towards deterring this behaviour.	Page 6 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
19. Common Land		
18.1	The National Trust supports the re-provision of Common Land, in principle.	Page 8 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
20. Improvements for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders, including disabled users		
19.1	The National Trust supports the provision of the Cotswold Way and Gloucestershire Way crossings, and the re-purposing of the existing A417 route, subject to detailed design.	Page 7 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
19.2	The National Trust supports the proposed improvements, being mindful that they must accommodate different user groups, whilst still protecting the mosaic of habitats, designated sites and differing land uses across landownerships.	Page 7 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
21. Land		
21.1	National Trust agree to the acquisition of two parcels of inalienable land as stated in the first land acquisition plan dated 13.01.2020 – The parcels of land are identified as 1098/2 and 1098/3 on Plan. 177, ref. HE551506-ARP-LLO-X_XX_XXXX_X-DR-ZL-000178.	March 2021
21.2	Highways England and the National Trust commit to ongoing discussions with regards to long-term land management, with a particular focus on Crickley Hill & Barrow Wake SSSI.	SoCG meeting, 25 January 2021

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

- 5.1.1 The principal matters outstanding between National Trust and Highways England are listed below. It is important to recognise that there may be further matters outstanding identified, subject to the determination of the matters identified in Appendix B where the position of the National Trust is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES).
- 5.1.2 The principal matters outstanding between National Trust and Highways England are:
- The scheme's approach to delivering biodiversity net gain;
 - The conclusion of the predicted impact on Crickley Hill during construction and operation; and
 - That a holistic landscape approach should be taken for scheme mitigation that overlays cultural heritage, historic environment and natural environment.

5.2 Matters Outstanding

- 5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters which remain under discussion by the parties. It sets out the latest position of each party in relation to each matter outstanding, and the latest date of that position.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between the National Trust and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1.	Scale of intervention	National Trust question whether the extent of overall highway corridor is necessary or appropriate in an AONB context.	The new road design will ensure a free flow of traffic, which will improve journey times, safety and reliability on the A417. Journey time reliability and safety would also improve on the A436, however, the traffic modelling undertaken by Highways England shows variations in how the scheme would affect journey times on the A436, depending on the direction and time of travel. For example, journey times for those travelling between the A436 and Gloucester/M5 will increase at some times of day, and in some	Page 17 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			directions, and decrease at others. For those travelling towards Cheltenham/Stroud, there will be a decrease in journey times on the A436 in comparison a scenario without the scheme.	
2. Consultation				
	No matters identified			
3. Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
3.1.	A436 link road alternatives	The National Trust considers that the selection of alternatives for the A436 link road and the assessment did not consider that Alternative 2 would be three carriageways wide for its whole length (one northbound, two southbound). This may not have influenced the choice of route, but the additional lane adds to the overall width of the proposed highway corridor	The options assessment process is set out in the Scheme Assessment Report and Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives of the Environmental Statement. The Highways England landscape and engineering specialists worked collaboratively to design the scheme, including finetuning to reduce the footprint and cutting slopes of the A436 in order to reduce the effect of the road on the surrounding landscape and visual receptors.	Page 15 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
4. Environmental Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
4.1.	Use of DMRB standards	The National Trust has concerns about the potential over-reliance on the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) in assessment criteria and methodology. This includes a particular focus on Cultural Heritage Chapter 6 of the ES (the Trust consider that Historic England guidance should be used here). This concern was also raised in response to the Scoping Report.	DMRB is Highways England's principle guidance for undertaking the environmental assessment of trunk road schemes. However, other best practice standards and guidance have been consulted in the course of the assessment, as set out in individual chapters of the Environmental Statement.	Page 11 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
5. Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
5.1.	Human health receptors	National Trust considers that human health receptors must include the visitors to Crickley Hill, not just residential properties.	Impacts of air pollution to human health in relation to short term exposure will be assessed where it is predicted that the annual mean NO2 concentration is greater than 60 ug/m3. Human health receptors will	Page 12 of National Trust response to Statutory

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>be assessed at residential properties, schools and hospitals where they are within 200m of the ARN and are representative of exposure for other properties. This follows the standard set out in DMRB LA105.</p> <p>Highways England consider populations around the project and not visitors to the area as it would not be possible to develop any sort of baseline (as it's not possible to know who they are or what health considerations would need to be made).</p>	Consultation, 6 November 2019
6. Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
6.1.	Baseline information	<p>The National Trust considers that the baseline information to inform the understanding of the asset, it's setting and the mitigation is poor. National Trust consider there to be a lack of evidence concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a landscape-scale approach and the focus on individual assets outside of their landscape context; • an assessment of historic landscape impacts; • an explanation of how the value of identified sites has been assessed information on how undesignated sites of schedulable value have been identified (i.e. what criteria has been used) • detailed information about heritage sites and believe that this information, as well as a full site survey, should've been available to inform route selection. 	<p>Highways England notes the comments of the National Trust. Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage has carried out the assessment of the scheme in accordance with the standards set by DMRB. Highways England has also engaged with Historic England during the development of the scheme, as set out in the Historic England Statement of Common Ground. Highways England considers that the assessment is robust and meets the requirements of NPSNN.</p>	Page 15 and 16 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
6.2.	Assessment conclusion	National Trust disagrees with the conclusions of Highways England with	<p>Highways England notes the comments of the National Trust. Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage has carried out the assessment of the scheme in accordance with the standards set by</p>	April 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		regards to the impact on cultural heritage, in particular Emma's Grove and Crickley Hill.	<p>DMRB. Highways England has also engaged with Historic England during the development of the scheme, as set out in the Historic England Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>The assessment in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage takes account of changes to setting as a result of noise and visual intrusion, against the baseline conditions.</p>	
7. Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
7.1.	Impact on Cotswolds AONB and proposed mitigation	<p>At this time, the National Trust believes that this road scheme significantly challenges the integrity of the Cotswolds and questions the likelihood of success of the proposed mitigation. The Trust considers that the current scheme does not demonstrate the 'whole design' approach as set out in DMRB LD 117 Landscape Design, Appendix A, and consider that this should be evident in a landscape-led scheme.</p> <p>The proposed new A417 would involve excavating a significant cutting through the Cotswold escarpment, which would have significant landscape impacts and require substantial mitigation that must equal the significance of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designation.</p>	<p>The landscape-led approach to this scheme is set out and illustrated within the Design Summary Report, including how the scheme addresses DMRB and policy requirements, whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape will be set out in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement. These documents are submitted with the DCO application. The landscape-led approach has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the Cotswolds AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features, typical to the area, such as Cotswold stone walling, hedgerow, tree, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitat for rare and protected local wildlife. The landscape-led approach has allowed design</p>	Page 1 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>interventions on all aspects of the scheme to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. Wider benefits of the scheme include improving access and recreational opportunities and improving access to cultural heritage sites. This will be set out and illustrated within the Design Summary Report, whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape will be set out in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement. These documents are submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Highways England has sought to limit the effect of the construction on the environment as far as is practicable. To assist with this, Highways England would seek to re-use as much material as possible on-site, if it is assessed as suitable for re-use. Discussions are ongoing to determine whether any limited surplus material now arising could be re-used off-site with local landowners or on other projects within the region to minimise the requirement to transport this material. Where possible, Highways England would also seek to source material locally.</p>	
8. Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
8.1.	Biodiversity Net Gain	The National Trust considers that in order to deliver a landscape-led scheme, biodiversity net gain needs to be delivered on a landscape scale, and every opportunity sought within the redline boundary to deliver biodiversity improvements.	<p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These new and improved habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity, in line with the nature recovery network strategy for the area.</p> <p>Highways England is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land that is available. Highways England has worked</p>	Pages 8 and 9 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies to consider the evolving DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool and have agreed to focus on providing priority habitats, which are in keeping with the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB, as part of this scheme.</p> <p>Highways England is continuing to investigate further opportunities to achieve BNG with neighbouring landowners and through looking at other off-site measures.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Case for the Scheme submitted with the DCO application.</p>	
9. Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
9.1.	Consideration of geology in design	The National Trust considers that the scheme proposal still does not consider or address the importance of geology. It does consider the impact on the SSSI, however, there is no consideration given of the opportunities for geology and geological conservation.	Chapter 9 Geology and Soils considers geology and opportunities for the protection and enhancement of features.	Page 21 and 22 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
10. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
11. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
11.1	Impact on Crickley Hill	The National Trust disagrees with the assessment conclusion of a neutral impact on the Crickley Hill business model, especially during construction.	Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Population and Human Health considers the potential effects on the Country Park with visitor centre, café and waymarked trails. The assessment concludes there would be a minor impact, with a discernible change in attributes and environmental quality during construction activities in close proximity, with minor loss of and alteration to key characteristics. Construction requires acquisition of some land which would not compromise	April 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>the overall viability of the resource, and access to the resource would be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan Annex B (Document Reference 6.4)) identify appropriate mitigation and phasing to help reduce adverse effects at Crickley Hill. For example, access to the facilities would be retained at all times.</p> <p>Highways England is committed to continuing to engage with all landowners and others affected to help identify and mitigate any potential adverse effects.</p>	
11.2	Crickley Hill SSSI unit	The National Trust disagree with Highways England's conclusions about likely operational impacts on Crickley Hill and are concerned about the potential effects of increased visitor pressure from the Cotswold Way crossing and new PRoWs into Crickley Hill and therefore, the required mitigation.	An assessment of the potential impact of new and diverted public rights of way and recreational pressures from walkers cyclists and horse riders on the SSSI during operation is assessed within Chapter 8 Biodiversity and concludes a minor adverse impact upon Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI which is slight and not significant. Highways England has carefully considered a request for monitoring of recreational activity on Crickley Hill Country Park and the SSSI before, during and/or post construction but does not consider this to be appropriate given the conclusions of the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (slight adverse and not significant).	Page 14 of 2020 consultation
12. Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
	No matters identified.			
13. Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
13.1.	Relevant policy and legislation	The National Trust consider that Highways England should commit to the necessary actions within the National Adaptation	Highways England recognises the concern raised about the scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes	Page 17 of National Trust response to Statutory

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<p>Programme (2018-2023) during construction and as a legacy.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report refers to the NPSNN in relation to climate change and emissions. The National Trust note that since its publication 5 years ago, there has been a much stronger emphasis on climate change and efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions such as the Environment Bill and UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017 report.</p>	<p>which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced on 27 June 2019.</p> <p>Highways England is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget period. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement submitted as part of the DCO application, and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the scheme.</p> <p>The Climate: second national adaptation programme (2018 – 2023) (NAP) was produced by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and launched in 2018. The plan sets out the government’s response to the second CCRA. It forms part of the five-yearly cycle of requirements laid down by the Climate Change Act, with the aim of driving a dynamic and adaptive approach to building the nation’s resilience to climate change. Section 3.4.4 of the NAP highlights the economic and strategic value of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in the UK and notes the implications of risks to severance and safety posed by climate change. It details how HE are embedding resilience to climate change, based on the UKCP09 future climate projections, including measures such as safeguarding against flooding, erosion, falling trees, instability and risk of failure across the SRN to increase safety.</p> <p>Highways England is taking action to safeguard against climate risks on the road network through a series of adaptation plans, as set out in Section 8 of their climate change adaptation risk assessment. These include adaption actions related to pavements; drainage; structures; geotechnics; non-motorised</p>	<p>Consultation, 6 November 2019</p>

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			users; soft estate; vehicle restraint systems; signs and signals; and road markings. For some risks doing the minimum is appropriate because the rigorous design standards or existing procedures are already sufficient to cope with the predicted impacts of climate change. In other cases, including those relating to drainage, it has been considered necessary to act. For example, updating technical standards through the DMRB or the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works (MCHW) to ensure new designs and projects are prepared for the future climate.	
14. Environmental Management Plan				
	No matters identified.			
15. Crossings of the A417				
15.1.	User conflicts of the Cotswold Way crossing	The National Trust have concerns that at 5m width, thought will need to be given to final design to avoid conflict between the different user groups (including disabled users) for walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and periodic movement of cattle. The National Trust also consider that it is important to consider how horse-riders and cyclists safely approach and leave the crossing to join existing bridleways and therefore minimise damage to priority habitats and wildlife.	Highways England considers that the 5m width of the bridge would be sufficient to accommodate all likely users effectively, designed in accordance with DMRB. The occasional use for cattle would be managed to avoid unnecessary conflict with other users. The approaches to the crossing would be carefully designed to ensure damage to adjacent habitats is avoided.	Page 1 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
16. Gradient change				
	No matters identified.			
17. Realignment of the B4070 to Birdlip via Barrow Wake				
17.1.	Impact on the Barrow Wake SSSI	The National Trust considers that the realignment of the B4070 misses the	Highways England acknowledges feedback received in response to public consultation, which has	Page 6 of National Trust

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		opportunity to either reduce the size or remove the road surface and car park completely from the Barrow Wake SSSI unit to a more suitable location.	suggested the reduction, removal or relocation of the Barrow Wake car park. This change is outside the scope of the scheme and the car park is not owned as part of the strategic road network by Highways England. However, Highways England has offered the relevant stakeholders help to inform or facilitate any discussions about any changes that might be proposed to the Barrow Wake car park. Highways England will ensure the A417 scheme is able to accommodate the existing car park arrangement, or a future scenario where the car park is reduced or removed.	response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
18. Common Land				
	No matters identified.			
19. Improvements for walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users				
	No matters identified.			
20. Land				
20.1.	Matters identified have been outlined and discussed in National Trust's position statement. Please see Appendix C for further details.			

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	National Trust
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

Appendix B Matters to be determined

- B.1.1.1 There are some matters which the position of the National Trust is pending upon publication of the full suite of DCO application documents, in particular those relating to the Environmental Statement (ES). These are set out in Table B 1.
- B.1.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters with the National Trust during the examination of the DCO application and discussions will be aided by the National Trust being able to review the full suite of DCO application documents on the National Infrastructure Planning website (at the point of submission).

Table B-1 Matters to be determined between the National Trust and Highways England

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Principle of Development				
A.1	Ability to deliver a 'landscape-led' scheme that meets the vision and objectives	National Trust have requested a definitive list of assurances and demonstrable outputs of the scheme that identify the 'value add' aspects of the scheme that result in it being landscape-led. They would like a clear comparison between the A417 Missing Link and a standard 'engineering-led solution.'	<p>Highways England notes the position of the National Trust.</p> <p>Highways England has drawn comparisons between the A417 Missing Link scheme and a 'traditional' highways scheme in a series of collaborative engagement sessions with the Trust, and other environmental stakeholders, which includes detailing the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed as part of this scheme.</p> <p>Highways England is producing a Design Summary Report as part of the documentation to be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which will detail the design decisions made during the development of the A417 Missing Link scheme and how this compares with a 'traditional' highways scheme.</p>	Page 10 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.2	NPSNN Policy Test	The National Trust considers that the scheme may not meet the policy tests in the NPSNN relating to the location of the scheme within an AONB.	Highways England has considered the balance of the benefits and impacts of the scheme, within the context of the Cotswolds AONB and the relevant policy tests, namely the NPSNN. Highways England considers that the scheme fulfils the requirements of the NPSNN, as a scheme which is of a high environmental standard and includes measures to enhance the environment. This is set out in the Case for the Scheme submitted as part of the DCO application	Page 13 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Assessment of Alternatives (Chapter 3 of the ES)				
A.3	A436 link road alternatives, visual assessment	The National Trust would like to understand whether the link road would be visible from Crickley Hill and reserve further comment on this until visualisations to support Highways England's position are available.	The visual impacts of the scheme are covered in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The A436 would be located behind Emma's Grove in views from Crickley Hill and would be obscured. It may be possible to get a glimpsed view of the upper cut slopes along that section of the A436 but the road would not be visible. Three alternative routes for the A436 link road were presented at the preferred route announcement in March 2019. An assessment of the alternative A436 link road routes was carried out and presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. This was informed by consultation with stakeholders such as local councils, environmental bodies, and other organisations. The assessment is presented in an Alternatives Technical Note which will be provided in Appendix 3.2 of the Environmental Statement appendices. Alternative 2 was the preferred landscape and environmental solution compared to Alternatives 2 and 3. It was also judged to be more likely to fulfil the requirements of the NPSNN.	Page 8 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
Assessment Methodology (Chapter 4 of the ES)				
A.4	Construction	The National Trust considers that all necessary assessments will have to be undertaken before any construction commences.	Scheme assessments have been ongoing throughout 2019 – 2021, the results of which will be published in the Environmental Statement, submitted with the DCO application. This will be subject to independent Examination by The Planning Inspectorate during the DCO consenting process. There will also be a commitments register submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan, which will set out where further survey work may be required.	Page 9 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Air Quality (Chapter 5 of the ES)				
A.5	Details of Chapter 5	<p>National Trust reserve comment on the specifics of Chapter 5 until they have had the opportunity to review the Environmental Statement. Particularly regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of nitrogen deposition from increased traffic on ecological receptors • The air quality objectives and limit values of different habitats (designated sites and priority habitats) • Understanding the proposed compensation for post construction NOx levels at SSSI habitats • An updated conclusion regarding best practice construction phase dust effects, especially for Unit 3 at Crickley Hill 	<p>An assessment of the effects of the scheme on air quality in relation to human and ecological receptors is provided in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement. In relation to the specific points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope and selection of ecological receptors has been defined using DMRB LA105. • Mitigation measures have been identified when impacts are assessed to be adverse. <p>An assessment of the effects of the scheme on air quality in relation to human and ecological receptors is provided in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement. In relation to the specific points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of nitrogen deposition will be assessed according to the standards set out in DMRB LA105. • The thresholds for different habitat types have been assessed. • DMRB LA105 uses a wider definition of designated habitats. For the purposes of the assessment, designated habitats are: Ramsar, Special Protected Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Nature Improvement Areas, Ancient Woodland, Veteran Trees. 	SoCG meeting, March 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Cultural Heritage (Chapter 6 of the ES)				
A.6	Mitigation measures	The PEI report states that the proposed scheme would result in a “significant adverse effect” on the setting of various scheduled monuments including Crickley Hill camp. This conclusion is meant to have taken into account the implementation of mitigation measures, although it says that: “A programme of mitigation appropriate to the proposed scheme will be developed in consultation with Historic England and the County Archaeologist to reduce harm and to provide enhancements”. As one of the key stakeholders, the National Trust would like to understand the proposed programme of mitigation and how it might address the adverse effects.	Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on archaeology and sets out the methodology for this assessment. Annex C of the Environmental Management Plan sets out the archaeological mitigation measures proposed prior to and during construction.	Page 13 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
A.7	A holistic landscape approach	National Trust reserve comment on the holistic landscape approach taken to cultural heritage until they've reviewed the Historic landscape characterisation.	The Historic landscape characterisation (Appendix 6.3 to Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage) was made available as part of the 2020 PEI report, found here: HE551505-ARP-EHR-X XX XXXX X-RP-LE-000010 (arup.com)	April 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Landscape and Visual Effects (Chapter 7 of the ES)				
A.8	Impact on the AONB Visualisations	<p>The National Trust reserve comments on specific elements of Chapter 7 until they have had the opportunity to review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • photomontages showing the proposed designs from viewpoints 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 23 • Cowley lane and Stockwell Farm overbridges photomontages or at least wireframes to enable consultees to understand the basis on which the judgements included in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) have been made and therefore be able to challenge those judgements where necessary • visualisations of the Cotswold Way crossing 	This will be set out and illustrated within the Design Summary Report, whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape will be set out in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement. These documents are submitted with the DCO application.	April 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.9	Landscape mitigation	<p>Significant landscape mitigation does not currently appear to be built into the scheme and the National Trust considers that a standard approach to road scheme mitigation is being proposed which does not appear to fulfil its own landscape-led scheme vision and principles. For example, many of the proposed mitigation measures – whilst helpful – remain rather tight to the proposed dual carriageway itself, and we consider that there are additional opportunities that could be afforded by working with the DCO boundary. This is a landscape scale intervention / development, so it requires a landscape scale approach to mitigation – including more woodland and limestone grassland.</p> <p>Overall, in order to address the likely significant adverse impacts on building a major new highway through an AONB, the National Trust consider that more robust landscape mitigation and enhancement is required.</p>	<p>Highways England has taken a landscape-led approach to the design of the A417 Missing Link scheme, in which the Cotswolds AONB landscape has been a primary consideration in every design decision made.</p> <p>By working with the DCO Boundary this approach has meant that significant landscape design proposals have been developed for the scheme and have been fully integrated into the scheme design.</p> <p>This includes a range of considerations and measures to develop the scheme to fit with the AONB landscape, some of which have been incorporated since 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape design input into vertical and horizontal alignment, junction layouts and approaches to road design and detailing. • Comprehensive landscape earthworks proposals designed to fit with the different landscape character areas of the AONB. These earthworks have been combined with the engineering earthworks for landscape integration and visual screening. • The sensitive design of highways features and structures including materials and finishes appropriate to the character of the AONB landscape. This includes; the provision of boundary features such as Cotswold drystone walls rather than traditional highway timber fencing; bespoke retaining wall designs that reflect the geological strata of the limestone landscape; design of the cutting slopes to provide a natural appearance with rock exposures and planting in combination. 	Page 13/14 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A landscape scheme that works with ecology to reconnect and enhance the AONB landscape and restore downgraded landscape features. • Comprehensive planting proposals including new woodland, tree lines and groups, scattered trees, scrub, hedgerows, and species rich calcareous grassland. • A greater area of woodland planting will be created to replace that lost by the scheme. • Native species rich hedgerow will be doubled in length compared to that lost. Proposals include the translocation of important hedgerows with their soil and ground flora which are severed or lost to the scheme. • The provision of limestone grassland verges and embankments has been considered a priority habitat. Only 4 ha of good condition limestone grassland will be lost (with the rest being neutral or improved grassland or cereal crops). 73 ha of limestone grassland will be being created across the scheme. • Complete redesign of the detrunked sections of A417 to create new opportunities for walking, cycling and horse riding and habitat restoration and enhancement along the detrunked section. • Environmental upgrading of Barrow Wake Car park plus additional parking facilities at the Golden Heart Inn and as the start of the detrunked section (includes disabled parking and parking for horse boxes). • The detrunking WCH route is part of a wider improvement of public rights of way links developed as part of the scheme – this includes new opportunities for loop walks and ‘heritage 	

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
			<p>routes' that link existing historic features including more direct links between Crickley Hill, Emma's Grove and The Peak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Heritage proposals include upgrading works at Emma's Grove to provide a better setting for the Anglo-Saxon barrows. <p>The landscape-led approach has taken a landscape scale approach with measures designed to match the scale of the infrastructure proposed. The landscape design proposals are indicated on the Environmental Masterplans to be issued with the DCO. Management proposals are described in the Environmental Management Plan.</p>	

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.10	Visual impact of the cutting	The National Trust has concerns about the potential visual impacts of the cutting sides, and this needs to be carefully considered, with sensitive design and mitigation as appropriate.	<p>The design of the cutting sides has been carefully considered in line with the landscape-led approach for the project. Following the statutory consultation in 2019, retaining walls have been used only where it is not possible to expose the local geology. The retaining walls have been designed with banding of different materials (including stone cladding and space for planting) to visually break down their appearance, whilst also reflecting the character of the local sedimentary geology.</p> <p>The potential to make greater use of the exposed geology has been taken for the cutting slopes above the retaining walls. Given the landscape-led approach the design of the basic 35° cutting required for geotechnical engineering stability has been developed with a series of steeper (60°) rock sections with natural stone benching and spaces for planting. This would take no more land than a basic 35° cutting but would visually appear steeper.</p> <p>The design approach has been to keep the slopes as steep as possible through the Cotswold escarpment to reduce the landscape impact. Greater land take would have been required to reach a solution where slopes could have been seeded with native calcareous that could be readily maintained.</p>	Page 14 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
	Shab Hill junction	<p>The National Trust questions the raised height of the Shab Hill junction on the 'wold' landscape and considers that more assessment is required to lower the junction further, to reduce the visual impact of this junction in the landscape.</p>	<p>Highways England notes the concern about the elevation of Shab Hill junction. The proposed Shab Hill junction itself lies within a complex topographical area of the AONB, with undulating hillside. Geotechnical and engineering issues and solutions have governed the necessity for the proposed vertical alignment of the A417 mainline and junction configuration within this specific area. As designed in the scheme, Shab Hill junction would be located in a localised valley which would require filling, using excess excavated material won from other locations in the scheme. To mitigate the visual impact of this section of the route, landscape earthworks in the form of false cuttings would be provided. These landscape earthworks would act to provide visual screening and noise reduction.</p> <p>The Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is recognised as having an extensive area of naturally occurring dark night skies. The Cotswolds Conservation Board in their Position Statement Dark Skies and Artificial Light are proactively working to help reduce light pollution and enhance the Dark Skies of the Cotswolds AONB. CCB Policy CE5: Dark Skies states: Proposals that are likely to impact on the dark skies of the Cotswolds AONB should have regard to these dark skies, by seeking to (i) avoid and (ii) minimise light pollution. Responding to the scheme's setting within the Cotswolds AONB, the scheme (including Shab Hill and Cowley junctions as well as the Ullenwood junction) would not be lit, to reduce the amount of light spillage to the Dark Skies area.</p>	Page 7 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Biodiversity (Chapter 8 of the ES)				
A.11	Mitigation and monitoring	<p>The National Trust reserve comment on the details of Chapter 8 until the full survey results and mitigation are presented. Comments to date, subject to review of the ES, specifically relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a scientific appraisal of the effectiveness of proposed mitigation methods for getting wildlife safely across roads • An analysis of species (inc. invertebrates and plants) and their relative mobility and ability to get across the widened road to see which would be most affected • alternative mitigation if the proposed fails to work (particularly bat roosts) • the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for habitat creation methodologies, SSSI fragmentation, long-term management, monitoring and remedial action • the viability and likely success of creating habitats within 200m of road where NOx levels exceed critical levels and loads • the compensation for loss of tufa and vegetation 	The full survey results and mitigation will be presented in the ES with appropriate cross references where applicable to other DCO documents.	April 2021
A.12	Mitigation and/or compensation for loss of high value grassland	With the detailed information on the vegetation NVC (Appendix 8.4) it is evident that the field north of Shab Hill is high value MG5 grassland. Appropriate mitigation and/or compensation needs to be provided.	All appropriate mitigation measures are set out in ES Chapter 8.	Pages 20 and 21 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.13	Compensation for the loss of veteran trees	The National Trust would like to understand what compensation is being provided for the loss of veteran trees.	The impact on and all appropriate mitigation is set out in ES Chapter 8.	Page 13 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.14	Bushley Muzzard SSSI	The National Trust would like to understand the hydrological effects on the SSSI, proposed mitigation, ongoing monitoring to assess long-term hydrological changes and processes to enforce remedial compensation (if required).	A hydrogeological impact assessment has been undertaken to understand the potential impacts on springs, associated surface water courses and groundwater resources and receptors. This will be presented as part of the ES Chapter 13. Numerical modelling of the groundwater regime will not be undertaken given the complexity of the study area and its interaction with the proposed scheme. The hydrogeological conceptual model, as presented in the ES, will be refined at detailed design. This will include any new data obtained from additional investigations including site specific ground investigations and groundwater monitoring. The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment presents the latest iteration of the hydrogeological conceptual model used to inform the impact assessment. The Hydrogeological Impact Assessment will be submitted as part of the ES accompanying the DCO application.	National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.15	Barrow Wake SSSI unit	National trust require review of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to decide whether proposed mitigation measures are robust enough to protect the Barrow Wake SSSI during construction and will strengthen the SSSI resilience.	The proposed mitigation measures for impacts on Barrow Wake will be set out in EMP (doc reference number)	National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.16	Habitat assessment	The National Trust consider that a reassessment of habitats based on their importance to species groups would resolve the concern regarding the impact assessment not being coherent.	Chapter 8 Biodiversity has been prepared in accordance with DMRB, and has carefully assessed impacts on habitats as appropriate.	Page 14 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
Geology and Soils (Chapter 9 of the ES)				
A.17	Soils	The National Trust would like to see a focus on the movement of topsoil and subsoil, to avoid or minimise any temporary and long-term impacts with regards to the creation of new woodland or grassland.	The movement of topsoil and subsoil with regards to the creation of new woodland or grassland will be outlined in the LEMP, available as part of the DCO documents.	Page 15 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)				
A.18	Noise effects	National Trust reserve comment on the specifics of Chapter 11 until they've had the opportunity to review the ES in detail. Particular comments, made to date, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact during operation from key locations that have heritage significance • ability to reduce noise during detailed design • the commitment from Highways England regarding the use of low noise road surfacing • assessment of noise effects which considers potential tree felling and the time lapse between new planting being established 	The full assessment will be presented in the ES with appropriate cross references where applicable to other DCO documents.	April 2021

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.19	A436 Roundabout to Shab Hill junction mitigation	The National Trust questions the likely success of the proposed mitigation to reduce noise and light pollution across this section of the scheme.	<p>Highways England has produced an Environmental Management Plan as part of the DCO application, which includes details of the mitigation and enhancement measures, such as wildlife access provisions including flight lines for bats, wildlife culverts and bridges. The commitments set out in the Environmental Management Plan are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Since the 2019 statutory consultation, the Gloucestershire Way crossing has been introduced to provide habitat connectivity and traffic-free public access. Public access through Shab Hill junction has been removed. Stone walls and landscape earthworks screen headlights. The junction will not be lit, further reducing light pollution.</p> <p>The scheme design includes the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. There will be beneficial effects for several PRoW due to the removal of traffic from the existing A417 to the south of Air Balloon roundabout; including parts of the Gloucestershire Way, Cotswold Way, and Gustav Holst Way. In areas to the southeast of Air Balloon roundabout, the incorporated noise mitigation would reduce adverse noise impacts as far as reasonably practicable, however, there would be some residual adverse noise impacts on footpaths around the new alignment, including parts of the Gloucestershire Way between Air Balloon roundabout and Coberley.</p>	Page 2 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
A.20	Visitor experience of Crickley Hill	<p>As previously stated, we consider that the effects of the proposed road scheme on the visitors to Crickley Hill, and their experience thereof, should be taken into consideration. Crickley Hill (both National Trust and GWT land) contributes to the health and wellbeing of the people who visit, whether they are local residents or visitors from further afield. It offers them the opportunity to get outdoors and close to nature and appreciate some great views across the Cotswolds landscape and beyond.</p> <p>National Trust reserve further comment until they have reviewed the assessment.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health considers the potential effects on the Country Park with visitor centre, café and waymarked trails. The assessment concludes there would be a minor impact, with a discernible change in attributes and environmental quality during construction activities in close proximity, with minor loss of and alteration to key characteristics. Construction requires acquisition of some land which would not compromise the overall viability of the resource, and access to the resource would be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The CTMP (ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan Annex B (Document Reference 6.4)) identify appropriate mitigation and phasing to help reduce adverse effects at Crickley Hill. For example, access to the facilities would be retained at all times. Highways England is committed to continuing to engage with all landowners and others affected to help identify and mitigate any potential adverse effects.</p>	Page 22 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.21	Access to Crickley Hill during construction	<p>In addition, the ability of people to gain access Crickley Hill during construction and operation of the scheme also needs careful consideration. We would want to be part of the dialogue in drafting the construction traffic management plan.</p> <p>National Trust reserve further comment until they have reviewed the assessment.</p>		Page 22 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.22	Increased pressure on Crickley Hill SSSI, the Cotswolds Commons and Beechwoods SAC	<p>National Trust reserve comment on specific elements of Chapter 12 until they've had the opportunity to review the ES, with a particular focus on concerns relating to increased visitor pressure and impacts on the Crickley Hill SSSI units and the Cotswolds Commons and Beechwoods Specials Areas of Conservation (SAC), and the expected assessment of visitor impacts on the SSSI and the resulting embedded or essential mitigation.</p>	<p>Recreational impacts on the SAC and SSSI are assessed in Chapter 8 Biodiversity and considered in Chapter 12 Population and Human Health. The ES cross references where appropriate to other DCO documents such as the HRA.</p>	Page 7 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Chapter 13 of the ES)				
A.23	Potential impact to downstream watercourses	The National Trust are concerned about the retaining walls for the road cutting, and the construction works to reduce the gradient of the dual carriageways at the base of Crickley Hill, because of the unknown impact it will have to the aquifers and hydrology in the area, in addition to the potential negative impacts to the water courses downstream (in particular Norman Brook and Hatherley Brook).	The EIA reported in Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water of the ES considers the potential impacts of the retaining walls and cuttings on the local hydrogeology including groundwater flows and levels within the aquifers. As part of the surveys, groundwater monitoring has been undertaken to provide information on the groundwater regime within the scheme area. This would inform the assessments of potential impacts of the scheme construction and allow for appropriate mitigation.	Page 16 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
A.24	Impact of loss of water supply on habitat	National Trust would like to further understand the implications and likelihood of “the interruption of flow [due to the cutting drainage system] may lead to a reduction or loss of water supply to abstractions, springs and streams and potential loss of habitat”, with the view that this could therefore influence the assessment of effects on biodiversity and the natural environment, and landscape and visual effects.	This will be detailed in Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water of the ES.	Page 16/17 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Climate (Chapter 14 of the ES)				
A.25	Climate change and emissions	<p>The National Trust reserve comment on Chapter 14 of the ES until they are able to review the detail. Positions raised, to date, regard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a request for a clear statement on how GHG emissions arising from the scheme could be accommodated within the government's carbon reduction plans a detailed assessment of the "capital, operational and user carbon emissions" arising from the road scheme • the vulnerability of the scheme to climate change – appropriate design and mitigation for resilience 	This will be detailed in Chapter 14 Climate of the ES.	Page 17 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
Environmental Management Plan				
A.26	Construction	<p>National Trust reserve comments until particular documents are available to review, including but not limited to the Environmental Management Plan, Traffic Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan. Comments, to date, regard concerns in relation to a commitment from Highways England that ensures every measure is taken to ensure that the impact of harm is mitigated, and with a management plan for construction (with particular reference to a compound in close proximity to the Cotswold Way crossing, and change in gradient)</p>	<p>Highways England has produced an Environmental Management Plan as part of the DCO application, which includes details of the mitigation and enhancement measures. The commitments set out in the Environmental Management Plan are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application. Highways England has also produced a Traffic Management Plan which will be submitted with the DCO application. Highways England will continue to engage with relevant stakeholders regarding construction management as the scheme progresses.</p>	Page 9 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
A.27	Construction mitigation	<p>The National Trust would like the following construction mitigation measures to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree protection areas around retained trees within the DCO Boundary • Measures to minimise soil loss during construction • Measures to prevent water course pollution during construction <p>Appropriate planning and use of excavated limestone and soil (limestone is a valuable material in habitat recreation projects. It would be good to see this used on site where limestone grassland creation is proposed, as well consideration for how excess can be used by local partners for habitat creation projects)</p>	<p>Highways England has produced an Environmental Management Plan which will be submitted as part of the DCO application, which includes details of the mitigation and enhancement measures. The commitments set out in the Environmental Management Plan are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Highways England has also produced a Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be submitted with the DCO application. Highways England will continue to engage with relevant stakeholders regarding construction management as the scheme progresses.</p>	Page 10 of National Trust response to Statutory Consultation, 6 November 2019
Crossings of the A417				
A.28	Gloucestershire Way crossing	National Trust reserve comment on the detail of the Gloucestershire Way crossing until they have been able to review information following detailed design to ascertain the efficacy of connecting target species.	This efficacy of connectivity is assessed in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the ES.	Page 3 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020
A.29	Cotswold Way crossing	National Trust consider that the Cotswold Way crossing presented in the 2020 supplementary consultation does not appear to reflect the Cotswolds characteristics, or the landscape colour palette when observing the geological features or landscape characteristics in the immediate vicinity and would like to understand the decision making process that has come to the proposed concept design.	The decision making process which informed the proposed design is set out in the Design Summary Report available as part of the DCO submission, and is subject to detailed design.	Page 3 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Ref.	Matter	National Trust position	Highways England position	Date of the position
Gradient change				
A.30	Impact on landscape	<p>National Trust considers that it will be important to ensure that any areas of greater landscape impact (for example because fast moving vehicles are physically closer to public rights of way) are fully understood and ameliorated where appropriate. This also applies to any greater noise impact on the users of Crickley Hill and public rights of way leading to it. Sound, light, air, NO² pollution are still of concern and we will want to further discuss the data and proposed mitigation (for example choice of road surface, noise barriers etc) to address these issues and associated impacts for Crickley Hill SSSI. We also want to understand and discuss the design detail of how the dual carriageway will actually tie into the verges, woodland edges and agricultural fields along the escarpment, whilst being sensitive to the geological rock exposures and water courses, but at this time, we believe that the 1% gradient change will have minimal impact on heritage or landscape.</p>	<p>A lower noise road surface, cuttings, earth bunding and Cotswold stone walls have been used to minimize the visual and noise effects of the scheme on the AONB and Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>A construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Assessment. Temporary significant construction noise effects have been assessed for parts of Crickley Hill during the proposed works, although not specifically from construction vehicles.</p> <p>Highways England has produced an Environmental Management Plan as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the Environmental Management Plan are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application. Temporary significant adverse noise effects associated with the proposed construction works have been identified as part of the assessment. Mitigation to manage construction noise and vibration impacts is described in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4), submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>	Page 5 of National Trust response to Supplementary Consultation, 10 November 2020

Appendix C National Trust's Landowner Position Statement

This document will be submitted early in the examination

Appendix H Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group

Table of Contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
1.2 The WCH TWG	1
1.3 Structure of this SoCG	3
1.4 Status of this SoCG	3
2 Consultation	4
2.1 Membership of the WCH TWG	4
2.2 Summary of consultation	5
3 Topics covered in this SoCG	19
4 Matters agreed	20
5 Matters outstanding	28
5.1 Principal matters outstanding	28
5.2 Matters outstanding	28
Appendices	i
Appendix A Signing Sheet	ii
Appendix B Terms of reference	xvii

Table of Tables

Table 2-1 Consultation activities with WCH TWG	6
Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered with this SoCG	19
Table 4-1 Matters agreed between WCH TWG and Highways England	20
Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between WCH TWG and Highways England	28

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a joint Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding (WCH) Technical Working Group (TWG) members in relation to the A417 Missing Link scheme, focusing on Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and Other Routes with Public Access rights (ORPAs).
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the parties:
- Matters that have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed).
- 1.1.3 The matters which are referenced in this document are those that are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, will be reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.4 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the pre-application and examination stages.
- 1.1.5 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided early in the examination.
- 1.1.6 This document has been prepared in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) guidance on the pre-application process¹.

1.2 The WCH TWG

- 1.2.1 This joint SoCG is between Highways England and a wide range of individuals and organisations with an interest in public access. For the purposes of the TWG, the term WCH includes users of public rights of way and Other Routes with Public Access Rights, including disabled users.
- 1.2.2 The following parties have been involved in the WCH TWG since its first meeting in July 2019 (acknowledging some members represent more than one organisation and some have changed over time, please see Appendix B1.1.7):
1. Active Gloucestershire;
 2. British Horse Society (BHS);
 3. Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Gloucestershire;
 4. Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign;
 5. Cotswold District Council;
 6. Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB);
 7. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership²;
 8. Cycling UK;
 9. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) PRoW officer;

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

² The Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership were represented by a member of the Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) who coordinated feedback and inputs to the group as appropriate

10. GCC transport officer;
11. GCC ThinkTravel Coordinator;
12. Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF);
13. Gloucestershire Ramblers;
14. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust;
15. National Trust;
16. Natural England;
17. Sustrans;
18. The Disabled Ramblers; and
19. Trail Riders Fellowship.

- 1.2.3 Without being formal members, on occasions representatives have joined the WCH TWG from Coberley Parish Council, Birdlip and Cowley Parish Council, and Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council, to help better understand the proposals and opportunities pertinent to local access.
- 1.2.4 This SoCG has been informed by WCH TWG meetings and correspondence with representatives from the above organisations. Those representatives were identified through engagement with Highways England and its Strategic Stakeholder Panel, as well as recommendations from individuals and organisations during the engagement process associated with the TWG and those engaged with the wider design and development of the scheme.
- 1.2.5 This has led to membership of the group changing and expanding over time in order to help introduce representation of different interests relevant to the scheme and rights of way.
- 1.2.6 Given the nature of the SoCG and the multi-party involvement, the following points should be acknowledged / recognised:
- a) Some organisations have engaged in the TWG at different levels and, as set out above, membership of the group has changed and expanded over time. In some instances, this has led to some organisations being involved at an early stage and not at a later stage of consultation (e.g. Sustrans), and so this SoCG has not been signed by all parties involved and set out within this document.
 - b) Some members of the WCH TWG are members of more than one of the organisations represented.
 - c) The TWG comprises members that try to best represent their organisations where appropriate but acknowledge that interests and opinions can differ within organisations as well as within the TWG.
- 1.2.7 All members of the WCH TWG have been provided with Terms of Reference for the group, to help establish the role and function of its engagement with Highways England. A copy is provided at Appendix B.
- 1.2.8 Members of the WCH TWG have been engaged through a variety of group and smaller or one-to-one focused meetings in addition to written correspondence to support engagement activities. The details of meetings are provided in section 2 of this SoCG.
- 1.2.9 It should be acknowledged that in some cases, focused meetings were necessary to accommodate the availability of a large number of stakeholders and some requests to focus on particular matters (e.g. walking, cycling or horse riding).

- 1.2.10 A Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoW Management Plan) (see Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan) has been developed iteratively since July 2019 and has been shared and discussed with the WCH TWG to help capture proposals and commitments pertinent to PRoW as the appropriate document in support of the DCO application.
- 1.2.11 It should also be recognised that some of the members of the WCH TWG submitted their own individual and/or organisation responses to the statutory public consultation associated with the scheme held between 27 September 2019 and 8 November 2019. Further and supplementary public consultation was held between 13 October 2020 and 12 November 2020. Any such responses are responded to as part of the statutory Consultation Report in support of the Development Consent Order application.

1.3 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of the WCH TWG in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken.
 - Section 3 summarises the topics considered within the SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Chapter 5 lists those matters which remain outstanding, incorporating: a description of the matter; the position of both parties; any actions taken to address the matter; and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.
- 1.3.2 Appendix A includes the signing sheet.
- 1.3.3 Appendix B includes the Terms of Reference.

1.4 Status of this SoCG

- 1.4.1 This joint SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of the parties at the pre-application stage.
- 1.4.2 It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of those party to this SoCG may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the examination stage.

2 Consultation

2.1 Membership of the WCH TWG

2.1.1 The following members of the WCH TWG are statutory consultees:

Gloucestershire County Council

2.1.2 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated wholly within the boundaries of GCC. It is therefore a statutory consultee for the proposed scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(c) of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).

2.1.3 GCC is the local highway authority for Gloucestershire and has statutory duties in relation to local highways and maintenance, as well as the PRow network.

Cotswold District Council

2.1.4 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated partially within the boundaries of Cotswold District Council. It is therefore a statutory consultee for the proposed scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(b) of the Act.

2.1.5 Cotswold District Council is the local planning authority for Cotswold District.

National Trust

2.1.6 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated partially on land which is owned and/or managed by the National Trust. PRows also pass through this land. They are therefore statutory consultees for the proposed scheme, as defined under section 42 (1)(d) and section 44 of the Act.

2.1.7 This SoCG deals with issues that are relevant to the National Trust in their capacity as an affected landowner and a conservation organisation. While comments received from the National Trust regarding WCH and PRow provision have been included within the development of proposals and this SoCG, it should be noted that the National Trust have their own SoCG with Highways England and as such have expressed that they wish to sign their separate SoCG given their full position is outlined within their specific SoCG.

Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust

2.1.8 The A417 Missing Link scheme is situated partially on land which is owned and/or managed by the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. PRows also pass through this land. They are therefore statutory consultees for the proposed scheme, as defined under section 42 (1)(d) and section 44 of the Act.

2.1.9 This SoCG deals with issues that are relevant to the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust in their capacity as an affected landowner and a conservation organisation.

2.1.10 The Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust have expressed that they wish to sign their separate SoCG given their full position is outlined within their specific SoCG with Highways England.

Natural England

2.1.11 Natural England is a statutory body established under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act). Natural England is the statutory advisor to Government on nature conservation in England and promotes the conservation of England’s wildlife and natural features. Natural England is a statutory consultee under section 42(a) of the Act.

- 2.1.12 While the comments received from Natural England regarding WCH and PRowS have been included within the development of proposals and this SoCG, it should be noted that Natural England have their own SoCG with Highways England and as such have expressed that they wish to sign their separate SoCG given their full position is outlined within their specific SoCG.

Cotswolds Conservation Board

- 2.1.13 Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) (also known as the Cotswolds National Landscape) is an independent statutory body that works to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was established by Parliamentary Order in 2004 and is one of two Conservation Boards in England.
- 2.1.14 CCB is a statutory consultee under section 42(a) of the Act.
- 2.1.15 CCB has expressed that they wish to sign their separate SoCG given their full position is outlined within their specific SoCG with Highways England.

Non-statutory consultees

- 2.1.16 All other members of the WCH TWG are non-statutory consultees but are interest groups that have volunteered their time to share their local and/or expert knowledge pertinent to PRow and ORPA.
- 2.1.17 Highways England consults with these individuals and organisation under section 47 of the Act.

2.2 Summary of consultation

- 2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with the WCH TWG during the development of the scheme's design. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the scheme.
- 2.2.2 The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 covers formal consultation with the TWG, and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as technical notes, requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below, but are available on request.
- 2.2.3 Meeting minutes were taken for each event. Matters discussed are summarised here and reflect the feedback or views of WCH TWG members involved and do not necessarily represent the views of Highways England then or now.
- 2.2.4 It should also be acknowledged that some of the WCH TWG members also attended other consultation meetings and events associated with the scheme, for example strategic stakeholder panel meetings, and events during the statutory consultation periods.
- 2.2.5 The consultation with the WCH TWG since the Preferred Route Announcement in March 2019 is set out in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Consultation activities with WCH TWG

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
2 July 2019	Landscape, Heritage and Environment Technical Working Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Cotswold AONB/Cotswolds Conservation Board 3. Cotswold District Council 4. Environment Agency 5. GCC 6. Historic England 7. National Trust 8. Natural England 9. Tewkesbury District Council 	<p>Whilst the Landscape, Heritage and Environment TWG is separate to that of the WCH TWG, some parties are members of both. At the 2nd July TWG meeting, Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and sought feedback including on WCH matters. Points raised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The need to obtain GIS data for mapping to make sure the baseline reflects the latest definitive maps b) Places such as Leckhampton Hill and Seven Springs Layby (both joining the Air Balloon Roundabout) identified as a key location where people park and walk c) Barrow Wake was identified as a key place for people to walk and enjoy the views via the Cotswold Way National Trail d) There is the opportunity to make a feature of the Golden Heart Inn e) The impact of the use of cars on the environment in this area, and anti-social behaviour f) Connections to the east of Cheltenham and the importance of links between routes and connections to the wider area g) The need for diversions of WCH routes/PROW to be as short and like-for-like as possible where practicable, ideally with continuation of the same status h) The importance of reconnecting and upgrading footpaths with connections to existing open land i) WCH movements and associated environmental impacts on Crickley Hill Country Park and Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation j) The opportunities for WCH surrounding Gloucestershire Way and link into the wider PROW network k) The provision of overbridges and the opportunities to landscape them and reduce noise impacts l) The type of surfacing which should be used

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
8 August 2019	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership 3. GCC transport planning officers 4. GLAF 5. Gloucestershire Ramblers 	<p>Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought from the group on the draft PRoW Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Gloucestershire Ramblers expressed objection to the proposed implementation of the preferred route and suggested a number of improvements to minimise the impact on walking and the landscape so that the scheme could meet its claims of being landscape-led and of recreational benefit.</p>
14 August 2019	Focused Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. GCC PRoW officer 	<p>Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought on the draft PRoW Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.</p>
14 August 2019	Focused Walking Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Sustrans 	<p>Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought on the draft PRoW Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.</p>
4 September 2019	Focused Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. British Horse Society 	<p>Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought from the group on the draft PRoW Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.</p>
27 September 2019 to 8 November 2019	Statutory public consultation	All	<p>Members of the WCH TWG were notified on 27th September 2019 by letter and/or email of the statutory consultation and provided with a deadline to submit their responses (11.59pm on 8th November 2019). The statutory consultation sought views on the scheme design and the Preliminary Environmental Information which was published for the consultation. Many members of the WCH TWG provided responses to the statutory consultation, which are reported upon in the Consultation Report submitted with the DCO application.</p>

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
1 October 2019	Focussed Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical Working Group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust 3. National Trust 	Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought from the group on the draft PRow Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.
8 October 2019	Focused Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Natural England 	Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought from the group on the draft PRow Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.
10 October 2019	Focused Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. GLAF 	Highways England provided an update on the scheme design and set out the Terms of Reference and SoCG process. Feedback was sought from the group on the draft PRow Management Plan and the proposals it contained, as well as the baseline and methodology of the assessment underpinning it.
27 November 2019	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Active Gloucestershire 3. British Horse Society 4. Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign/Cycling UK 5. Cotswold Conservation Board 6. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership 7. Disabled Ramblers 8. GCC PRow Manager 9. GCC ThinkTravel Coordinator 10. GCC Transport Planning Department 11. GLAF 12. Gloucestershire Ramblers 13. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust 14. National Trust 15. Natural England 	Highways England provided a project update and the change in methodology for the Environmental Impact Assessment under DMRB. The session consisted of a PRow Management Plan workshop which discussed the scheme proposals in three sections. Feedback was sought from the group on the PRow proposals. Members of the group were able to mark-up plans with their comments at the workshop (plans were not shared externally for individual mark-up and were subsequently updated as appropriate). Highways England provided more detail on the SoCG process and how it would be structured and progressed.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
10 February 2020	Email	British Horse Society	Emailed concerns about use of the unclassified road 50944 and suggested alternative.
19 February 2020	Email	Highways England British Horse Society	Emailed response to concerns about use of the unclassified road 50944 and suggested alternative.
24 February 2020	Email in response to the scheme and draft PRow Management Plan	GCC	Feedback on the latest design proposals for the scheme and detailed points and proposals set out within the draft PRow Management Plan.
27 February 2020	Focused Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Gloucestershire Local Access Form 	Highways England provided an overview of the response to statutory consultation, and then set out the updates to the scheme design that were made following the consultation. The proposals for further changes to the scheme design were set out, and an update provided on the next steps and programme of the scheme.
3 March 2020	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. British Horse Society 3. Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign 4. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership 5. GCC PRow officer 6. GCC Thinktravel co-ordinator 7. GCC Transport Planning Officer 8. GLAF 9. Gloucestershire Ramblers 10. National Trust 11. Natural England 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England provided an overview of the response to statutory consultation, and then set out the updates to the scheme design that were made following the consultation. The proposals for further changes to the scheme design were set out • The SoCG with the group was discussed and the process for updating it • The majority of the meeting consisted of a workshop on the updated PRow Management Plan in which the members' views on the updated proposals were sought • An update on the programme of the scheme was provided
1 April 2020	Email in response to the scheme and draft PRow Management Plan	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Feedback on the latest design proposals for the scheme and detailed points and proposals set out within the draft PRow Management Plan (issued to WCH TWG members on 24 February 2020).

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
28 May 2020	Letter (via email due to Covid-19) and phone call	All members of the WCH TWG	Members of the WCH TWG were notified via a letter that the DCO submission of the A417 Missing Link scheme would be delayed due to further design and development work. The letter stated that Highways England would be continuing to engage with stakeholders. Members of the Highways England team followed up the email with a phone call to outline the contents of the letter and advise of the delay.
2 July 2020	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Query as to when TWGs will re-start and information provided with notes on crossings of the A417 and an updated position from the Gloucestershire Ramblers, seeking continued input into scheme and suggestions made for future format of TWG meetings. Highways England replied to advise that a TWG would be scheduled imminently and that the information provided would be considered.
22 July 2020	Combined Technical Working Group meeting	Members of the WCH TWG and the Environment, Heritage and Landscape TWG	Project update following delay to programme, setting out the key changes to the design and the amended timescales. Invited questions from stakeholders during the session. A presentation and Q&A summarising the session was subsequently issued to all attendees (on 11 th August).
28 July 2020	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Provided updated information on the views of Gloucestershire Ramblers. Provided link to the Gloucestershire Ramblers June 2020 newsletter and attached documents summarising the position of the Gloucestershire Area group in May 2020. Links provided to recent press about the delay to the scheme.
6 August 2020	Emails	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Two further emails setting out the position of the Gloucestershire Ramblers in relation to the scheme. Marked-up map provided of ORPAs and PRow numbers, as well as suggested proposals for scheme design changes.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
12 August 2020	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Active Gloucestershire 3. British Horse Society 4. Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign 5. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership 6. GCC PRoW officer 7. GCC Thinktravel co-ordinator 8. GCC Transport Planning Officer 9. GLAF 10. Gloucestershire Ramblers 11. National Trust 12. Natural England 13. CPRE 14. Disabled Ramblers 15. Sustrans 16. Cotswold District Council 17. Woodland Trust 	Highways England provided an update on how the design changes in the scheme have resulted in changes to the PROW network. Feedback was sought from the group and Q&A on the proposals. The next steps were outlined including the issue of the draft updated PROW Management Plan, the upcoming statutory consultation and the SoCG process. Minutes were issued on 4 th September.
14 August 2020	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Request that SoCG makes it clear how organisations' views are represented – whether these are individual views or views of an organisation and which organisations are best able to comment on relevant matters. Provided clarification on role and purpose of Gloucestershire Ramblers as a charity working for all walkers.
28 August 2020	Email	All members of the WCH TWG	Highways England shared with the group the draft General Arrangement and Profile plans for the scheme, ahead of the supplementary public consultation. It was explained that the information was work in progress, draft and confidential and should only be shared within their organisation where there is a legitimate reason to do so. This was followed up with an email on 1 September sharing the draft PRoW Management Plan as well.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
1 September 2020	Telephone call	British Horse Society	<p>A number of queries regarding the proposals, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the likely increase in motor traffic on Crickley Hill and how this may affect the A40 the possibility of a pegasus crossing near the Frogmill pub at Shipton Oliffe concerns from horse riders that the bridleways are on the wrong side of the road where the A40 meets the A417
2 September 2020	Email	British Horse Society	<p>Highways England Population and Health specialist provided a response to queries made on 1st September. Provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> information on the traffic modelling on the scheme for flows on the A436 and A40 confirmation that a pegasus crossing near the Frogmill would be outside of the scope of the scheme due to being significantly outside of the DCO Boundary, but BHS could speak to the relevant local authority about such provision the proposals at the new Ullenwood junction (A417/A436) are considered to provide an appropriate and safe arrangement for all users
2 September 2020	Email	GLAF	<p>Feedback on the draft PRow Management Plan, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarification sought on what is proposed to provide a connection from the west end of the severed eastern half of the Unclassified Road (UCR) 50853 to the northern part of the proposed new Shab Hill junction clarification sought on what is proposed for the section of UCR 47282 that runs north-eastwards from Barrow Wake car park to the present A417 just south of the Air Balloon
2 September 2020	Email	GLAF	<p>Response to query on 2nd September to state that the next WCH SoCG meeting would provide a justification for the proposals in the PRow Management Plan and that a more detailed specialist response would be provided directly, as soon as possible, regarding the crossings queried</p>

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
Between 8 September and 14 September 2020	Meeting and emails	Gloucestershire Ramblers	A two-part meeting to discuss Gloucestershire Ramblers' concerns over PRow provision in revised scheme and suggestions that the group has put forward for alternative or additional design suggestions, including the downsides of increase of the current gradient from 7% to 8% (in terms of visual and noise impact) and that the Air Balloon should be referred to as an Inn rather than a pub otherwise its significance to many people as part of the landscape and heritage would be missed. Highways England specialists provided their view on the suggestions that the Ramblers had provided and discussed feasibility of these. It was agreed further position statements on these topics would be provided by Highways England in due course. Associated with these meetings were a number of emails from Gloucestershire Ramblers containing further thoughts and information to help inform the ongoing discussions.
12 September 2020	Email	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign	Set out three concerns for the A417, having reviewed updated PRow Management Plan and information sent on 28 August. Considers there to be some good improvements but three areas outstanding: lack of crossing at Crickleigh Farm; lack of clarity on bridleway at Dog Lane to Cold Slad Lane; and Cotswold Way bridge which needs to be a green bridge. Highways England PRow specialist responded on 14 th September to advise that these points would be considered and be discussed in updated SoCG and next WCH SoCG meeting.
16 September 2020	Meeting	GCC PRow and highways officer	Meeting to discuss: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The council's position on a potential unclassified road or byway open to all traffic (BOAT) connecting to Shab Hill junction; 2. Reclassification of existing PRow e.g. at Grove Farm 3. Historic severance of crossing points of the A417 near Dog Lane
18 September 2020	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Gloucestershire Ramblers set out their views on three points following the meetings held on 8 ^h and 14 th September: the need to retain the Air Balloon Public House; the impact of the gradient on the cutting and level and waste material; and the operation of the TWGs and SoCGs.

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
29 September 2020	WCH impacts on Crickley Hill meeting	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and National Trust	Meeting to discuss the walking, cycling and horse riding impacts of the updated scheme on Crickley Hill. An alternative option for replacement Common Land and access to/from the Barrow Wake car park was discussed and supported by the Wildlife Trust, to reduce potential impact on the SSSI. Support was expressed for removing existing rights of way from areas of SSSI where appropriate to do so.
29 September 2020	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Active Gloucestershire 3. British Horse Society 4. Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign 5. Disabled Ramblers 6. GCC PRoW officer 7. GLAF 8. Gloucestershire Ramblers 9. National Trust 10. Natural England 11. Trail Riders Fellowship 	<p>Meeting to provide initial feedback on the draft Public Rights of Way Management Plan, draft Chapter 12 Population and Health of the 2020 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report and progress the Statement of Common Ground in light of the latest scheme design. Key areas for improvement expressed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of Shab Hill connection – provision of a BOAT between existing unclassified road and proposed junction • Crossing west end of the scheme - suggested additional crossing • Common Land - opportunity to carry on the restricted byway as part of the repurposed A417 along the edge of the replacement Common Land and across the Cotswold Way crossing. This would allow Highways England to extend the Common Land further and avoid impact on the SSSI at Barrow Wake
13 October 2020	Supplementary statutory public consultation	All	Members of the WCH TWG were notified of the supplementary statutory consultation and provided with a deadline to submit their responses (11.59pm on 12 November 2020). The consultation sought views on the revised scheme design and the 2020 Preliminary Environmental Information which was published for the consultation. Many members of the WCH TWG provided responses to the statutory consultation, which are reported upon in the Consultation Report submitted with the DCO application.
20 October 2020	Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. CCB 3. GCC PRoW officer 4. Natural England 	Meeting to discuss the diversion of the National Trail and associated requirements as part of the scheme and its DCO application

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
23 October 2020	Email	British Horse Society Highways England	Query raised during Teams Live event during public consultation from the British Horse Society about extending the bridleway from Ullenwood Junction along to the Crickley Hill Access Road as far as Coberley Bridleway 10 further along Leckhampton Hill Road. Emailed response from Highways England.
28 October 2020	Email	British Horse Society Highways England	Queries by email from the British Horse Society about connections and routes proposed near Barrow Wake, replacement Common Land and unclassified road 50853. Emailed response from Highways England.
18 January 2021	Email	WCH TWG Members	<p>Email to confirm intention to issue an emailed letter from Highways England confirming all of the design changes adopted since the public consultation that was held in Autumn 2020.</p> <p>Providing thanks for comments in response to the consultation, on the draft WCH Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and draft PRow Management Plan.</p> <p>Emailed two technical notes as previously requested / promised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shab Hill Connectivity – confirming the new sections of BOAT each side of the proposed Shab Hill junction 2. PRow Connection at Online Section – confirming the reasons why we have been able to provide a Grove Farm underpass but no further crossings of the A417 west of Grove Farm <p>Confirmation of intention to share a third technical note, on tunnelling and cut and cover solutions.</p>
22 January 2021	Email	Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign	Email to provide further information about the arrangement and use of footpaths 77, 74, 80, 84 and 86 interfacing with the existing A417, and support for the scheme should an additional underpass offset from the bat underpass (in the vicinity of footpath 86) be provided.
29 January 2021	Email	WCH TWG Members	<p>Email to provide an update and agenda for 4 February meeting, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A PowerPoint presentation to inform the meeting on 4 February • A copy of the PRow Management Plan • A copy of the PRow Proposals Drawings • A copy of the latest SoCG document
3 February 2021	Email	National Trust	Notes to inform the update to the SoCG document

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
4 February 2021	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Notes to inform a position on the details of the Public Rights of Way Management Plan
4 February 2021	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. Active Gloucestershire 3. Cowley and Birdlip Parish Council 4. British Horse Society 5. Cheltenham and Tewksbury Cycling Campaign 6. Coberley Parish Council 7. Cotswold Way Association 8. Disabled Ramblers 9. GCC 10. GLAF 11. Gloucestershire Ramblers 12. National Trust 13. Natural England 14. Trail Riders Fellowship 15. CPRE 	Meeting to provide feedback on the design fix for assessment, discuss the Public Rights of Way Management Plan proposals (as also outlined in ES Chapter 12), and progress the Statement of Common Ground. A review of each of the proposals for PRow as set out in the Public Rights of Way Management Plan was held to better understand where each party agreed or disagreed.
8 February 2021	Email	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	Notes to inform the update to the SoCG document
10 February 2021	Email	British Horse Society	Concerns about the use of the 50944 up by Stockwell to carry WCH along the west of the new road, with suggestion for new bridleway.
17 February 2021	Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. GCC PRow Manager 3. GCC ThinkTravel Coordinator 4. GCC Transport Planning Department 5. GCC Highways Department 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary update from WCH TWG and design fix 2. Position with stakeholder requests for additional crossing(s) to the west of the scheme 3. Access to proposed bus stop near Birdlip

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
19 February 2021	Email	British Horse Society	Highways England response to email dated 10 February 2021, clarifying engagement held with GCC about the issues raised and reasons why Highways England is not able to accommodate the request at this time but with some reassurance about the future of the existing network, in addition to our proposals seeking to enhance it where possible.
23 February 2021	Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. GCC 3. Cowley and Birdlip Parish Council 	Access to proposed bus stop near Birdlip and potential alternatives given safety concerns
24 February 2021	Email	WCH TWG Members	Email to provide a copy of the latest SoCG document for comment in advance of the 29 March meeting
22 March 2021	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Comments to update positions within the SoCG
29 March 2021	Email	Gloucestershire Ramblers	Comments to update positions within the SoCG
29 March 2021	Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Technical working group meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. GCC 3. National Trust 4. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust 5. Gloucestershire Ramblers 6. Disabled Ramblers 7. Gloucestershire Local Access Forum 8. British Horse Society 9. Coberley Parish Council 10. Birdlip and Cowley Parish Council 11. Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council 	Pre application meeting to discuss and agree the draft Statement of Common Ground.
29 March 2021	Emails	Highways England British Horse Society	Clarifications with additions / corrections for consultation activities, and response from Highways England

Date	Method	Parties involved	Matters discussed
30 March 2021	Email	Highways England Gloucestershire Ramblers	Response to email 29 March to address comments within suggested update to positions within the SoCG
31 March 2021	Emails	Highways England Gloucestershire Ramblers	Comments to update positions within the SoCG from Gloucestershire Ramblers and response from Highways England
4 May 2021	Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways England 2. CCB 3. GCC PRow Officer 4. Natural England 	Meeting to discuss the draft National Trail Diversion Report and associated requirements as part of the scheme and its DCO application

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG.

Table 3-1 Summary of the topics considered with this SoCG

Overarching topic	Topic number	Topic
Background	1.	Principle of Development
	2.	Project Description
	3.	Consultation
Assessment	4.	Population and Human Health, including WCH (Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement)
	5.	Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Annex F to the Environmental Management Plan)
Potential Effects	6.	Effects and proposed mitigation for PRoW
Proposals	7.	New sections of PRoW
	8.	Reclassification of PRoW
	9.	Promotion of Public Access Rights
	10.	De-trunking of the existing A417

3.1.2 To avoid unnecessary duplication, and only where appropriate to do so, where matters are pertinent to more than one topic they are only made once in the topic section of most relevance. For example, where a matter may be relevant in both sections for topics 4 and 5, it may only appear in either topic section 4 or 5.

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 Table 4-1 shows those matters which have been agreed by some of the parties, including a matter reference number to assist the reader, and the date and method by which it was agreed. This table sets out where members of the WCH TWG agree with the matter specified unless where one or more members of the WCH TWG do not agree with the matter, then it is set out that this is explained in the next chapter 5, where matters are outstanding with one or more of the TWG members.

Table 4-1 Matters agreed between WCH TWG and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Principle/Need for Development		
1.1	The TWG members generally agree with the need for development in helping to address the current situation of poor road safety and daily congestion and that the solution should reflect the special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	TWG meeting held on 03.03.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
1.2	The TWG members generally agree with the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme that will deliver a safe and resilient free-flowing road whilst conserving and enhancing the special character of the nationally important protected landscape of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) that the new route passes through.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
2. Project Description		
2.1	The majority of TWG members agree with the form of the scheme to address the objectives of the A417 Missing Link as a landscape-led scheme, acknowledging that some members have expressed concerns about specific impacts, elements or suggested alternatives. This is addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
3. Consultation		
3.1	Through a collaborative approach to the preparation of the PRow Management Plan (see Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan) and feeding back on the relevant WCH sections of the Population and Human Health assessment found in Chapter 12 of the ES, the majority of WCH members agree their views and opinions have been listened to, with reasons given where Highways England have not been able to adopt their suggestions. For example, technical notes have been shared to help explain Highways England's position on some matters outstanding found in chapter 5.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
3.2	The TWG members agree that the detail of design will be discussed and agreed between Highways England, its contractor and GCC should the scheme progress to construction. This would include, for example, details of surfaces, signage and enclosures. The views of other organisations should be considered as part of detailed design and the PRow Management Plan (see Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan) sets out requirements for Highways England and its contractor. The TWG members would like to continue to be involved in the development of the detailed design of the scheme and its implementation, and Highways England agrees that GCC will represent the TWG members in discussions and agreements made with Highways England and its Contractor at the detailed design stage as the appropriate authority to do so.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 03.03.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4. Population and Human Health (Chapter 12 of the ES)		
4.1	The TWG members and Highways England agree that the consideration and assessment of potential effects on PRow has been undertaken using the most up to date and appropriate standard (namely the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Standard LA 112).	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4.2	The TWG members agree with Highways England's approach to include unclassified roads / ORPAs in the definition of local routes alongside PRow for the purposes of the ES. Highways England also agrees that non-motorised users of classified roads have public access rights to use highways where there are no legal restrictions to do so.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4.3	The TWG members agree with Highways England's approach to include disabled users in the definition of WCH for the purposes of the ES, building on the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Standard LA 112.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4.4	The TWG members and Highways England agree that the baseline for WCH and PRow matters are adequately set out and recorded.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4.5	<p>GCC and Highways England agree that the previous A417 scheme caused fragmentation or severance of historic crossing points of the A417 near Dog Lane, where Badgeworth footpaths converge and meet the A417, which has been exacerbated by increased motor traffic levels over time. GCC has expressed these routes may have been better stopped-up at that time to prevent safety concerns associated with some users continuing to attempt to cross the A417 mainline at grade despite areas of vegetation, embankment, fencing and central reservation/safety barriers causing obstruction to crossings. Highways England has expressed concerns for the safety of walkers crossing in this location, supported by recorded incidents, including a fatality of a pedestrian.</p> <p>TWG members and Highways England agree that, where possible and reasonable to do so, the proposed scheme could help to provide enhancement rather than mitigation by addressing the fragmentation or severance caused by the previous scheme and by providing crossings of the A417. A technical note was shared by Highways England with the TWG members on 18 January 2021 to explain the reasons why it has been able to provide a Grove Farm underpass but no further WCH crossings of the A417 west of Grove Farm, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money.</p> <p>GCC agree the proposal for the Grove Farm underpass would adequately achieve a safe north-south crossing of the A417 in this location.</p> <p>Where some members of the TWG have expressed the need for further crossing points not proposed by the scheme (where some members consider there is a need to retain crossings), this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 GCC meeting held on 16.09.2020 Email sent 18.01.2021 Position reconsidered and confirmed within the Statement of Common Ground between Joint Councils and Highways England Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
4.6	<p>The majority of TWG members generally agree with the assessment of potential effects on the WCH and PRoW network.</p> <p>Any exceptions are addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
4.7	<p>The TWG members agree that the ES appropriately cross refers to the PRoW Management Plan (Annex F to the Environmental Management Plan), which sets out appropriate requirements for Highways England and its contractor pertinent to WCH routes and PRoW should the scheme proceed to construction.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
4.8	The TWG members and Highways England agree existing and replacement Common Land associated with the scheme can be accessed on foot, whereas access to cyclists and horse riders is prohibited for legal reasons. The TWG members agree that the quantity and accessibility of the replacement Common Land provides an improved situation compared to the existing. Any surfacing, signage and enclosures would be agreed at the detailed design stage.	GCC meeting held 16.09.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4.9	The TWG members agree that the ES Appendix 12.2 'Walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users review at preliminary design' document has been undertaken to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help ensure that previously identified opportunities at the assessment phase have been taken into account and implemented where achievable; • identify opportunities for improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians as a result of the developing highway scheme design; and • Provide survey data and design details. 	TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4.10	The TWG members agree with the proposed provision of two areas of parking to the eastern end of the repurposed A417 for users of the Air Balloon Way, near the Golden Heart Inn and Stockwell Lane, including car parking and horse box spaces, and disabled parking spaces respectively. This seeks to help improve access to recreational routes, provide safe areas of parking, and help relieve pressure on Crickley Hill Country Park and Barrow Wake car parks with associated Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5. Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan)		
5.1	The TWG members generally agree that the PRow Management Plan sets out sufficient and adequate mitigation and enhancement of WCH routes and PRow. Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative mitigation and enhancement measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meetings held on 27.11.2019 and 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.2	The TWG members generally agree the proposals set out in the PRow Management Plan would benefit the WCH and PRow network in the study area overall. Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative mitigation and enhancement measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meetings held on 27.11.2019 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.3	The TWG members generally agree with Highways England's attempts to provide access for as many users as possible for existing or new PRow where appropriate, although acknowledging that some members have expressed concerns for reclassifying existing routes and would not agree that where a footpath is reclassified to a bridleway or restricted byway that it is terms an 'upgrade'. This is addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 Focused meetings held on 11.09.2020 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.4	The TWG members support and accept the need to consider gradients and safe PRow routes for all throughout, including ensuring access for disabled users utilising the British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles which would be agreed at the detailed design stage. The TWG members agree with Highways England's aim for a maximum gradient of 5% on new walking and cycling routes but accept this may not be possible on all / existing routes (as set out in the ES Appendix 12.2 'Walking, cycling and horse riding including disabled users review at preliminary design' document).	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.5	The TWG members broadly agree with the hierarchy for mitigation and understand Highways England and its Contractor would discuss and agree detailed matters during construction (and operation) at the design stage (e.g. to assist with the selection of appropriate surfaces, signage and enclosures). Highways England agree that appropriate diversions, design parameters and materials would be provided for substituted and new PRow, taking into account the proposed type and nature of the proposed PRow.	TWG meeting held on 03.03.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.6	The TWG members agree that Highways England does not have the powers to create amenities/facilities, for example café and toilet facilities at Barrow Wake car park, for the use of WCH. However, this could instead be explored (and delivered) by the local authority, the landowner or private businesses. Highways England agrees that the demolition of the Air Balloon Public House would result in the loss of existing facilities, as reported within the Environmental Statement as a likely significant effect.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.7	In general, TWG members agree that the PRow Management Plan is seeking to maintain and where possible enhance routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders including appropriate use of footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways, unclassified roads and the repurposed A417 ('Air Balloon Way'). Specific exceptions where some TWG members object to particular proposals for PRow are addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.8	In general, the Disabled Ramblers and other members representing disabled users agree with the PRow Management Plan in seeking to maintain and where possible enhance accessible routes for all users including use of footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways, unclassified roads and the 'Air Balloon Way'. Specific exceptions are addressed in chapter 5.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
5.9	Classifications of substituted and new PRoW have been discussed with GCC PRoW officers, who will update their Definitive Maps as necessary, following notification of completion of works by Highways England and its contractor. GCC would then be responsible for maintaining legal access to those PRoW, subject to any discussions and agreements made at the detailed design stage. Highways England further agrees any changes to the List of Streets would be updated by GCC.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 16.09.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.10	Highways England agrees that post construction, surfaces would be made good and restored/be as per existing. Suitable surfaces for different types and classification of routes will be provided, taking into account relevant guidance, for example from the British Horse Society and others as appropriate, to be coordinated through GCC at the detailed design stage when such details would be agreed. For multipurpose routes (e.g. routes providing private means of access and a footpath) details of surfaces and access restrictions features (e.g. enclosures) will be agreed with Highways England, its contractor, GCC, the landowner and/or third party responsible for maintenance and/or use of that surface and/or route.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5.11	Highways England agrees that with its contractor it will provide appropriate signage for re-provided and new PRoW in agreement with GCC, to be discussed and agreed at the detailed design stage.	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
6. Effects and proposed mitigation for the existing PRoW network		
6.1	<p>The TWG members agree that where there are instances of stopping-up, the PRoW Management Plan seeks to minimise or where possible reduce journey distances with diversions, with all reasonable efforts made to avoid or limit as far as practicable diversions especially for walkers who are typically most adversely impacted by diversions.</p> <p>Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative mitigation measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2019 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
6.2	<p>The TWG members agree that the mitigation of the severance of the Cotswold Way National Trail by way of a new Cotswold Way crossing would result in an enhancement compared to its existing situation, by virtue of a grade separated and safer crossing of the A417 for users. The TWG members agree that a restricted byway designation over the crossing is most appropriate, helping connect the Air Balloon Way and provide access to all non-motorised users.</p> <p>Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Cotswold Way crossing and/or consider further or alternative mitigation measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
6.3	<p>The TWG members agree that the mitigation of the severance of the Gloucestershire Way long distance path by way of a new crossing would result in an appropriate solution when compared to its existing situation, by virtue of a grade separated and safe crossing of the A417 for users. Reasonable steps have been taken to divert the Gloucestershire Way as close to its existing alignment as possible, responding to the constraints and limitations of the scheme. The TWG members generally agree a bridleway designation over the crossing is the most appropriate, helping connect footpath and bridleway connections either end of the crossing.</p> <p>Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Gloucestershire Way crossing and/or consider further or alternative mitigation measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
6.4	<p>Highways England agrees that further discussions will be required with GCC in order to confirm any construction specific mitigation. This will take place following the appointment of a contractor, during the detailed design stage, and would follow the hierarchy of mitigation as presented within the PRow Management Plan.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
7. New Sections of PRow		
7.1	<p>The TWG members agree that the PRow Management Plan proposes new sections of PRow that would lead to enhancements across the WCH and PRow network when considered alongside existing and proposed diversions of sections of PRow in the study area.</p> <p>Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
8. Reclassification of PRow		
8.1	<p>The TWG members agree that the PRow Management Plan proposes appropriate reclassification of three sections of existing PRow, which would lead to an enhancement of the WCH and PRow network by virtue of increasing access to more types of user. Where some members disagree with the reclassification of PRow or suggest other forms of reclassification, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
9. Promotion of Public Access Rights		
9.1	<p>The TWG members generally agree that the PRoW Management Plan proposes sections of new Byways Open to All Traffic and highways connecting to PRoW that will help benefit the PRoW network. Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meetings held on 27.11.2019 TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
10. De-trunking of the Existing A417		
10.1	<p>The TWG members generally agree with the principle of stopping-up the existing A417 to motor traffic and re-purposing sections of the existing A417 as the 'Air Balloon Way' to create a motor traffic-free route as a restricted byway between the new area of parking near the Golden Heart Inn to the Cotswold Way crossing and beyond.</p> <p>TWG members agree the Air Balloon Way should comprise a minimum width of 5m, specifically 3m hard top and 2m soft top. Highways England proposes the Air Balloon Way and connection to the Cotswold Way crossing to be this arrangement with further landscaping and planting along the corridor to create a high-quality route for people that can also provide landscape and wildlife benefits. This is considered by most as a significant enhancement to the WCH and PRoW network in the study area, with all reasonable steps taken through the PRoW Management Plan to help increase accessibility to and from this feature of the scheme. Where some members disagree with the stopping-up to all motor traffic (and preferring that local access is retained along a section of the existing A417), this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meetings held on: 08.08.2019 14.08.2019 04.09.2019 08.10.2019 10.10.2019 22.07.2020 And within statutory consultation responses received on 08.11.2019 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
10.2	<p>The TWG members agree with the need for replacement Common Land and that the replacement Common Land near Barrow Wake is the preferred solution, with it being contingent with the existing area of Common Land at Barrow Wake. TWG members agree this would benefit from access rights to walkers.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020 TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
10.3	<p>The TWG members generally agree with the realignment of the B4070 with new roundabout and segregated restricted byway connection to and from Air Balloon Way, to provide a safe connection for WCH. The TWG members agree with the equestrian holding area on the B4070 to provide a safe crossing. Where some members disagree with specific elements of the Plan and/or consider further or alternative measures should be included, this is addressed in chapter 5.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 29.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

- 5.1.1 There is one principal matter that remains outstanding or not agreed between Highways England and some members of the WCH TWG. In summary this is:
- The need for the scheme to provide at least one additional crossing of the A417 between Bentham Lane and Grove Farm underpass, to restore severed, address obstructed, or improve fragmented PRowS..
- 5.1.2 It should be acknowledged that some members of the WCH TWG object to or do not agree with wider elements of scheme design beyond the topic of WCH, for example impacts of severance on the landscape, and the demolition of the Air Balloon Public House. Those wider matters are not relevant to and are thus not captured within this SoCG, which considers WCH and PRow related matters only. Where wider design matters have been raised as part of engagement and consultation with WCH TWG members, these have been shared with the relevant project team members for further consideration and response, for example through the Consultation Report or Environmental Statement that supports the DCO application, and/or with separate meetings as appropriate.

5.2 Matters outstanding

5.2.1 Table 5-1 shows those matters which remain under discussion by the parties. It sets out the latest position of each party in relation to each matter outstanding, and the latest update of that position.

Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between WCH TWG and Highways England

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
1. Principle of Development				
1.1	Landscape-led scheme	The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree that the scheme is landscape-led and challenge its claim to provide recreational enhancement in its current form should it lead to the loss of footpaths, the Air Balloon Public House and not retain sufficient	The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the Cotswolds AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved	Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		<p>crossings of the A417. Their position is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Through motor traffic should be removed from local roads to make them walkable and crossable again, with the landscape remaining much the same. An enhancement to one person or organisation may be seen as a detriment to another. Retain (same or better than present) can be a useful compromise. b) The proposals appear to change the landscape to fit the road scheme rather than try to design the road so as to minimise impact on the landscape. c) For many people the Air Balloon is a key part of the landscape and its presence when the scheme is complete will demonstrate whether the scheme is truly landscape led. d) To minimise visual and noise impact the road should be kept low in the landscape with a sequence of green bridges for all user types and for wildlife flora and fauna interconnect e) The Cotswold and Gloucestershire Way national and regional trails should be kept on-line alongside the landmark and historic Air Balloon Public House. f) If the Birdlip Bypass is to be renamed the Air Balloon Way it should at least reach the Air Balloon Public House. g) To maintain the countryside and avoid severance between villages the present A417 should be repurposed as any other low traffic minor local road usable for 	<p>by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features, typical to the area, such as Cotswold stone walling, hedgerow, tree, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitat for rare and protected local wildlife. The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the scheme to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. Wider benefits of the scheme include improving access and recreational opportunities and improving access to cultural heritage sites. The PRoW Management Plan is considered to provide sufficient mitigation and appropriate crossings of the A417 to provide an enhanced WCH and PRoW network.</p> <p>Wherever possible, Highways England has worked to avoid the need to demolish property or businesses during scheme design, however the need to demolish the Air Balloon Public House is unavoidable. The consideration of the Air Balloon Public House and its demolition is considered in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage and Chapter 12 Population and Health of the Environmental Statement. Whilst it is recognised that the Air Balloon Public House is not a Listed Building, detailed historic building recording will be undertaken as part of the mitigation of the scheme.</p> <p>The existing A417 will be detrunked and repurposed with the Air Balloon Way as a recreational route to help contribute to the landscape-led vision for the scheme,</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		walking, cycling and horse riding, as well as farm, local and maintenance vehicles whilst avoiding creation of rat-runs nearby.	with proposed landscape, replacement Common Land, and WCH access improvements.	
2. Project Description				
2.1	Vertical alignment	<p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed vertical alignment (in terms of visual and noise impact) and stress that the road should be kept low in the landscape along its length to allow near ground level bridges to retain PRowS where they are crossed by the new A417 and to meet the scheme aims of recreational enhancement and prevent the loss of the landscape such as the landmark Air Balloon Inn.</p> <p>They set out that the downsides of increasing the current gradient from 7% to 8% from Bentham to Grove Farm, including that the reduction in excavation of material for a tunnelled bridge (max 150 metres) compared to a deep cutting has not been quantified within the proposals, nor the landscape and heritage benefits of retention of a historic landmark, nor the noise and visual benefits of tunnelling at the site and at nearby Emma's Grove. There should be a ready market for bagged up Cotswold Stone excavated during the project.</p>	<p>The Preferred Route Announcement in early 2019 carefully considered the views of stakeholders and set the remit within which Highways England is progressing the preliminary design of the A417 Missing Link. A tunnel or cut and cover solution has been discounted for many reasons including impact on the environment and cost. A technical note has been shared to explain this decision making, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money. Other than an alternative alignment avoiding the Air Balloon Public House entirely, there is no method of construction that could prevent the loss or potential significant damage to the Air Balloon Public House. Further cutting would lead to a significant excess of material that would need to be disposed of off-site given the scheme has already achieved a near balance of material, reusing material where it can. Any additional cutting and excess material would require increased construction traffic, carbon and cost in addition to increased impact on the environment.</p> <p>The PRow Management Plan is considered to provide sufficient mitigation and appropriate crossings of the A417 to provide an enhanced WCH and PRow network overall.</p>	<p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
2.2	Crossings of the A417	<p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree that there are sufficient proposed crossings of the A417 as part of the scheme and suggest the scheme should be delivered by first providing sufficient interconnections for both</p>	<p>Highways England is committed to re-purposing the A417 as part of the scheme by providing a safe and free-flow new route that would allow for the de-trunking of the existing A417. That would facilitate a motor traffic-free route for walking, cycling and horse riding to</p>	<p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		<p>humans and wildlife, and that funds should be used to retain existing crossings. That approach should take precedent over the proposals to stop up the current A417 which should be retained as a low traffic route suitable for walking cycling and horse riding, while retaining access for local people and businesses.</p> <p>They express concerns ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health lists diversions greater than 500m (0.3mile) as a major adverse impact, and set out that there are a number of crossings that should be retained, which are currently not proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) At the eastern end of existing Badgeworth Bridleway 125 the opportunity to cross the A417 would be lost. The southern linking Badgeworth footpaths 74,77,78, 80 and 126 would be diverted on to a Private Means of Access to the Bentham underpass to return along Dog Lane, which adds 1 mile b) The Badgeworth footpath 80 where it meeting the A417 would no longer provide the opportunity for a crossing, resulting in a 1.25 mile detour via Bentham underpass c) Badgeworth footpath 86 where it meets the A417 would no longer provide the opportunity for a crossing and objects to its change in use to a bridleway from its current footpath classification. The diversion via Grove Farm is 0.7 miles. d) Unclassified roads (ORPAs) 50853/50944 would be severed and no 	<p>be enjoyed by all, as well as offering replacement Common Land with landscape and wildlife benefits along its new corridor.</p> <p>Technical notes have been shared to explain decision making about potential additional crossings, discounting them on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money.</p> <p>The PRoW Management Plan is considered to provide sufficient mitigation and appropriate crossings of the A417 to provide an enhanced WCH and PRoW network overall.</p> <p>Requests for the additional crossings as part of the scheme are addressed at 6.3 and 7.1 below.</p>	<p>and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		<p>direct crossing would be provided and the diversion through Shab Hill junction is 0.6 miles.</p> <p>e) Cowley restricted byway 36 would be severed and a diversion would be 0.5 miles.</p> <p>f) ACO15 and unclassified road 50852 are crossing points on the A436 and although these fall outside the red line boundary of the scheme they are already difficult at times and require safe crossings if motor traffic levels on the A436 increase further as a result of the scheme.</p>		
3. Consultation				
3.1	Disagreement between TWG members, approach and weighting of opinions	The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the approach Highways England has taken to engagement in that they consider weighting should be greater towards the views of Ramblers as a walking focused organisation on walking issues as for other organisations within their field. They consider a gain to one organisation may be seen as a loss to another. They set out that a 'maintain and retain' approach should be more consistent with other organisations.	Highways England has taken all reasonable steps to collaborate with individuals and organisations with an interest in WCH and PRow through the TWG. Highways England has listened and carefully considered all views and has not applied any weighting to one view over another within the TWG. The principles that Highways England has strived to address are clearly set out within the PRow Management Plan Terms of Reference, and the Plan has been collaboratively developed. Highways England has held specific focused meetings with the Gloucestershire Ramblers to better understand their concerns and suggestions, however there remain some fundamental differences of opinion as to how the scheme should be designed.	Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
4. Population and Human Health – Public Rights of Way (Chapter 12 of the ES)				
4.1	Baseline	The Gloucestershire Ramblers and Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign disagree with the baseline in that	Highways England does not consider there to be safe or appropriate PRow crossing points in this location that require mitigation as part of the scheme. The	Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		<p>it should identify the need to retain crossing points including near Crickley Farm/Fly-Up (near Dog Lane). In particular, where Bridleway 125 and Badgeworth footpaths 83 and 86 meet the current A417, crossings should be retained and improved.</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers and Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign stress that the increase in motor traffic levels along this stretch of route has made crossing the A417 difficult and impossible unless there are suitable gaps in motor traffic.</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers set out that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Extinguishment of these crossings would result in extra journey distance and cannot be considered a recreational enhancement when the road is converted to dual carriageway. b) Inclusion of suitable bridges or underpasses could be called an enhancement in line with the scheme aims. c) Ecological benefits would be provided due to wildlife connectivity if the crossing were provided. d) Although bridges would be preferable, a suitable underpasses solution such as on the A417 at Gloucester Beeches (or longer ones on the 3+3 lane M5) are usually unlit but a central reservation skylight could be provided. e) It could be of advantage to combine an unlit or naturally lit underpass with use by bats but it's welcome that a separate 	<p>previous A417 development created severance and acknowledges that increased motor traffic levels have led to fragmentation with safety concerns evidenced by incidents including a pedestrian fatality. Highways England maintains that the Grove Farm underpass will sufficiently address the historic severance of Badgeworth footpath 86 which remains on the Definitive Maps, with an enhanced situation by providing a safe north-south crossing.</p> <p>A technical note has been provided to explain why further crossings will not be provided, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money.</p> <p>Responses to suggested additional crossings is provided at 6.3 and 7.1 below.</p>	<p>GCC meeting held on 16.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		footpath crossing could also be considered.		
4.2	Assessment	The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the assessment findings that the proposals would lead to an improved WCH and PRoW network if there is a general loss of footpath and other crossings. They consider that safe crossings are required for all existing routes that would be severed by the scheme to avoid diversions that are longer than specified in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Standard LA112 in order to meet the scheme aims of recreational enhancement.	The PRoW Management Plan is considered to provide sufficient mitigation and appropriate crossings of the A417 to provide an enhanced WCH and PRoW network overall. It is not considered to be necessary or appropriate to provide crossings of every existing route experiencing severance or fragmentation by this linear scheme on grounds of impact on the environment, landscape, land acquisition, and cost. Where routes are required to be diverted, they would be as short and direct as possible taking into account environmental and accessibility considerations, and in some cases beneficial either by way of shorter routes or providing more, and grade separated / safer crossings of the A417 compared to the existing situation.	Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
5. Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Annex F of the Environmental Management Plan)				
	Matters set out in sections below			
6. Effects on the PRoW Network				
6.1	Badgeworth Bridleway 125 and proposed footpath diversions along Private Means of Access (Fly Up 417 Bike Park)	The Gloucestershire Ramblers, the Tewkesbury Walking and Cycling Campaign and some members of the GLAF disagree that there are sufficient proposed crossings of the existing A417 and consider it necessary for a crossing to be retained and improved with a bridge to benefit safety to cross from the south side of the A417 to the north side and Dog Lane, to mitigate the stopping up of Badgeworth Bridleway 125 without substitute (and other routes with diversions proposed) (see 7.1 below). The Gloucestershire Ramblers would like to see the diverted PRoW marked alongside	Badgeworth bridleway 125 is proposed to be stopped up without substitute but with an alternative east-west route being available for cyclists and horse riders via Dog Lane off Bentham Lane, and for walkers diverted onto a new private means of access running through Fly Up 417 Bike Park area helping connect multiple footpaths in this area, and allow safe crossings of the A417 via Bentham Lane to the west of the scheme, or via the proposed Grove Farm underpass to the east via Badgeworth bridleway 87. Highways England does not consider there to be safe or appropriate PRoW crossing points in this location that require mitigation as part of the scheme. The previous A417 development created severance and	Email received 01.04.2020 Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		the private means of access, rather than over it, to help give separation to users with different types of surfacing.	<p>acknowledges that increased motor traffic levels have led to fragmentation with safety concerns evidenced by incidents including a pedestrian fatality.</p> <p>A technical note has been provided to explain why an additional crossing of the A417 will not be provided in this location, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money.</p> <p>It is intended for the footpath diversions running along the Fly Up 417 Bike Park Private Means of Access to be a shared route, given the likely very low level of motor traffic using it for access to the facility. Providing a segregated route for walkers alongside the access road would require additional land from the business.</p> <p>Details of surfacing would be discussed and agreed at the detailed design stage between Highways England, its contractor and GCC.</p>	
6.2	<p>Gloucestershire Way</p> <p>Coberley footpath 16</p> <p>Cowley footpath 3</p> <p>A new bridleway to connect unclassified road (50852) to new bridleway over Gloucestershire Way crossing</p>	The Gloucestershire Ramblers and some members of the GLAF welcome the proposal for a Gloucestershire Way crossing but disagree with its form. They would prefer it kept flatter and closer to its current alignment and better help connect existing woodland.	The Gloucestershire Way crossing and its connecting sections of footpath and bridleway would provide an appropriate and safe crossing of the A417, avoiding impact on the ancient woodland. A crossing even closer to its existing alignment would require crossing of up to 11 lanes of motor traffic and result in significant impacts on land, ancient woodland, landscape and have significant cost and engineering implications.	<p>TWG meeting held on 03.03.2020</p> <p>Email received 01.04.2020.</p> <p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
6.3	<p>Cowley footpath 7</p> <p>New section of unclassified road to connect unclassified roads 50853 and 50944</p> <p>A new footpath to connect unclassified road 50853 with Shab Hill junction side road with public access rights</p>	<p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree that there are sufficient proposed crossings as part of the scheme and have expressed the need for a crossing on a popular Crickley Hill Circular walk to maintain the unclassified road 50853 where it is severed by the proposed A417 and connects to Cowley footpath 7 and unclassified road 50944. They stress that without a crossing the proposed diversion at 50853 would be 0.6 miles and not as commodious to walkers or other users as it would pass through a busy junction. Lowering the proposed road at this location to accommodate a near flat green bridge should benefit the landscape of the AONB.</p>	<p>The Gloucestershire Way crossing and Cowley overbridge provide appropriate mitigation and alternative crossings for users of the unclassified road, with appropriate connections each side of the A417 with new sections of connecting PRow.</p> <p>A technical note has been shared to help explain decision making with the agreed provision of Byways Open to All Traffic to help address severance and help connect routes to and beyond the Shab Hill junction. An additional bridge at this location would involve significant cost and likely represent poor value for money and with an additional adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>An underpass in this location would need to be up to approximately 110m in length and the requirement to provide adequate levels would require additional engineering and land acquisition. In addition, the drainage of this underpass would need to be a pumped solution. The provision of an additional structure would increase cost, construction duration and environmental impacts.</p>	<p>TWG meeting held on 22.07.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
6.4	<p>Realigned B4070 and repurposing the old B4070 into north end of Barrow wake car park</p>	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the design of the realigned B4070 and express that this is the new main Birdlip to A417 link and as such should be confirmed as running alongside the current unclassified road 50852 used for WCH to Barrow Wake underpass and car park. Their preference would be for a separate direct connection to Birdlip so that the Barrow Wake viewpoint and car park can be kept for walkers and other users to enjoy.</p> <p>Gloucestershire Ramblers suggest various proposals to connect the Barrow Wake car park to the Air Balloon Way, Cotswold Way</p>	<p>The design of the scheme presented at the 2019 statutory consultation proposed to join the B4070 to the new A417 via green fields near Barrow Wake and along an existing narrow lane in the vicinity of Birdlip Radio Station. In response, there was some concern raised around the impacts of this routing because it would cross the proposed repurposed A417 and would result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Comments were also received that raised concerns about the issue of anti-social behaviour at Barrow Wake car park and which suggested that the scheme could be an opportunity to help to address this.</p>	<p>Email and TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		National Trail and Gloucestershire Way should be considered for all users including local traffic.	<p>Having considered this feedback, and undertaking further technical assessment, Highways England has decided to amend the design of the B4070 road to Birdlip by rerouting it via the entrance of Barrow Wake car park and along the existing road to Birdlip. It is proposed to use an existing underpass and Barrow Wake's access road to replace the existing T-junction with a new, safer roundabout. This change would mean that the B4070 would no longer cross the repurposed A417, and the new roundabout would help slow motor traffic, increase the natural surveillance of the area and make Barrow Wake a more welcoming place to visit.</p> <p>With the proposals in place, WCH could use the highway with public access rights to access Barrow Wake from the B4070, or utilise the proposed new restricted byway that would connect the Air Balloon Way with Cowley footpath 44 and the B4070 on a motor traffic free route.</p> <p>Highways England is committed to improving the access with passing places and help people access the Air Balloon Way safely. The current arrangement could legally be used by motor vehicles along a narrow path joining the existing A417 pavement, which is considered to be unsafe. Motor vehicles would not be permitted to use the Air Balloon Way.</p>	
7. Proposed Mitigation				
7.1	Badgeworth bridleway 125 Badgeworth footpath 78 Badgeworth footpath 77 Badgeworth footpath 74	Gloucestershire Ramblers together with the Tewkesbury Walking and Cycling Campaign disagree that there are sufficient proposed crossings of the existing A417 as part of the scheme and consider it necessary for a crossing to be retained and improved with a green bridge over the A417 to cross from the	Badgeworth bridleway 125 and short sections of footpath are proposed to be stopped up and diverted on a new private means of access running through Fly Up 417 Bike Park area helping connect multiple footpaths in this area and allow safe crossing of the A417 via Bentham Lane to the west of the scheme, or via the proposed Grove Farm underpass to the east via Badgeworth bridleway 87. An alternative east-west route is available via Dog Lane and Cold Slad with a	Email received 01.04.2020 Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
	<p>Badgeworth footpath 126 Badgeworth footpath 80 Badgeworth footpath 84</p>	<p>south side of the A417 to the north side of Dog Lane and Badgeworth footpath 91.</p> <p>The Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign have provided evidence (email 22 January 2021) indicating that the three signed crossings provided for PRow 77, 78, 80, 125 and 126 with Dog Lane and 91, 84 with Dog Lane and 127 (via A417 footway), and 86 with the A417 footway and 127 exist and are currently in use, and are asking that one good crossing be provided, in mitigation of the three listed that will be closed, between the foot of the escarpment and the Bentham underpass, to link Dog Lane/new link replacing the A417 footway to the north and the new Private Means of Access replacing and reconnecting sections of PRow 74/77/126/84 to the south.</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) both express a preference for an additional crossing in this location, and/or in the vicinity of Badgeworth footpath 86 (see 7.2 below).</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers suggest in this location the land is already elevated at the north side for footpath 80 and could allow for a foot bridge to land and there is space to the south of the new road too.</p> <p>Footpath 84 is at a distance to suggest retaining a crossing, with a green bridge which could also benefit wildlife. For example, underpasses of the 2+2 dual carriageway at Bentham & Cowley Junction have a length of approximately 30 metres.</p>	<p>new section of connecting bridleway, joined to the referenced PRow by Bentham Lane, Grove Farm underpass and the Cotswold Way crossing.</p> <p>Highways England does not consider there to be safe or appropriate PRow crossing points in this location that require mitigation as part of the scheme. The previous A417 development created severance and acknowledges that increased motor traffic levels have led to fragmentation with safety concerns evidenced by incidents including a pedestrian fatality. Highways England maintains that the Grove Farm underpass will sufficiently mitigate the historic severance of Badgeworth footpath 86 which remains on the Definitive Maps.</p> <p>A technical note has been provided to explain why further crossings will not be provided, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money.</p>	<p>or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
7.2	Badgeworth footpath 86	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers together with the Tewkesbury Walking and Cycling Campaign disagree with the stopping up of Badgeworth footpath 86 south of the proposed earthworks and consider it desirable for the retention of a crossing to be provided for Badgeworth footpath 86 to cross onto Dog Lane where it currently meets the A417. They stress that the footpath is signed and agrees with the definitive map, and that motor traffic levels have increased to make crossing virtually impossible so requires a suitable crossing of the proposed dual carriageway to meet the scheme aims of recreational enhancement. Extinguishment of the crossing would need a diversion with severe adverse impact. A proposal to reclassify a footpath as a bridleway would not be generally welcome by walkers. Nearby Badgeworth Bridleway 87 is already available as a riding route.</p> <p>The Tewkesbury Walking and Cycling Campaign have expressed they would support the entire scheme if a new underpass offset from the bat underpass would provide a dedicated crossing point for pedestrians in the vicinity of Badgeworth Footpath 86 provided that access is provided from this crossing to footpaths 77/74/80/84 on the south side of the A417.</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) express a desire for an additional crossing in this location.</p>	<p>Highways England does not consider there to be a safe or appropriate PRoW crossing point in this location that requires mitigation as part of the scheme. The previous A417 development created severance and acknowledges that increased motor traffic levels have led to fragmentation with safety concerns evidenced by incidents including a pedestrian fatality. Highways England maintains that the Grove Farm underpass will sufficiently mitigate the historic severance of Badgeworth footpath 86 which remains on the Definitive Maps. GCC agree with this position.</p> <p>The scheme also includes a new section of bridleway to connect Badgeworth footpath 86 (to be reclassified as a bridleway) to Badgeworth bridleway 87 and beyond, including via the new Grove Farm underpass.</p> <p>A technical note has been provided to explain why a further crossing will not be provided, on the basis of cost / poor value for money.</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p> <p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
7.3	Cowley footpath 22	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the design proposal to stop up and divert Cowley</p>	<p>The proposed scheme results in the severance of Cowley footpath 22 and mitigation is proposed via a</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p>

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
		footpath 22 onto the proposed Stockwell Farm overbridge. As an alternative option, the Gloucestershire Ramblers consider it desirable to lower the new road and the Stockwell overbridge in such way to avoid the stopping up and diversion of Cowley footpath 22. Gloucestershire Ramblers object to Highways England's proposal to stop-up Cowley footpath 22 where it joins Cowley footpath 40 and divert it to the east of the proposed A417 as they consider this realignment to be severe and avoidable.	new overbridge to re-provide the route on a similar alignment with greater access rights via a restricted byway. This is an appropriate solution and enhancement to the PRoW network. The short section of Cowley footpath 22 to be stopped-up is unavoidable, with the current scheme proposing a new Cowley junction that partially severs it. A slight diversion is proposed with increased access rights with Cowley footpath 22 to be reclassified as a restricted byway. This is considered to be an appropriate solution and enhancement to the PRoW network, connecting into other sections of restricted byways in this area.	Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
7.4	Cowley restricted byway 36	Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed stopping up of Cowley restricted byway 36 and its proposed diversion along a road. An alternative scheme design is suggested to maintain the crossing since the proposed new road is already low here.	The proposed A417 completely severs Cowley restricted byway 36 and therefore the need to stop it up is unavoidable. The scheme proposes an appropriate diversion across the new Cowley Lane overbridge, providing a safe grade separated solution with provision for WCH.	Email received 01.04.2020. Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021
8. New Sections of PRoW				
8.1	A new restricted byway to carry the National Trail across the A417 where it would join its existing route A new bridleway to connect Cold	Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed design and would prefer that the route of the National Trail is kept on its present alignment maintaining use for all users on a mixed use green bridge alongside the landmark Air Balloon Public House (retaining its facilities) in line with the scheme's aims of landscape led, recreational enhancement. Low cost tunnelling methods have been used in other AONBs and the HS2 scheme. Whereas tunnelling of length	A tunnel or cut and cover solution has been discounted for many reasons including impact on the environment and cost. A technical note has been shared to explain this decision making, on the basis of engineering risk, ecological and environmental impacts, and cost / poor value for money. Other than an alternative alignment avoiding the Air Balloon Public House entirely, there is no method of construction that could prevent the loss or potential significant damage to the Air Balloon Public House.	Meeting held on 3.09.2020 Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
	Slad Lane and the Cotswolds Way National Trail to Leckhampton Hill	<p>less than 150 metres would be deemed a bridge and could keep the gradient to 7%, a 1km tunnel from Grove Farm under the SSSI to Shab Hill would have a gradient of 6% and may not need a crawler lane.</p> <p>Gloucestershire Ramblers is concerned that the footway along the side of the Air Balloon roundabout is replaced with a proposed bridleway on the opposite side of the road joining Ullenwood roundabout. A safe and suitable crossing should be provided.</p> <p>The National Trust and Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust have expressed concerns about the impact of creating these routes that could encourage the use of cycling and horse riding, as well as mountain biking in Crickley Hill Country Park and adversely affect the SSSI.</p>	<p>As a result of feedback received during the 2019 consultation, ongoing discussions with stakeholders and emerging survey data, there will no longer be a green bridge located on Crickley Hill as part of this scheme. While it would have provided benefits to the area, concerns were raised about its location, purpose, scale and visual impact, and its effect on veteran trees and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>The purpose of the new bridleway link is to connect Cold Slad and Leckhampton Hill without having to navigate the proposed Ullenwood roundabout, thus avoiding safety concerns raised by our WCH Lead Assessor, which would otherwise be introduced should we now remove the link. The current solution with the new bridleway situated to the west of Ullenwood roundabout means that horse riders and cyclists would merge onto the carriageway at the Crickley Hill access instead of directly onto the Leckhampton Hill carriageway. This is the preferred solution from a highways safety, cost and land requirement perspective.</p> <p>An assessment of potential impact of recreational activity on the SSSI is provided in ES Chapter 8 and does not conclude any likely significant effects with appropriate mitigation measures identified, for example promoted trails, signage and enclosures to be agreed at detailed design.</p>	
8.2	A new section of byway open to all traffic to connect unclassified roads 50853 and 50944;	Whilst not objecting to a BOAT, Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed implementation because they would like to see Highways England lower the new A417 in the landscape so that a bridge can be provided for 50853 to connect to 50944. Lowering the new A417 in the landscape would mean that steps are not	<p>Lowering the alignment would lead to a large increase in cutting depths and an associated increase in excavated volumes requiring disposal off site. This would also increase carbon impacts and cost considerably.</p> <p>The existing tree line will be retained as much as possible with new lime trees planted to flank the new bridge. Highways England has produced an</p>	Email dated 4.02.2021

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
	New steps joining new Cowley Lane overbridge to connect Cowley footpath 44 (west) and Cowley restricted byway 26 (east); and Cowley restricted byway 26	required and other diversions here are not necessary. A green bridge in line with the current unclassified road 40859 could retain a Lime tree avenue and retain habitats and the ACY26 veteran hedgerow, all integrated with the landscape.	Environmental Management Plan as part of the DCO application, which includes details of the mitigation and enhancement measures, such as planting and habitat restoration. The commitments set out in the Environmental Management Plan are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO application. The proposed Stockwell and Cowley overbridges will be planted with hedgerows, which will help connect habitats and integrate them into the landscape.	
8.3	A new bridleway along Cowley [Wood] Lane between proposed Cowley footpath 40 and Cowley footpath 39 (along new Private Means of Access); and a new restricted byway between proposed A417 south of new Cowley junction and Cowley Footpath 40	Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed stopping up of Cowley Wood Lane to general motor traffic. An aim of the new road should be to remove rat-running of through traffic from local roads and in pressing to retain the nature of the countryside they do not seek closure of local roads and would prefer Highways England to retain Cowley Wood Lane for local traffic including WCH.	The design of the scheme presented at the 2019 statutory consultation included provision at Cowley junction for access between Cowley and the A417 via Cowley Wood Lane. However, many comments were received in response to the consultation that highlighted concerns that there would be an increase in motor traffic and 'rat running' on Cowley Wood Lane, which is a narrow, single-lane road. Additionally, it was raised that an increase in motor traffic would cause disruption in Cowley village. As a result, Highways England reassessed the need for this access and decided to amend the design of the junction to prevent vehicles from access Cowley Wood Lane. Access would, however, be retained along Cowley Wood Lane for local properties (with any potential enclosures to be subject to discussion and agreement at the detailed design stage), as well as a route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, including disabled users.	Email dated 4.02.2021
9. Reclassification of PRow				

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
9.1	Badgeworth footpath 86	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposed reclassification up of Badgeworth footpath 86 to a bridleway to connect into a new section of bridleway joining Badgeworth bridleway 87 and the proposed Grove Farm underpass to the east.</p> <p>The Gloucestershire Ramblers confirm that walkers generally do not consider changing a footpath to a bridleway as an upgrade or an enhancement.</p> <p>Badgeworth Bridleway 87 already runs in parallel with this proposed route, so the change in use is not necessary.</p>	<p>The scheme includes a new section of bridleway to connect Badgeworth footpath 86 (to be reclassified as a bridleway) to Badgeworth bridleway 87 and beyond, including via the new Grove Farm underpass with bridleway connectivity to an unclassified road, which could also be used by a wider group of users such as cyclists. It is considered that this would help connect PRow and increase access to a wider group of users, helping enhance the network in the area.</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p> <p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
9.2	Cowley footpath 22	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposals for Cowley footpath 22 to be reclassified as a restricted byway between Cowley footpath 40 and the new Stockwell Farm overbridge, and express it would be to the detriment of walkers. There is already a popular WCH route via Cowley Bridleway 45 and the Cowley underpass.</p>	<p>Highways England proposes to reclassify Cowley footpath 22 as restricted byway in order to connect into other sections of existing and proposed restricted byway in this area, to provide an appropriate trail for a wide range of non-motorised users connecting Cowley to the Gloucestershire Way crossing, Air Balloon Way and beyond with opportunities for trails. This seeks to improve access to a wider range of users in the area.</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
9.3	Reclassification of Cowley footpath 21 to restricted byway over its entire length	<p>Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the reclassification of Cowley footpath 21 to restricted byway as they consider it not to be necessary and generally a change in use of footpaths is considered a detriment to walkers. There is already a popular WCH route via Cowley Bridleway 45 and Cowley underpass.</p>	<p>Highways England has sought to improve access rights where possible on the PRow network. This includes reclassifying Cowley footpath 21 as bridleway (not restricted byway) to provide an appropriate connection between the adjoining bridleway over Stockwell Farm overbridge, restricted byways to the east of Stockwell Farm overbridge, and the re-purposed A417. This provides with opportunities for trails for a wider group of non-motorised users and seeks to improve access to a wider range of users in the area.</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>
10. Promotion of Public Access Rights				

Matter reference number	Matter	TWG position	Highways England position	Date of position
10.1	No matters identified			
11. De-trunking of the Existing A417				
11.1	De-trunking and classification of existing A417	<p>While disagreeing with severance for various users within the scheme, Gloucestershire Ramblers disagree with the proposals but would agree with alternatively de-trunking with reclassification to a quiet B or C class road of the existing A417 between the Air Balloon roundabout and Cowley Junction to retain local access and allow all groups of users to enjoy it with the benefit of huge loss of through-traffic. There is also already a parallel walking cycling and horse riding route available through Birdlip on the stopped up old Cirencester roman road. On completion of the scheme a hierarchy of roads should be in place to separate local and through traffic.</p> <p>It would not be considered an enhancement to the operation of the countryside for the road to be converted to a Restricted Byway and closed completely to local, business and farm vehicles.</p>	<p>Highways England is committed to re-purposing the A417 as part of the scheme by providing a safe and free-flow new route that would allow for the de-trunking of the existing A417. That would facilitate a motor traffic-free route for walking, cycling and horse riding to be enjoyed by all, as well as offering replacement Common Land with landscape and wildlife benefits along its new corridor.</p> <p>The proposed scheme seeks to address the identified problems on the strategic road network, as well as improve travel conditions for users of local roads and PRow interfacing with the scheme. The scheme seeks to enhance connectivity for WCH and the repurposing of the existing A417 is a key element to help achieve this as well as meet other scheme objectives.</p> <p>A small section of the existing A417 between Cowley junction and Stockwell would be retained for vehicular access to provide access for local residents and to access parking facilities that would be provided for users of the Air Balloon Way.</p>	<p>Email received 01.04.2020</p> <p>Focused meetings on 8 and 14.09.2020</p> <p>Position reconsidered and confirmed at or in response to TWG meeting held on 04.02.2021</p>

Appendices

Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Signed	
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
On Behalf of / Signed, Date Name and Position	<p>1. Active Gloucestershire</p> <p>Signed</p> <p>Name</p> <p>Position</p> <p>Date</p>

2. British Horse Society (BHS)

Signed

Name

Position

Date

3. Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Gloucestershire

Signed

Name

Position

Date

4. Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign

Signed



Name

GEORGE ALLCOCK

Position

Committee member.

Date

5/4/21

5. Cotswold District Council

N/A – Cotswold District Council has confirmed that it is not appropriate for it to sign this SoCG because PRow are the responsibility of Gloucestershire County Council

6. Cotswolds Conservation Board

N/A – please see separate Statement of Common Ground

7. Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership

N/A – The Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership were represented by a member of the Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) who coordinated feedback and inputs to the group as appropriate

8. Cycling UK

Signed

Name

Position

Date

9. Gloucestershire County Council PRow Officer

Signed

Name

Position

Date

Please also see separate Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire County Council as part of the Joint Councils

10. Gloucestershire County Council Transport Officer

Signed

Name

Position

Date

Please also see separate Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire County Council as part of the Joint Councils

11. Gloucestershire County Council ThinkTravel Coordinator

Signed

Name

Position

Date

12. Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF)

Signed



Name

RICHARD HOLMES

Position

GLAF VICE CHAIR

Date

26.4.21

13. Gloucestershire Ramblers

Signed

Name

Position

Date

14. Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust
N/A – please see separate Statement of Common Ground
15. National Trust
N/A – please see separate Statement of Common Ground
16. Natural England (including national trails)
N/A – please see separate Statement of Common Ground
17. Sustrans
N/A – this organisation has not participated in the WCH TWG since 25/10/2019 due to resourcing constraints

18. The Disabled Ramblers

Signed



Name Nic West

Position Member

Date 15/04/2021

	<p>19. Trail Riders Fellowship</p> <p>Signed</p> <p>Name</p> <p>Position</p> <p>Date</p>
--	---

Appendix B Terms of reference

B.1 Walking, cycling and horse riding Technical Working Group (WCH TWG)

B.1.1 Terms of Reference of TWG membership

Role of Technical Working Group

B.1.1.1 The Walking, Cycling and Horse riding (WCH) Technical Working Group (TWG) will serve to establish and maintain an open and productive dialogue between the A417 project team and counterparts in key stakeholder groups. The WCH TWG will provide an environment for discussion regarding the approach to the assessment of impacts, appropriate mitigation and design opportunities related to the scheme and its impacts on WCH routes, during the construction and operation of the A417 Missing Link project.

B.1.1.2 Members will work together to:

- Express their views and, where appropriate, influence the approach taken by the project team
- Identify concerns about the scheme and its impacts, and where possible propose potential solutions to address those concerns
- Share information about the project's progress and key milestones
- Understand and where possible agree the Environmental Impact Assessment
- Where appropriate, produce a Statement of Common Ground

Activities

B.1.1.3 The principal activities for the WCH TWG will be to consider current and upcoming aspects of the scheme. Topics expected to arise are likely to include the following:

- Proposed study area
- Proposed methodology
- Proposed baseline
- Assessment of likely effects
- PRow Management Plan

Meetings

B.1.1.4 Meetings shall take place approximately every two months, or as otherwise agreed by the group's members, subject to review of frequency and need.

Standard agenda items

B.1.1.5 While individual agendas will be developed for meetings, the following are proposed as standard agenda items:

- Project update
- Review of last meeting / actions
- Progress on assessment
- PRow Management Plan
- Statement of Common Ground
- AOB

Outputs

B.1.1.6 The main outputs from the meetings will be:

- Decision register and actions
- Feedback to the project on specific topics
- Feedback to the Strategic Stakeholder Panel
- Any other outputs as agreed

Membership

B.1.1.7 The membership of the group is:

- Highways England & Highways England Project Team
- Active Gloucestershire (Tom Beasley)
- British Horse Society (BHS) (Ralph Hampton, Philip Hackett, Ros Davies)
- Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Gloucestershire (Nick Dummett)
- Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign (George Allcock)
- Cotswold District Council (Sophia Price)
- Cotswolds Conservation Board (CCB) (Rebecca Jones)
- Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership (Richard Holmes)³
- Cycling UK (George Allcock)
- GCC PRoW officer (Alan Bently)
- GCC transport officer (Emma Shibli)
- GCC ThinkTravel Coordinator (Jo Atkins)
- Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) (Alison Williams, Richard Holmes, Charlie Morriss)
- Gloucestershire Ramblers (Bernard Gill, Penny Fernando, Michelle Holden)
- Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (Gareth Parry)
- National Trust (Lisa Edinburgh, Sarah Cook)
- Natural England (Hayley Fleming, Andrew Barker, Tess Jackson)
- Sustrans (Paoula Spivach, Iain Stewart)
- The Disabled Ramblers (Nicola West)
- Trail Riders Fellowship (Charlie Morriss)

Administration

B.1.1.8 The project team will provide administrative support to the group.

B.1.1.9 The agenda and any relevant information for each meeting will be issued one week in advance of the future meeting.

B.1.1.10 A decision register and actions (including draft SoCG) will be captured from each meeting and distributed no later than two weeks after each meeting.

³ The Cotswold Trail and Access Partnership were represented by a member of the Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) who coordinated feedback and inputs to the group as appropriate