A417 Missing Link
TR010056

8.22 Landowner Position Statements (Rev 1)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 8

March 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A417 Missing Link

Development Consent Order 202[x]

Landowner Position Statements (Rev 1)

Regulation Number:	
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010056
Application Document Reference	8.22
Author:	A417 Missing Link

Version	Date	Status of Version
C01	February 2022	Deadline 3
C02	March 2022	Deadline 5

Table of contents

Table of Tables

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 This document has been prepared by National Highways (as the Applicant) during the Examination of the application it has made for a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the A417 Missing Link scheme (the scheme).

1.1.2 This document provides a schedule of the ~~At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) held on 26 January 2022, the Examining Authority (ExA) made a request (Hearing Action Point CAH1-AP3) that where there are~~ Position Statements that the Applicant has drafted with Affected Parties and sets out the current status of each Position Statements at Deadline 5 of the Examination. All Position Statements that have been submitted to the ExA to date are appended to this document, except where the Position Statement relates to a party with which there is also a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) in progress. In such instances, this document provides a signpost to the SoCG document that contains the latest Position Statement. ~~but has not yet submitted to the ExA, these are submitted at Deadline 3 of the Examination (2 February 2022).~~

~~1.1.3 At Deadline 3 of the Examination, this document therefore includes a number of Position Statements that have not yet been submitted to the ExA. It also provides a schedule of all of the Position Statements that have been submitted to the ExA in the Examination so far, and provides a signpost to the document that they are in, if it is not int this document.~~

~~1.1.4~~1.1.3 It is the intention of the Applicant that this document will be updated at ~~one or more~~ future deadlines to include any further updates to ~~the latest version of all submitted~~the Position Statements.

2 Schedule of Position Statements

2.1.1 Table 2-1 provides a schedule of all Position Statements with Affected Parties that have been submitted to the ExA to date and provides a signpost to their location within this document or other ~~the~~ Application documents.

2.1.2 ~~As set out above, it is intended at a future deadline that all~~Where possible, all Position Statements ~~would be~~have been consolidated into an updated version of this document for Deadline 5, with the exception of those Position Statements that are incorporated into a separate Statement of Common Ground.

Table 2-1 Schedule of Position Statements

Affected Party	Location of latest version of Position Statement	Date of latest submission to ExA
Mr Medlock	Appendix A of this document	Deadline 5 (9 March 2022)~~Deadline 3 (2 February 2022)~~
Mr Mendel	Appendix B of this document	Deadline 5~~3~~ (~~2 February~~9 March 2022)
Flyup Ltd (Mr and Mrs Ruskin)	Appendix C of this document	Deadline ~~3 (2 February~~5 (9 March 2022)
Mrs Besterman	Appendix D of this document	Deadline 5~~3~~ ~~(2 February~~(9 March 2022)
Mr Dick	Appendix E of this document	Deadline 5~~3~~ (9 March~~2 February~~ 2022)
Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	Appendix C of SoCG with ~~Joint Councils~~Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (Appendix F of Document Reference 7.3, Rev 2)[GU4]	Deadline 5~~3~~ (9 March~~2 February~~ 2022)
Gloucestershire County Council	Appendix B of SoCG with Joint Councils (Appendix A of Document Reference 7.3, Rev 2)	Deadline 5~~3~~ (9 March~~2 February~~ 2022)
National Trust	Appendix C of SoCG with ~~Joint Councils~~National Trust (Appendix G of Document Reference 7.3, Rev 2)[GU5]	Deadline 5~~3~~ (~~2 February~~9 March 2022)
Alexander and Angell	Appendix ~~A of Response to Written Representations made at Deadline 1 (Document Reference 8.11, REP2-012)~~F of this document	Deadline 5~~2~~ ~~(13 January~~(9 March 2022)
Mr and Mrs Ford	Appendix ~~A of Response to Written Representations made at Deadline 1 (Document Reference 8.11, REP2-012)~~G of this document	Deadline 5~~2~~ (~~13 January~~9 March 2022)
Robert, Patricia and Sarah de Lisle Wells	Appendix H of this document~~A of Response to Written Representations made at Deadline 1 (Document Reference 8.11, REP2-012)~~	Deadline 5 (9 March 2022)~~Deadline 2 (13 January 2022)~~

National Star College	Appendix ~~A of Response to Written Representations made at Deadline 1 (Document Reference 8.11, REP2-012)~~I of this document	Deadline ~~2~~5 (~~13 January~~9 March 2022)
Mr and Mrs Field	Appendix ~~A of Response to Written Representations made at Deadline 1 (Document Reference 8.11, REP2-012)~~J of this document	Deadline 5~~2~~ (9 March~~13 January~~ 2022)
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited	Appendix K of this document	Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) (first submission to ExA)

Appendix A Position Statement with Mr Medlock

Landowner Position Statement – Medlock

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement regarding Ian Medlock's position as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Ian Medlock's during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to his land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated to reflect the current position at Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
27/09/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	No response received from land owner.
05/11/2019	Meeting	It was explained to Ian Medlock that land take is unlikely to be required for the new road into Birdlip. In collaboration with Ian Medlock, alternative fields were identified for construction landfill sites to created by the scheme.
27/03/2020	Correspondence and Telephone Call	National Highways issued a letter to Ian Medlock outlining intentions to use statutory powers to enter the land unless survey access was agreed. This subsequently led to a call between National Highways and Ian Medlock and his representatives but no agreeable solution between all parties was reached.
30/03/2020	Correspondence	A notice was served to Ian Medlock under Section 172 Planning Act 2016 to obtain access to complete environmental surveys.
22/05/2020	Survey Work	An attempt was made to undertake environmental survey work however the access gates were locked.
04/08/2020	Meeting	Meeting attended by Chris Graham the land agent acting for Ian Medlock, Oliver Kirkham and Michael Downes. Chris Graham requested further information for the works required relating to access. This includes vehicle movements for archaeological works and ground investigation. Chris Graham asked if alternative land take could be agreed in exchange for site access. Oliver Kirkham explained that National Highways do not want to enter into 3rd party rights of agreement for the purposes of access. Chris Graham explained that Ian Medlock felt positively about agreeing S253 agreements for his land.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to Ian Medlock notifying him of the beginning of the public consultation.

26/10/2020	Correspondence	Chris Graham (Land Agent) requested an in-person site meeting.
28/10/2020	Correspondence	Michael Downes explained to Chris Graham and Ian Medlock a Microsoft Teams meeting is the best course of action in the first instance.
28/10/2020	Correspondence	Ian Medlock requested an in-person site meeting.
29/10/2020	Correspondence	Michael Downes explained to Chris Graham and Ian Medlock that due to varying Coronavirus pandemic restrictions across the UK and the need to have certain members of the project team present at this particular meeting an in-person site meeting was not possible. It was explained that anything specific coming out of the update meeting which does require an essential follow up site visit (face to face meeting), a site visit can be reconsidered for the relevant members of the team to attend site. A Microsoft Teams meeting was requested.
30/10/2020	Correspondence	Ian Medlock stated he did not have the IT capabilities to allow for a Microsoft Teams meeting. Ian Medlock suggested that the consultation period is extended or postponed allowing for engagement with all relevant landowners and stakeholders as a result of Coronavirus pandemic restrictions.
10/11/2020	Correspondence	Adam Davis issued a consultation response to Ian Medlock. The response explained that given the current restrictions in place due to the Coronavirus pandemic, unless there is very clear justification for a site meeting, a site visit is not something that can be accommodated. The Section 42 letter dated 13 October 2020 explained National Highways position concerning online or telephone meetings. The relevant software to allow for a virtual meeting was offered to Ian Medlock if required.
11/11/2020	Correspondence	Ian Medlock explained that Stuart Milsom has been employed as a land agent alongside Chris Graham at Moore Allan and Innocent. Ian Medlock raised concerns about the value that a virtual meeting could have. Ian Medlock stated he has attended two public consultation meetings.
12/11/2020	Statutory Consultation Response	Ian Medlock submitted a consultation response in relation to the scheme.

		Ian Medlock opposed and strongly opposed several different aspects of the scheme. Ian Medlock raised concerns about the plans and information produced in relation to the scheme.
15/12/2020	Court Hearing	National Highways had attempted to obtain land access for surveys. Though this could not be agreed with Ian Medlock and his representatives. The use of statutory powers was therefore required to enable the scheme to progress. At the hearing both parties were instructed by the court to come to an agreement on access in the first instance. If this could not be achieved in a four week period a second court date was to be set for a warrant to be provided for survey access. The parties agreed a survey licence to provide access.
16/12/2020	Meeting	Meeting on site with Ian Medlock to discuss the scheme Ground Investigation works.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Ian Medlock for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Ian Medlock notifying him of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
15/02/2022	Meeting	Meeting held in relation to access for Ground Investigation works. District valuer also in attendance and the principle of a section 253 agreement explained and to commence land acquisition discussions.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Comment	National Highways Response
1	Land take	Ian Medlock's lawyer requested a comprehensive justification for the land take proposed.	Land take justification was provided in the form of a written note to Ian Medlock's lawyer. Land take justification was accepted on review by Ian Medlock and his lawyer.
2	GI.2A	Ian Medlock refused access to complete the GI.2A survey's for the scheme.	The GI.2A surveys have now been completed in his land.
3	Existing tenant	The existing tenant refused access to the site for the purposes of the scheme.	Notice has been served to the existing tenant. S174 notice served to Mr Pollard on ~~the~~ 29 June 2020. Site access has now been agreed with Mr Pollard.
4	Site Investigation Work	Licence to be signed to allow for the GI.2B site investigation works to begin.	Archaeological licence agreed and signed with Ian Medlock.
5	Plans and Information Provided	Ian Medlock raised concerns about the plans and information provided in relation to the scheme.	National Highways has continued to consult and engage with affected landowners throughout the design of the scheme. This is set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027), which evidences how National Highways has met the statutory consultation requirements for a

			Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008.
6	Water Drainage	Ian Medlock raised concerns about the water drainage ~~off of~~off the escarpment from noise, light, nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide.	National Highways has carried out an assessment of the environmental effects of the scheme as set out in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2, APP-032 to APP-049) which is submitted with the DCO application and which will be subject to Examination by the Planning Inspectorate. This has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and the Planning Act 2008. The Environmental Statement assesses the likely effects of the scheme against the current and future baseline (a 'do minimum' scenario) and identifies measures proposed within the scheme to mitigate likely adverse effects. Chapter 15 Assessment of Cumulative Effects of the Environment Statement assesses the effects of the scheme cumulatively.
7	Birdlip Village Growth	Ian Medlock questioned whether the scheme has considered the future growth of Birdlip village.	Regular advice from Local Planning Authorities and the Cotswold Conservation Board has been considered in the development of the scheme proposals through Strategic Stakeholder Panel meetings. This has included discussing the expansion of Birdlip and Local Plan provision.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Comment	National Highways Response
1	Gloucestershire Way Crossing	Ian Medlock opposes the Gloucestershire Way Crossing. Ian Medlock states that the intended purpose of the Crossing can be achieved by moving the footpath north of Emma's Grove and along the new edge of the A417.	National Highways has continued to consult and engage with affected landowners throughout the design of the scheme. This is set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027), which evidences how National Highways has met the statutory consultation requirements for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008. Responding to 2019 consultation feedback, the Appendix 2.1 Annex F (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323) proposes the mitigation and enhancement for footpaths and other WCH routes, whilst the Gloucestershire Way crossing and Cotswold Way crossing will help to address the concerns expressed. National Highways continue to look to engage with Ian Medlock about the Gloucestershire Way Crossing.
2	Land Acquisition	~~Stuart Milsom has advised that if no transaction can take place for a reasonably long duration, property values may therefore change. As such the landowner wishes to wait for a General Vesting Declaration.~~The land ~~owners~~owner's agent does now wish to explore acquisition discussions.	~~A summary of the acquisition types has been provided to Stuart Milsom for his consideration with the landowner. As such they do not wish to commence negotiations for acquisition of the land.~~ Following the first compulsory acquisition hearings the landowner would now like to explore discussions on land acquisition. These are to be advanced by the district valuer.
3	Accommodation Works Plans	Accommodation works plans were issued to Ian Medlock on ~~the~~ 26 January 2021.	Ian Medlock did not provide any comments on the draft accommodation works plans provided until the relevant representation response submitted in September 2021.

			National Highways to agree the accommodation works with Ian Medlock as the scheme progresses.
4	Tunnelling Design Option	Ian Medlock stated that the tunnelling design option should be reconsidered. Ian Medlock stated the cost difference between the tunnelling design option and the preferred scheme option isn't significant.	Tunnel options have been considered as part of options identification and appraisal; however they have been discounted largely due to cost and environmental impact. Tunnel route options for the scheme were discounted prior to the 2018 public consultation, as set out in the Scheme Assessment Report (March 2019) (Document Reference 7.4, APP-420). Please refer to section 3.1 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) or the Scheme Assessment Report (March 2019) (Document Reference 7.4, APP-420) for further information.
5	AONB Impact	Ian Medlock raised concerns about the scheme's impact on the AONB. Ian Medlock stated the tunnel option would reduce the impact on the AONB.	National Highways recognises the significance and sensitivity of the landscape. National Highways 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 (Document Reference 7.7, APP-423), whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects (Document Reference 6.2, APP-038).
6	Ecological Impact	Ian Medlock stated the scheme is likely to disturb bat, owl and other species feeding grounds. Ian Medlock raised concerns about the bat report being 'confidential'.	ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039) provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on biodiversity, including through increased recreational pressure. Ecological surveys on protected species have been carried out between 2017 and 2021. Advance survey techniques such as radio tracking were used to

			assess the movement of bats across the landscape as well as surveys to establish the extent of different badger territories. Population surveys were also carried out for reptiles and great crested newts within the survey area. Information on ecological surveys carried out for the scheme is provided in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039).
7	Ecological Mitigation	Ian Medlock challenged his land being acquired for the purposes of ecological mitigation as shown on Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan Sheet 8 of 25 (Document Reference 6.3, APP-175).	National Highways has considered the comments received from Ian Medlock. The ecological mitigation shown on Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan Sheet 8 (Document Reference 6.3, APP-175) has been identified as essential for the delivery of the scheme. The landscape design focusses on provision of priority habitats which are present within the Cotswold AONB; lowland calcareous grassland, lowland broadleaved woodland and native species rich hedgerows. 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 ecological mitigation as described within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039). ES Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference 6.3, APP-175) provides green infrastructure which would help to deliver climate change resilience for both habitat and wildlife connectivity.
8	PRoW Proposed	Ian Medlock objected to the PRoW proposed on his land if the land is returned to him instead of being used for ecological mitigation.	It is intended that the land will be acquired permanently for ecological mitigation for the scheme.
9	Construction Compound	Ian Medlock contests the construction compound located on his land interest.	National Highways has assessed the compound on Ian Medlock's land as essential for the construction the scheme.

			All compound locations have been assessed within the Environmental Impact Assessment reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.2, APP-032 to APP-049). Further detail about the layout of the compound will be developed by the construction contractor appointed for the scheme.
10	Land Interest Access	Ian Medlock raised concerns about continued access to his remaining land interest not being acquired throughout the construction of the scheme.	The proposed measures to ensure continued access to homes and businesses is set out in the ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex B CTMP (Document Reference 6.4, APP-319) which is submitted in support of the scheme. Further opportunity to discuss and agree proposals will be available following the appointment of a contractor, should the DCO be granted.
11	Noise and Light Impacts	Ian Medlock raised concerns about noise and light impacts created by the scheme on his land interest.	ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.2, APP-042) sets out the measures that National Highways proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. A low noise road surface is incorporated into the proposed scheme design. The Cotswolds AONB is recognised as having an extensive area of naturally occurring dark night skies. Responding to the scheme's setting within the Cotswolds AONB, the scheme including Shab Hill and Cowley junctions will not be lit, to reduce the amount of light spillage to the Dark Skies area.
12	Security Measures	Ian Medlock requested that appropriate security measures are considered and agreed with him in relation to the scheme.	Once appointed, National Highways will work with their contractor to ensure safe working practices are followed across the construction of the scheme. This would include measures such as security on site / site compounds, fencing and enclosure of work areas from public areas, and staff identification.

			National Highways would also appoint a community liaison officer for the duration of the construction who would be the first point of contact should any safeguarding issues arise.
13	Acquisition at Emma's Grove	As set out in his Relevant Representation (RR-070) and raised at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) on 25 January 2022, Mr Medlock has raised concern over land acquisition at Emma's Grove and seeks justification for its permanent acquisition.	National Highways has set out its position on this matter in the Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010) submitted at Deadline 3. This stated that there is no proposal to upgrade Emma's Grove land take to permanent acquisition. Emma's Grove is a scheduled monument and is being temporarily possessed so that National Highways can enhance the scheduled monument in light of the Scheme's impact on cultural heritage assets. In contrast, the land being compulsorily acquired to the East of Emma's Grove is to deliver essential mitigation taking the form of calcareous grassland habitat 'Stepping Stones' to mitigate impacts of fragmentation on the SSSI. National Highways is committed to discussing the practicalities of maintain Emma's Grove, the SSSI Stepping Stone and the possibility of a section 253 agreement with Mr Medlock. Access to Emma's Grove from Mr Medlock's land holding will be maintained.

Appendix B Position Statement with Mr Mendel

Landowner Position Statement – Mendel

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Steven~~Mr~~ Mendel~~'s~~ as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mr Mendel during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to his land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by ~~This Position Statement has been~~was ~~updated in December 2021 to ensure that matters raised within~~ Mr Mendel are~~Mendel's Relevant Representation have been~~ were considered and responded to.

~~1.1.5~~

Table 1 Summary of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
06/08/2019	Meeting	At the meeting it was identified that Shab Hill Junction takes up most of Mr Mendel's landholding. Access will be provided from the B4070.
27/09/2019	Landowner Consultation Invitation - Letter	Landowner consultation invitation event issued to Mr Mendel by letter. Meeting agreed for ~~the~~ 10 October 2019.
10/10/2019	Meeting	It was agreed that additional copies of the land plans showing the scheme design and Mr Mendel's land will be prepared and issued.
13/01/2020	Landowner Consultation Invitation - Letter	Landowner consultation invitation event issued to Mr Mendel by letter.
05/02/2020	Meeting	The key issues and outcomes agreed at the meeting with Mr Mendel included**:** • Access requirements; • Surveys required; and • Section 253 agreement on environmental mitigation land. Mr Mendel's main concerns following the meeting were: • Blight and compulsory purchase of the farmhouse and land • Access to the northern parcels of land being retained. • S.253 agreement on ecological mitigation land. • Impact of the construction compound.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to Mr Mendel notifying him of the beginning of the public consultation.
28/10/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	The scheme design changes were explained to Mr Mendel. The key issues and outcomes agreed at the meeting were: • Land take; • Land acquisition; • Land access; and

		• Discretionary purchase. The main concern raised by Mr Mendel at the meeting related to the discretionary purchase application. Mr Mendel stated that he has incurred approximately £70,000 of costs as a result of the scheme. Mr Mendel stated he will pursue compensation for this. It was explained to Mr Mendel that the original discretionary purchase application did not include the farmland and property that he has not been able to sell. Mr Mendel agreed he will discuss the matter further with his land agent before coming back to National Highways.
26/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation work plans issued to Mr Mendel for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Mr Mendel notifying him of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
12/03/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the discretionary purchase application, and land required and impacted by the scheme. Mr Mendel and National Highways to agree a valuation for the property. The required detail for the discretionary purchase application was explained to Mr Mendel. Justification to be provided for the byway open to all (BOAT) proposed on the eastern boundary of Mr Mendel's land.
23/03/2021	Email Correspondence	Comments received from Mr Mendel in relation to the accommodation work plans issued.
13/05/2021	Email Correspondence	National Highways issued a note to Mr Mendel on ~~the~~ 13th ~~May~~ 2021 to provide detail about the PRoW and BOAT proposals on his land interest.
11/06/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
25/08/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
26/08/2021	Email Correspondence	Licence and relevant plans issued to Mr Mendel for the purposes of undertaking intrusive surveys on his land interest.
24/09/2021	Email Correspondence	Signed licence was provided by Mr Mendel to undertake the intrusive surveys.
08/10/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application

29/10/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
12/11/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
17/01/2022	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
21/01/2022	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application
11/02/2022	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to progress the progress the discretionary purchase application

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matters	National Highways Position
1	Site Access	Access for the site investigation works.	Access has been agreed and the licence signed.
2	Landowner Access	Concerns raised about how access will be retained to the portion of the top field that will remain in family ownership when the scheme is built.	National Highways explained and provided assurances that access to the top field identified will be provided during the construction and operation of the scheme. A new gated access is shown on the general arrangement plans.
3	Scheme Red Line Boundary	Concerns raised that an area of land will be land locked by the scheme red line boundary.	The land identified is an existing area of woodland and is not to be impacted by the scheme.
4	Access	Mr Mendel requested that access is maintained to/from his land to an area of land owned in Ullen Wood.	The gated access location has been agreed as part of the ongoing accommodation work discussions.
5	Section 253 Agreement	Mr Mendel requested that a Section 253 agreement is created with National Highways for land identified for ecological mitigation. At the landowner meeting on the 28th October 2020, a Section 253 for the purposes of access was discussed.	The Discretionary Purchase application submitted by Mr Mendel has identified the area of land to be acquired. This includes the land needed for ecological mitigation. Thus a S.253 agreement is no longer required.
6	Land Ownership	No title information is available for the land to the south and west of Ullenwood though the ownership is historic.	Land ownership information has been provided. The title documents show good ownership, and it has been confirmed that the executors do not need to register the title.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Discretionary purchase	A discretionary purchase application has been submitted by Mr Mendel.	National Highways understanding of the land take included as part of the discretionary purchase application has been explained to Mr Mendel. This issue has now been clarified. The valuation for the land and property has now been agreed. National Highways continue to engage in dialogue with Mr Mendel to progress the discretionary purchase and solicitors have now been instructed to draw up the contract of sale for the land required for the scheme. ~~application submitted.~~
2	Accommodation Works	Mr Mendel has provided comments on the draft accommodation work plans with the final details still to be agreed.	National Highways continue to develop proposals for accommodation works and these will be finalised ~~at the~~ during detailed design stage in liaison with Mr Mendel. Accommodation works discussions will be progressed. A Meeting on site has been requested and we are waiting for a response from the land owner. ~~in February 2022.~~
3	BOAT	Concerns raised in relation to the BOAT proposed on the land interest. Mr Mendel does not object to walking, cyclists and horse-riders but objects to motorised vehicles using the BOAT. Mr Mendel raises concerns about the fact that he was not consulted on the BOAT proposed. Safety concerns and the historic use of the proposed BOAT were also challenged.	An unclassified highway (50853) would be severed by the scheme and two new BOATs are proposed, one east and one west of Shab Hill junction, to mitigate the loss of that access. It is the proposed BOAT to the west of the new A417 alignment and south of Shab Hill junction that ~~Steven~~ Mr Mendel objects to, which would connect unclassified roads 50853 and 50944. The BOAT maintains an existing route and is essential mitigation for the scheme.

		Mr Mendel feels he was not included in the development and decision process for the BOAT across his land. At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH1) on 26 January 2022 and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on 27 January 2022, Mr Mendel reiterated his concerns regarding the BOAT and provided this to the Examining Authority in written submissions also (RP3-068/069)	The existing Cowley Footpath 7 lies immediately to the west of the new proposed BOAT location and as such the two routes will be ~~in close proximity to~~near each other. A section would be stopped up and diverted onto the new BOAT to maintain access. The majority of Cowley footpath 7 is outside of the DCO boundary. As such an application to Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) for a Stopping up order would be made after the construction phase is complete and the new BOAT ~~is~~ in place. ~~-~~The footpath and unclassified roads serve different purposes and users, as established in engagement and consultation with user groups, including a Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Technical Working Group (WCH TWG). That group has been involved in the proposals for new and diverted rights of way and this particular proposal to connect unclassified roads 50853 and 50944 is an example where the user groups have worked hard to find a solution to severed routes as part of the scheme (see Statement of Commonality, Document Reference 7.3, REP1-006). PRoW and other routes with public access rights have been considered as part of a WCH assessment and review, undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). This is available in the ES Appendix 12.2 Walking, Cycling & Horse riding including Disabled Users Review at Preliminary Design (Document Reference 6.4, APP-396). ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (Document Reference 6.2, APP-043) undertakes an assessment of PRoW. Routes in the local area have been identified using data and mapping provided by Gloucestershire County Council as the relevant authority responsible for rights of way, and through stakeholder engagement and public consultation.

			The proposals were subject to statutory consultation at the pre-application stage. In March and September 2021, National Highways recommended to Mr Mendel to contact GCC to discuss this issue further. National Highways has offered to assist with Mr Mendel's discussions with GCC but not to reimburse any associated costs. This is because a majority of Cowley footpath 7 is outside of the DCO boundary. A supplementary note providing details about the PRoW (and BOAT) proposals was issued to Stephen Mendel on 13 May 2021. The GCC definitive maps have been provided and digital links to the 'List of Streets Gazetteer'. This is in addition to signposting to the consultation materials including the then draft PRoW Management Plan. Further detail can be found in EMP Annex F Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323). Additional email from GCC Highways Records confirming the status of the unclassified highway provided to Mr Mendel 28/01/22 National Highways provided a response reiterating its above position regarding the BOAT at CAH1 and ISH2, reflected in the subsequent written submissions (REP3-010/11) and in its Comments on Responses received by Deadline 3 (Document Reference 8.25, REP4-035).
4	Ecological Mitigation	~~Steven~~ Mr Mendel objects to the scheme as his land interest being acquired for the purposes of environmental mitigation. ~~Steven~~ Mr Mendel stated the land take will significantly impact his farm and there is	Detail about the proposed ecological mitigation can be found in the Sheet 10, and 25 of the Environmental Masterplan (ES Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference, 6.3 APP-177 and APP-192).

		~~an insufficient evidence~~insufficient evidence for it to be included as part of the scheme. At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH1) on 26 January 2022 and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on 27 January 2022, Mr Mendel reiterated his concerns regarding the land acquisition for ecological mitigation and provided this to the Examining Authority in written submissions also (RP3-068/069)	Further detail can be found in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039). The c~~C~~alcareous g~~G~~rassland proposed is essential mitigation for that lost elsewhere on the scheme. During the construction phase the ground will be significantly disturbed with the creation of calcareous grassland requiring additional removal or nitrate rich soils from those currently in extent. There will be a mixture of species-rich neutral grassland meadow and calcareous grassland creation in the Shab Hill area on ~~Steven~~ Mr Mendel's land. The management of the grassland types will differ slightly but will be managed to provide barn owl and bat foraging habitat to replace habitat lost at Shab Hill. The fields will be managed to provide longer grassland to encourage barn owl prey species and include leaving uncut field margins to provide strips of foraging habitat. Further mitigation for barn owls would be provided on ~~Steve~~Mr~~n~~ Mendel's land interest. Mitigation would include strategic planting of woody species of a height of at least 3m in areas considered to be of high collision risk i.e. at Shab Hill Junction to encourage barn owls to fly at a safe distance above the road network or along the edge of treelines to safe crossing points such as the Gloucestershire Way crossing. Grass verges and embankments adjacent to the road would be managed as short grassland, with arisings removed to reduce the potential for long tussocky grassland with a deep thatch layer that would support barn owl prey species. This would decrease the foraging potential and collision risks to barn owls. There are several bat roosts in the Shab Hill area which would be subject to higher noise levels because of the scheme in operation. Through the embedded design mitigation proposed, there would be an increase in foraging habitat such as calcareous

			grassland and broadleaved woodland that would be accessible to the roosts subject to a significant increase in noise level around the wider Shab Hill area. A small brick structure on the edge of Shab Hill beech woodland that is an existing roost used by lesser horseshoes, is falling into disrepair. It is proposed that this is repaired and enhanced to create additional roosting opportunities. A main badger sett at Shab Hill will be closed and replaced with an artificial sett. Sett activity will be confirmed during pre-construction surveys. Two badger culverts are also included in the design under the main A417 and the B4070. ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (Document Reference 6.2, APP-043) considers the impacts on agricultural holdings. It reports that ~~in order to~~to construct the scheme permanent land take is required which would continue to affect farm holdings during operation. Those holdings where a moderate or major magnitude is identified include Shab Hill Farm. The scheme would require a large proportion of the agricultural holding (61%), which may impact on their viability in relation to the amount of land remaining to be farmed/productive. Given the current use and sensitivity of the holding, Shab Hill Farm is expected to experience a potential significant adverse effect. National Highways provided a response reiterating its above position regarding ecological mitigation on Mr Mendel's land at CAH1 and ISH2, reflected in the subsequent written submissions (REP3-010/11) and in its Comments on Responses received by Deadline 3 (Document Reference 8.25, REP4-035).
5	Safety of Junction between the B4070 and unclassified highway	Concerns raised about horse riders and cyclists travelling onto the Birdlip Link Road from the direction	National Highways is committed to the highest levels of safety for the construction and operation of the scheme and aim to minimise disruption to the public.

		of Shab Hill Farm being exposed to fast moving traffic making the junction unsafe for use.	Where a potential conflict between these two objectives has been identified, National Highways have carefully considered options and proposed a design that provides safe routes for all users. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme. National Highways has discussed the safety standards and works required as part of the scheme design with GCC. Safety is considered throughout the schemes development and the entirety of the scheme is formally assessed at 4 different stages, each stage has a road safety audit undertaken by an independent organisation audit team not associated with the design of the scheme. The objective of the road safety audit process is to provide an effective, independent review of the road safety implications of engineering interventions for all road users. This process is detailed in document GG119 of the DMRB. The Stage 1 audit was undertaken in October 2019 and a supplementary Stage 1 audit in June 2020. The scheme has been designed using the design standards detailed in the DMRB. Specifically "DMRB CD 143 - Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding" has been used to design WCH provision. To enable equestrian, walkers and cyclists to cross the B4070 link road safely an uncontrolled crossing is proposed approximately midway along the B4070 Barrow Wake Road. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Mendel on this matter.
6	Loss of beech trees in Shab Hill valley	At the Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on 27 January 2022, Mr Mendel raised concern specifically in relation to the loss of beech trees in Shab Hill valley, querying	National Highways provided a response to this matter in its Comments on Responses received by Deadline 3

		how many would be lost, what the impacts would be and how this may be mitigated.	(Document Reference 8.25, REP4-035), which states on page 30: The submission by Mr Mendel sets out an objection to the loss of beech trees in Shab Hill Valley. The ecological benefit and arboricultural interest of the Shab Hill beech trees is appreciated and every effort has been made to retain as many of the trees as possible throughout the design process of this landscape-led highways scheme. The woodland has been assessed as the priority habitat lowland mixed deciduous woodland valued as nationally important. The loss of this habitat across the scheme is stated as a significant adverse effect within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039). A veteran oak tree recorded within the western end of woodland will be retained and protected. Woodland planting across the scheme will result in approximately a 9.5 ha gain of woodland habitat compared with the existing baseline. Beech trees will be prominent within the planting mix and species compositions for different locations will be agreed with stakeholders such as the Cotswold National Landscape

Appendix C Position Statement with Flyup Ltd (Mr and Mrs Ruskin)

Landowner Position Statement – FlyUp Limited

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement regarding Flyup Limited as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Flyup Limited during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to this land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

~~1.1.4~~1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (09 March 2022) and reflects the main matters agreed and outstanding at this stage of the project. This follows a formal change request at Flyup Limited which was submitted to the ExA on 14 February 2022, and accepted by the ExA on 17 February 2022. Where the proposed change means that certain matters are no longer relevant these have been deleted.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
11/09/2019	Meeting	Angela and Simon Ruskin (FlyUp) commented that they would object to the proposed Public Rights of Way following the south of the carriageway between the Green Bridge and FlyUp 417. It is not currently and horse riding or cycling route and they expressed concern that it goes against two of their operational requirements being insurance and security. FlyUp explained that during their planning application for the bike tracks they faced significant opposition from the ramblers and British Horse Society in relation to the use of the site for mountain biking. There is a bridle way to the north of the site which runs through the staging area at the top of the hill and increasing horse riding use may bring mountain bike users into conflict horse riders. It was stated that these points would be raised with the team working on the Walking Cycling and Horse-riding consultation groups. The current area used for a car park was shown on the scheme consultation boards as being used for tree planting. FlyUp stated that any loss of parking was a concern and that they would not want to lose parking spaces A summary of the main concerns raised by FlyUp at the meeting were: • Loss of car parking spaces. • Disruption to downhill tracks. • Loss of the dirt jump field. • Crushed stone access track. • No additional Public Rights of Way (PRoW) through their site. • Insurance and security concerns regarding PRoW's proposed. • Concerns about the noise impact created by the scheme. Appropriate noise mitigation requested. • Concerns about FlyUp's buildings being isolated because of the scheme. To address the concerns raised by FlyUp, it was agreed that the project team will: • Review the area of land take required. • Explore PRoW options. • Assess options for reformatting of the site.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
27/09/2019	Landowner Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with FlyUp for the 09 October 2019.
09/10/2019	Meeting	The following actions were identified at the meeting with FlyUp: • Project team to review moving the footpath to avoid hedge clearance. • Alternative location for the septic tank and car park to be considered. • Update track information to include 'dirt-jump' tracks identified by FlyUp at the bottom of the hill. • Agreement to be reached for the surplus Cotswold Brash material. • Noise levels are to be calculated and the relevant mitigation identified.
05/02/2020	Meeting	It was explained that FlyUp's land is required for the following elements of the scheme: • Permanent land take is required for essential mitigation and construction. It was explained that mitigation land is pink due to the commitment to retain as planting. • Temporary land take is required for construction access. • Temporary land take with permanent rights are required for the realignment of the stream, maintenance of drainage installations and highway maintenance for the scheme mainline. • It is envisaged that temporary ownership will be for 12 months from the start of construction. FlyUp raised concerns about their car parking being located with the temporary and permanent land take for the scheme. Jonathan Perks (Land Agent – Fisher German) stated the car park is the main limiting factor of the business growth, as the business can only accommodate those that drive and park at site. FlyUp stated that they don't feel that their business needs are being met. FlyUp questioned the number of car parking spaces counted in their car park. FlyUp raised concerns about relocating their car park closer to Alexander and Angell's land interest as the car park, office, café and shop need to be in close proximity to one another. FlyUp stated the dirt jump is critical to their business and can't be lost. FlyUp's preference would be to move the car park closer to the current area of scrub installed as mitigation/screening previously installed for the Brockworth Bypass.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		The scheme landscape specialist explained that the purpose of the scrub is to screen the view of the Brockworth Bypass scheme from the Cotswold Way. FlyUp raised concerns about how the closure of their track the 'Dubby Skipper' and the 'dirt jump field' would result in a significant loss in earnings. National Highways agreed to minimise the level of impact on this track. FlyUp stated that any temporary ownership of their pickup point would extinguish their business. FlyUp stated that the access track used for their business would be impacted because of the proposed temporary and permanent land take for the scheme. FlyUp stated that they would feel landlocked. Due to these issues they are not comfortable with the currently proposed land take in this area. FlyUp raised concerns about the noise and air quality impacts created by the scheme in respect of their residential property. At the landowner meeting, it was agreed that the project team will: • Review land impact and required for the scheme. • Prepare a draft Position Statement. • Explore further options to accommodate the needs of the business. • Review the planting, car parking, office and shop proposed on FlyUp's land. The main concern for FlyUp was the potential impact the scheme will have on their business and property. This included the direct interference of construction work on their cycle tracks.
21/10/2020	Meeting	FlyUp raised concerns that the new access track proposed will trap their property between the new A417 and the access track. FlyUp requested that the location of the access track is reconsidered. FlyUp and Jonathan Perks agreed to provide a proposed alternative location for the access track. FlyUp raised concerns about the proposed location of the temporary buildings and car park. FlyUp and Jonathan Perks agreed to provide alternative locations for the temporary buildings and car park. National Highways commented that it should be assumed that the temporary buildings will be required for the worst case scenario being at least 3 years in consideration of the duration of the proposed works. FlyUp stated the temporary buildings need to substantial enough to provide adequate facilities to the bike park for the duration of the construction works.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		FlyUp commented that the location of the temporary buildings would not work from a logistical perspective for the bike park. FlyUp to prepare further detail on what is required for the temporary buildings. FlyUp emphasised the importance of preserving the quality of their facilities during the construction works. FlyUp stated a permanent building instead of temporary would be the solution they would prefer if the mitigation car park is to remain on a permanent basis. FlyUp therefore requested that a permanent building be provided as mitigation and included within the DCO submission. FlyUp raised the point that the proposed scheme is inhibiting development of their business as uncertainty with land take required. FlyUp requested compensation for this. Hannah Basham (DVS) explained that sufficient evidence needs to be provided to justify compensation and needs to relate to actual losses incurred by the business. Hannah Basham explained to Jonathan Perks that the business should continue regardless as the DCO has yet to be submitted. FlyUp and Jonathan Perks to provide evidence of losses from not proceeding with new tracks and development of the site. FlyUp raised concerns relating to increased noise levels created by the scheme. FlyUp requested that the location of the Water Environment Survey equipment is moved away from their gateway.
12/11/2020	Consultation Response Received	Consultation response received from FlyUp. FlyUp support the current design that does not include a right of way through their land. FlyUp strongly oppose the greater land take and the road moving closer to their property. FlyUp strongly oppose opening existing footpaths and a new PRoW to horse riders and cyclists across their land. FlyUp request that the proposed access track to their site is re-routed. FlyUp request further detail about the noise mitigation available.
17/12/2020	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the site access design and car parking at FlyUp. FlyUp stated that on a Saturday/Sunday there are up to 350/400 journeys on FlyUp's access track. FlyUp's existing car parking provision allows for up to 120 cars on site. Photographs to be provided showing this. FlyUp stated the scheme does not allow enough space for their future requirements.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		FlyUp request that the coppice trees along the northern boundary of their land interest are felled and the car parking can be put in their place. Jonathan Perks stated that the costs associated with the temporary buildings means the permanent buildings would be a better option. FlyUp requested permanent buildings rather than the temporary proposed as part of the scheme. It was explained that the provision of new permanent buildings as part of the DCO would be considered 'betterment' and can't be provided. FlyUp request that the access track to their house does not form part of the main access track into their site. FlyUp stated that safe segregation between construction and permanent access tracks and construction works needs to be in place. FlyUp request that all car parking spaces are provided in one place rather than throughout the site. FlyUp stated they are happy that the green route Public Right of Way that was proposed has been removed. FlyUp to share the legal confirmation of the extinguishment of the footpath through their site. This is important if an objection is received about this PRoW at the DCO. FlyUp's track to the far right of their site will be altered slightly to move around a tree for the purposes of the construction of the scheme. FlyUp staff member confirmed this won't negatively impact the existing track. Updated noise assessment information to be provided to FlyUp. It was explained that noise reducing materials will be used to construct the main line of the scheme. It was explained that FlyUp can't claim compensation costs relating to an objection to the scheme. FlyUp request that their utility connections are improved because of the scheme. Meeting to be arranged with Taylor Woodrow to discuss.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation work plans issued to FlyUp for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to FlyUp notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation. This included land interest plans.
19/03/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	FlyUp raised concerns about the proposed location of the café/reception building location. It was explained that this is an indicative location that FlyUp could use. FlyUp support the revised car parking design.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		FlyUp raised concerns about users of the bike park having to travel by the slurry site on the south side of Alexander and Angell's land interest. It was explained that visual mitigation could be provided to address this issue. FlyUp stated they support the planting as part of the scheme but it needs to be sensible to allow for at least 2 metres between cycle tracks. Landscape planting proposed as part of the scheme was explained to FlyUp. FlyUp identified an overlap between a proposed hedge and bike track. The scheme landscape specialist will review and provide comment to FlyUp. It was explained that the access track will be designed using appropriate materials for service vehicle access. Comment from FlyUp was requested on the design proposed for the turning circle. FlyUp to provide comment. Jonathan Perks agreed to provide a quote to the DVS for temporary building structures. It was explained that National Highways can't pay directly for the planning application for FlyUp's new permanent building, but the business would be entitled to business compensation. FlyUp raised concerns about having to apply for planning permission for a building next to the car park. FlyUp requested that the building is included as part of the DCO. National Highways to prepare a response with input from the DVS on this request. FlyUp stated they are still waiting for a licence payment from last year. Licence payment to be issued to FlyUp. It was explained to FlyUp that they will need to arrange their own construction contractor to build their permanent building.
29/03/21	Phone call between DVS and Jonathan Perks	Hannah Basham confirmed that a café/reception building could not be included within the DCO.
12/05/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	The scheme noise specialist provided an overview of the noise levels created by the scheme both during construction and operation. It was explained that construction noise has been assessed as a significant effect at the residential dwelling during the daytime. It was explained that the residential dwelling would also be eligible for noise mitigation due to the operational noise impacts created. Noise mitigation would also include secondary glazing,

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		insulation, and mechanical air handling. Detail about the noise mitigation that will be available to FlyUp will be provided. The secondary glazing available to FlyUp was explained. It was explained that there could also be a ventilation compensation package available which will be acoustically attenuated. Although FlyUp's property qualifies for noise insulation, the actual increase in noise level won't be significant (1db increase in noise is predicted). It was explained that you wouldn't normally detect a noise level change of 1db (3 db is normally when you'd notice a change). FlyUp asked if National Highways leave after the scheme is built and the noise is louder than expected what will happen. Assurances were provided that everything so far has been based on projections and stated that traffic assessments completed have looked at volume, type of traffic etc. If FlyUp raised concerns about noise created when the scheme is in operation, appropriate assessments would be completed to verify their claims. National Highways would review any noise concerns raised by FlyUp and act appropriately. National Highways would look to see why there is a noise change that was not projected in the pre-construction assessments. The noise assessments consider worst case scenarios and it is hoped that noise levels created will be lower than what is expected. The noise assessments are done from standardised methodologies. FlyUp stated that the green line around the proposed car park is to be removed. It was explained that the removal of the green line was intended but had not yet been done as the comments on the access road and layout from FlyUp were yet to be received. Jonathan Perks requested further detail about meetings recorded in the Position Statement. This included detail discussed at meetings in September 2019, October 2020 and March 2021. Jonathan Perks requested that the permanent building is included as part of the DCO. Jonathan Perks stated that without the building being included in the DCO, FlyUp will object to the scheme. FlyUp stated their business won't be viable without the building being permanent and next to the car park. It was explained that the compensation constraints National Highways are working within means that they can only provide a temporary building. Compensation for business disruption will be available. FlyUp stated a temporary building will need to achieve their wide range of needs. Jonathan Perks stated the important issue is that FlyUp are looking to secure the ability to operate in the future. Jonathan Perks has requested a meeting with the DVS.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		Jonathan Perks stated the crux of previous conversations has been about the permanent building provision. It was explained that Arup have produced a design for new car parking which includes space for a permanent reception building. This design means FlyUp have the existing and new car and space for a permanent building. FlyUp stated the business won't work with the car parking proposed without a permanent building in place. It was explained that the construction phase will be approximately 3 years and if there's an opportunity to bring back the existing car park then it'll be reviewed. Jonathan Perks requested confirmation about the temporary buildings to be provided. DVS to provide written confirmation about temporary building cost provision. DVS agreed to look at the costs for the proposed temporary building structures. This money could then be provided to FlyUp for a permanent building. FlyUp stated they will not be applying for planning permission for the permanent building. Jonathan Perks stated there is a disagreement about what has previously been said. FlyUp stated that they thought they have been clear that if the original site is not returned to its original form then it's not a workable solution for going forward. Jonathan Perks stated that the cost of providing temporary buildings may meet or exceed the cost of permanent buildings. Jonathan Perks stated that he realises National Highways guidelines for betterment could create issues but does not believe this is a concern here. Jonathan Perks stated that National Highways stance that the provision of new buildings would be considered betterment is not correct. Jonathan Perks stated that the buildings being supplied by National Highways as part of the DCO or paid for as a compensable item under a claim would have the same impact as betterment. Such elements of the claim can be dealt with as part of the negotiations and Jonathan Perks see's little argument for the legal issues of betterment not being used to provide mitigation as part of the DCO. Jonathan Perks stated the driver for this should be for the business case and the fact that the costs incurred could be greater in the long run for the permanent building rather than the temporary. FlyUp to object to the scheme if this is not resolved.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
		Reference to two case studies for HS2 in relation to the provision of mitigation buildings being provided. Jonathan Perks to provide information on the two examples. DVS explained an appropriate financial mechanism needs to be identified. Jonathan Perks disagreed and said the big issue is planning. Jonathan Perks raised concerns about construction programmes for the scheme and permanent building aligning. The DVS explained the discretionary advanced payment would be paid in advance to help avoid programme conflicts. The intention of the new access track is to maintain access to the business from the start of construction of the scheme. DVS stated that discretionary payments are not associated with land acquisition. It was explained that FlyUp might end up with money for business losses that can be put towards buildings. FlyUp raised concerns about planning permission for the permanent building being refused by the local planning authority. It was explained that this is unlikely considering the nature of the proposed development but FlyUp would need to discuss this with their appointed planning agent and seek pre application advice from the Local Planning Authority. In terms of time scales a planning application if submitted soon would be quicker than including the provision of a permanent new building in the DCO. Detail to be provided about why the permanent building can't be provided as part of the DCO. FlyUp request that meetings are recorded in the future. Future meeting to be arranged.
23/07/21	Email correspondence	Explanation of why a permanent building cannot be provided. Position the professional fees that would be paid to enable a planning application for a new café/reception/shop building.
30/07/21	Email correspondence	Agent responds that if no permanent building is to be provided as part of the DCO and that the access track will need to be reinstated in front the house once use of the car parking and temporary building ceases. Questions need for areas of land to be acquired on a permanent basis.
6/08/21	Email correspondence	Email response from the A417 Project Director stating position on why a permanent building cannot be provided and explaining support for any planning application the business would wish to make.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics and Key Outcomes Discussed
6/08/21	Email correspondence	Agents response that if the car parking is to be permanent though the building temporary then it needs to be sufficiently substantial construction to be secure for a bike shop. If there is only going to be a temporary building provided then the access track will have to revert to the front of the house once construction activity is complete.
23/08/21	Email correspondence	Further email response from the A417 Project Director stating position on why a permanent building cannot be provided. Explanation of why a permanent building cannot be included within the DCO. The use of public funds and explanation of value for money was also provided. It was stated that a planning application for a permanent building would be assisted and that if any discussions where required with potential consultees this would also be supported. It was acknowledged that the planning process for the bike park itself has been challenging though it was felt that Mr and Mrs Ruskin would be better placed to "own" the design process.
08/12/21	Meeting	Meeting held to discuss access track and car parking provision during the construction phase. Discussion held also regarding permanent and temporary buildings.
12/01/22	Meeting (Virtual)	Revised car parking and access track presented for consideration. Alternation to land required for the scheme and nature of land required also presented. Access track to revert to being in front of the residential building and reduction of permanent land take affecting car parking.
22/02/2022	Meeting	Review of plans and discussion of access track arrangement, car parking, planting and land required for the scheme. At this meeting, Flyup Limited requested another change to the scheme, despite the formal change request that was submitted to the ExA on 14 February 2022.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Agricultural/HGV Vehicle Access	FlyUp raised concerns about the ability of agricultural vehicles and HGV's to access their site in the future.	A new access track on the southern side of FlyUp's land interest will be provided. The new access track will be suitable for HGVs and farm vehicles. Passing places have been included in the design and combine harvester access will be provided to the land south and west of FlyUp. This is unchanged as part of the formal change request.
~~2~~	~~Cotswold Brash Material~~	~~FlyUp requested that an agreement was made for the excessive Cotswold Brash Material produced by the scheme.~~ ~~The demand for crushed stone at FlyUp is noted. Construction contractor to be made aware this request.~~	
3	PRoW	FlyUp were~~are~~ concerned that the scheme could increase bridleway traffic on their land creating a safety risk to cyclists. FlyUp requested that the PRoW proposals are changed to not encourage new users of the PRoW.	Proposals issued as part of the 2020 consultation through the PRoW management plan, show a consolidation of PRoW in the west of FlyUp, with the existing bridleway stopped up and a footpath provided along the new access road to carry routes that join from the south. FlyUp have been advised that signage and guidance measures will encourage use of the detrunked A417 rather than the bridleway that goes through their land. National Highways have removed the PRoW that passes through FlyUp's land holding. This is unchanged as part of the formal change request.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
4	~~Pick-up Point~~ ~~FlyUp stated that any temporary ownership of their pick-up point could extinguish their business.~~	~~The scheme design has considered FlyUp's comment and will not include the pick-up point as part of the proposed land take.~~	
5	Access	FlyUp requested a design change to the access track to minimise potential conflict between construction traffic and customer access.	National Highways have realigned the access track to FlyUp's property and business to remove potential conflict between construction traffic/activities and the access used by FlyUp and their customers. This is unchanged as part of the formal change request.
6	Car Parking	FlyUp raised concerns about the temporary loss of car parking during the construction phase of the scheme.	National Highways have included additional car parking along the realigned access track which mitigates the temporary loss of car parking during the construction phase of the scheme. ~~This results in a net gain in overall in permanent car parking.~~ This is unchanged as part of the formal change request.
7	Eastern Bike Track	FlyUp raised concerns about the land required for the construction of the scheme to limit impact on the eastern bike tracks.	National Highways have revised the land required for the construction phase to minimise land impact on the eastern bike tracks and enable the existing bike tracks to operate during the construction phase of the scheme. National Highways will continue to work with Flyup Limited during detailed design to ensure impact is minimised.
8	Children's Track and Jump Track	FlyUp raised concerns about the scheme's impact on their children's track and jump track.	National Highways revised the scheme design to avoid the loss of the children's track and jump track. This is unchanged as part of the formal change request.
9	Site Connectivity	FlyUp requested that an effective means of access from the downhill tracks, back to the café, shop and uplift is maintained during construction.	National Highways will maintain connectivity on FlyUp's site between the relevant buildings as required and a temporary building is proposed during construction adjacent to the proposed temporary car parking.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Access Track Ownership	FlyUp requested detail about the ownership of the access track into their site.	National Highways have reviewed the title deeds relating to FlyUp's land interest. No covenant or formal right of access appears to have been agreed across the existing access track that goes through the neighbouring landowner's land. National Highways cannot provide freehold ownership of the access track to FlyUp as it is not within their power to do so. However, as part of the scheme, National Highways will provide a permanent right of access across the new access track on the southern side of FlyUp and the neighbouring landowners land connecting to the public highway. National Highways are awaiting comment from FlyUp to closeout this issue.
2	Bike Tracks	FlyUp are concerned the land take and construction work could impact their downhill run track making it unusable. The runoff area is within the area of permanent land take.	~~FlyUp to provide comment on the revised scheme design impact on bike tracks.~~ ~~FlyUp will provide comment when the car parking provision is agreed.~~National Highways await an updated position on this matter from Flyup Limited and consider that the proposed formal change request mitigates any impact on the downhill run tracks.
3	Compensation – Planned Bike Track Construction	FlyUp consider that they have lost money due to a planned track not being built. The track was not built due to scheme groundworks restricting development.	National Highways have explained that sufficient evidence needs to be provided to justify compensation. It was explained that FlyUp should not have postponed construction plans due to the emerging scheme as it is yet to gain consent and therefore not implementable. Any developments secured (e.g., new planning permissions) by FlyUp during the scheme design would have been considered by the design team. FlyUp and Jonathan Perks to provide evidence of losses for the compensation claim.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter		National Highways Position
~~4~~	~~Legal confirmation of extinguishment of PROW~~	~~FlyUp to share the legal confirmation of the extinguishment of the footpath through their site.~~	~~Awaiting FlyUp to share the legal confirmation of the extinguishment of the footpath through their site.~~	
~~4~~5	~~Hedge/Bike track overlap~~	~~FlyUp identified an overlap between a proposed hedge and a bike track.~~	~~National Highways to review the landscape overlap and provide update to FlyUp.~~ ~~National Highways will undertake this review during the detailed design stage of the scheme.~~	
~~5~~6	Turning circle	A design for the proposed turning circle was provided to FlyUp for comment.		National Highways await an updated position on this matter from Flyup Limited and consider that the proposed formal change request mitigates any impact on the downhill run tracks.~~FlyUp to provide comment when the car parking provision is agreed.~~
~~7~~	~~Network Rail Compensation Examples~~	~~Jonathan Perks stated he has examples of Network Rail projects where compensation has been provided for permanent buildings~~	~~Jonathan Perks to provide Network Rail compensation examples.~~	

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
		~~impacted by schemes.~~	
6~~8~~	Scheme Phasing Plan	FlyUp requested the scheme phasing plan to plan for the permanent reception building proposed on their land.	Programme phasing at the preliminary design stages is included within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) submitted as part of the application (Document Reference 6.4 Appendix 2.1 Annex B, Rev 1, REP2-008). Scheme phasing plan to be provided to FlyUp when the construction contractor has contractually appointed.
7~~9~~	Permanent Building Provision	FlyUp requested that permanent rather than temporary buildings (including the reception, shop, café, office) are provided as part of the DCO. The permanent buildings would adjoin onto their new car park. FlyUp stated that if they did not have permanent buildings with the specified facilities included then their business could no longer continue to operate. FlyUp stated that a temporary building with the facilities required would be more expensive than a permanent building. FlyUp stated they do not wish to proceed with their own planning application due to issues with the planning authority in the past. FlyUp stated the works as currently proposed will have a significant impact on their business and homelife, both temporarily and permanently. FlyUp stated that the current site layout means that anyone entering the site by car	National Highways are unable to provide the permanent buildings requested as part of the DCO. National Highways have agreed to pay the planning application fees for the permanent building should the business so wish. The cost of temporary buildings will be provided to Flyup Limited to contribute towards construction of a permanent building if Flyup Limited obtains planning permission for a permeant Café/reception/shop building. Such permission would need to be obtained prior to work commencing on any temporary buildings. National Highways continues to engage with FlyUp on this matter and the provision of a temporary building. No details on the type and specification has been provided to date. A permanent solution could still be delivered by Flyup Limited alongside changes proposed through the formal change request, should planning permission be forthcoming.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
		has to park beyond the administrative buildings and walk past such to get to the pick up point. On returning to their car, they walk back past the café. The proposed location for the new buildings will allow cars to park near the pick up point without passing the admin and café buildings. This raises issues of income and insurance, together with poorer visitor experience leading to lack of trade. The suggestion of new buildings is to allow the administration building and café to be by the car park. Any such buildings need to be substantial as, amongst other concerns, the bike shop needs to be at first floor level and secured (as is currently the case).	
~~8~~10	Septic Tank	FlyUp requested that an alternative location for the septic tank is considered.	National Highways to review the possibility of an alternative septic tank location during the detailed design stage of the scheme when a foul water drainage survey will~~to~~ be completed.
911	Land Take	FlyUp requested detail about the temporary and permanent land take as part of the scheme.	~~National Highways to provide detail about the temporary and permanent land take as part of the scheme. Detail about the permanent and temporary land take is included in the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3, APP-026) and Statement of Reasons (Document Reference 4.1, APP-024) submitted as part of the DCO.~~Details in relation to temporary and permanent land take is provided through documents submitted to support the formal change request. This includes an updated set of Land Plans (Document Reference 2.2, Rev 2, REP4-006), and an updated Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3, Rev 1, REP4-022). On the basis of the formal change request, National Highways consider that land take is now agreed in principle.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
102	Site Operation	FlyUp raised concerns about the operation of their site throughout the construction and operation of the scheme. These concerns relate to the powers that National Highways will have on their land if the DCO is granted and the construction impacts the scheme will create.	A meeting will be arranged between FlyUp and the construction contractor when they are appointed. S.253 will allow for Flyup to undertake planting with a planting specification to be provided by National Highways and potentially retain ownership of mitigation areas as discussed.
113	Car park	FlyUp requested a new car park as the scheme will impact their current parking facilities. FlyUp stated that because of the scheme, If the car parking was, post works, returned to its original position, it seems likely that it would be of smaller size than before. FlyUp are currently at capacity on car parking and would have limited room to extend such. The scheme will therefore put a permanent constraint on their visitor numbers	Approximately 12090 car parking spaces will be provided temporarily during the construction phase, to the west of the site in proximity to the current pick up point for the uplift. ~~The numbers of car parking spaces is based on our estimated capacity of the existing car parking area as the existing car parking is not formalised.~~ Through the formal change request, National Highways have proposed amendments to the scheme design which mean that ~~O~~once construction has been completed the current car park can ~~would~~ be returned to Flyup Limited in full, mitigating concerns raised. ~~Sketch plans have been provided for consideration and discussion.~~
12	Access Track	At a meeting on 22 February 2022, Flyup requested a further design change / concerns about the proposed northern access which was presented as a 'customer access' as part of the formal change request.	National Highways does not consider a further change to access arrangements necessary at this stage and considers that the formal change request, as submitted, allows greatest flexibility with changes possible at the detailed design stage when the outcome of Flyup Limited's planning application is known.
135	Land take	FlyUp raised concerns relating to the land take proposed and the impact it could have on their cycle tracks~~lanes~~. FlyUp identified an area for planting which is to be permanently acquired for the scheme.	National Highways continue to engage with FlyUp in regard to the planting proposed for the scheme which focusses on the area around the temporary car parking. Areas required for woodland planting mitigation can have the freehold retained by FlyUp if a S.253 agreement can be reached and discussions in relation to this are ongoing.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
146	Compensation – Business Impact	FlyUp raised concerns about the scheme's permanent and temporary acquisition of their land interfering with existing bike tracks. FlyUp stated that meaningful engagement is yet to occur regarding land take and the impact on the business. FlyUp raised concerns about the scheme resulting in the temporary and potentially permanent closure of their business.	National Highways continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the scheme using clear statutory procedures, to understand the effects of the scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate, in line with statutory compensation guidelines and policy including Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.
157	Noise	FlyUp raised concerns about the noise levels the scheme could create. FlyUp questioned the noise impact assessments completed.	The results of the noise assessment completed to inform the development of the scheme is set out in ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.2, APP-042), which also sets out the measures included by National Highways to mitigate adverse noise effects. Construction noise has been assessed as a significant effect at the residential dwelling during the daytime. Daytime construction noise could exceed noise thresholds which means the residential dwelling at FlyUp is eligible for noise insulation. The residential dwelling would be eligible for noise insultation due to the operational noise impacts created. Noise mitigation would include secondary glazing. An air quality ventilation compensation package would also be available to FlyUp which will be acoustically attenuated. Although FlyUp's property qualifies for noise insulation, the actual increase in noise level is low (1db increase in noise is expected). It was explained that you wouldn't normally detect a noise level change of 1db (3 db increase is the standard level for which you'd detect an increase). Means of funding and instruction of the noise mitigation works to be agreed between National Highways and FlyUp.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
168	Planting	Flyup Limited are concerned that woodland planting will interfere with the operation of the western bike tracks.	~~Areas required for woodland planting mitigation can have the freehold retained by FlyUp if a S.253 agreement can be reached.~~ ~~The planting will be designed to avoid the route of the bike tracks.~~ ~~The duration and timing of planting works are to be agreed with the landowner to avoid disruption to the business.~~ Through the recent formal change request, National Highways has sought to avoid impact on the western bike tracks and will continue to work with Flyup Limited during the detailed design of the scheme. We also continue to discuss a potential ~~To agreed via~~ S.253. with Flyup which would enable them to retain ownership of certain mitigation areas. ~~Planting to be completed by Flyup Limited.~~
179	Uplift	(Point raised in CAH) The uplift buses will not be able to operate during the construction phase	~~The uplift buses will be able to utilise the new access track. An option to increase capacity would be the provision of an additional uplift bus to transport people visiting the site from the temporary car park to the current location of the café/reception and shop buildings. Introducing increased uplift bus capacity could negate the need for a temporary building.~~ ~~The existing access track is open to the public highway and there is no solid barrier preventing cyclists from entering the site and the tracks without paying. The construction phase of the scheme does not alter this situation.~~ National Highways will avoid disruption to the uplift busses during construction and work with Flyup Limited to ensure an appropriate solution. Should any disruption occur and commercial loses incurred, they can be claimed back via a business disturbance claim.

Appendix D Position Statement with Mrs Besterman

Landowner Position Statement – Besterman

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Mrs Besterman as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mrs Besterman and/or her agent during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to this land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

~~1.1.5 T~~This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Mrs Besterman have been considered and responded to. ~~his Position Statement has been updated in December 2021 in order to ensure matters raised in the Relevant Representation, submitted to the Examination are considered and responded to.~~

~~1.1.6~~1.1.5

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
30/7/2019	Meeting	Meeting with Mrs Besterman and Mr Boucher (Farm Manager). The following issues and outcomes were discussed and agreed at the meeting: • The overbridges at Stockwell Farm will be wide enough for farm machinery; • Tree retention • Cowley lane and the main scheme alignment; • Lighting; • Noise concerns; • Public Rights of Way (PRoW); and • Accommodation works to be provided.
27/9/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation Letter	Consultation invitation issued to Mrs Besterman.
08/11/2019	Consultation Response	Statutory consultation response received from Mrs Besterman objecting to the scheme. Mrs Besterman objects to the scheme due to issues identified relating to the following: • The principle of the development; • AONB; • Loss of Amenity; • Volume of Traffic; • Construction Impacts; • Ecological Concerns; and • Insufficient supporting information.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation Letter	Meeting arranged with Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead (Land Agent).
27/01/2020	Meeting	Meeting with Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead (Land Agent). The following issues and outcomes were discussed and agreed at the meeting: • Land take to be reduced to minimise impact on lambing;

		• Compensation for land agent fees was explained; • Further survey work; • Potential conflict between works and water supply; and • Ecological survey findings and proposed mitigation.
24/08/2020	Meeting	Meeting with Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead. The following issues relating to the archaeological works were discussed at the meeting: • Access; • Compensation; • Phasing; and • Timescales.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to Mrs Besterman notifying her of the beginning of the public consultation.
05/11/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting with Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead as part of the statutory consultation for the scheme. A summary of the key actions from the meeting were: • Traffic impacts through Stockwell Farm as a result of the proposed works along Cowley Lane. • Reasoning for the footpath going past the quarry. • Further detail required for the car parking proposed on the Birdlip junction/old Birdlip Road. • Transport modelling data and methodology to be provided for the relevant areas discussed. • Tree planting proposed and the arboriculture report to be issued to Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead. A plan showing the trees to be removed by the scheme on Mrs Besterman's land to be provided. • A cross section of the overbridge at Stockwell Farm to be provided.
16/12/2020	Meeting	Meeting with Mrs Besterman to discuss updates from the meeting on the 5th November. Updates were provided and it was agreed that the Arup project team would provide further detail on the issues discussed before the end of the year.

		Michael Downes and Tim Broomhead completed a site walkover of Mrs Besterman's land inspecting and photographing the archaeological trenching remediation work completed.
30/12/2020	Correspondence	Email correspondence received from Mrs Besterman providing photographs of the weather conditions at Stockwell Farm in the winter months. Appropriate response to be prepared and issued to Mrs Besterman.
11/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Email issued to Mrs Besterman explaining the considerations and mitigation in place to ensure the roads around and through Stockwell Farm are safe in the winter months.
28/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Mrs Besterman for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Mrs Besterman notifying her of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
02/03/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation Response	Targeted landowner consultation response received from Mrs Besterman.
21/04/2021	Email Correspondence	A response to Mrs Besterman's Consultation Response was issued to Mrs Besterman for review.
28/04/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft Position Statement issued to Mrs Besterman for review.
10/05/2021	Email Correspondence	Tim Broomhead issued a letter with regard to the draft Position Statement issued on the 28th April.
13/05/2021	Landowner Meeting	Meeting with Mrs Besterman to discuss the issues raised in the consultation response received in February 2021 and provide a wider scheme update. Agreed actions at the meeting included: • The archaeological report and/or information relevant to the ground investigation that took place on Mrs Besterman's land to be provided. • Cross sectional plans to be issued to Mrs Besterman showing the scheme from her main dwelling. • The height of Stockwell Bridge is to be provided to Mrs Besterman. • Environmental Masterplan to be shared with Mrs Besterman in regard to her land interest.

		• The methodology for the safety assessments completed to provide a case for the scheme It was explained that when the DCO is submitted, the documents will be made publicly available on the Planning Inspectorate website. Discussions began about each of the points raised in Mrs Besterman's consultation February 2021 response. At the meeting, it was realised that Mrs Besterman and Tim Broomhead had not seen the email from Michael Downes on the 21st April 2021 which contained a written response to Mrs Besterman's issues. It was agreed that Tim Broomhead would review National Highways consultation response and provide comments. It was agreed that discussions about the consultation response would be progressed when Tim Broomhead provides comments to National Highways response. Tim Broomhead requested that land acquisition and compensation discussions are advanced. Hannah Basham stated Tim Broomhead would need to apply for discretionary purchase. Tim Broomhead explained that a hybrid approach of acquisition would be Mrs Besterman's preference. Tim Broomhead and Hannah Basham to arrange a separate meeting to discuss a means of acquisition Tim Broomhead to provide this meeting request and agenda to Mrs Besterman in writing.
06/08/2021	Email Correspondence	Email correspondence issued to Mrs Besterman requesting access to undertake ecological surveys. Mrs Besterman agreed to the ecological surveys in an email on the 6th August 2021.
05/10/2021	Correspondence	Tim Broomhead prepared and issued a draft set of Heads of Terms (HOTs) as per land acquisition discussions between him and Hannah Basham (DVS). National Highways to provide comments on the draft HOTs.
08/02/2022	Meeting (virtual)	Meeting to discuss land acquisition with Tim Broomhead, DVS and National Highways

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matters Comment	National Highways Position Response
1	Land take	Mrs Besterman raised concerns that the land take proposed included the removal of fields that are currently used for lambing.	Land take proposed was revised to ensure sections of the land used for lambing were maintained. The right to maintain a field drain adjacent to the detrunked A417 was also revised.
2	Ecology	Ecology information requested by Mrs Besterman.	The ecology detail requested was provided to Mrs Besterman. Further details about ecological assessments completed for the scheme can be found in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039).
3	PRoW	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the PRoW proposed next to the quarry. Mrs Besterman was concerned that the footpath could create a maintenance burden on her.	The PRoW identified by Mrs Besterman is an existing footpath. It is being re-designated from a footpath to a bridleway to improve connectivity for a wider range of users.
4	Vehicle Parking	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the vehicle parking along the existing A417. It was proposed to provide disabled parking bays and horse box spaces on the detrunked section immediately west of the turning for Stockwell Lane. Mrs Besterman requested that the parking proposed is moved to Barrow Wake.	Vehicle parking has been moved next to the Golden Heart Inn.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Land Impact	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the amount of land take proposed. Specific concerns were identified for the land next to Barrow Wake and the field drain opposite the Birdlip Junction.	Land take and the acquisition of permanent rights is only proposed where necessary. It was explained to Mrs Besterman that the land take is required for the connection of the PRoW routes from Shab Hill Junction to the repurposed A417 and the wider area. National Highways are awaiting confirmation from Mrs Besterman that her concerns about the land impact at Barrow Wake and the field drain opposite Birdlip Junction are addressed.
2	Rat Running	Mrs Besterman raised concerns that 'rat running' could be created by the scheme. Mrs Besterman was concerned that road users travelling to Cowley could now bypass Stockwell Farm. This could create higher volumes of traffic flow by her property.	By improving congestion and reliability, the scheme aims to reduce rat running through neighbouring communities and make it easier for drivers, walkers and other local road users to get around. National Highways has carried out traffic modelling throughout the development of the scheme to inform its design and to understand its likely effects on traffic. Traffic assessments completed do not suggest rat running will occur along the road at Stockwell Farm. The methodology and results of the traffic modelling is reported in the Transport Report (Document Reference 7.10, APP-426).
3	Stockwell Farm Overbridge	Mrs Besterman asked for confirmation that the overbridge proposed at Stockwell Farm is of a sufficient size and load bearing capacity to support modern farming machinery.	The Stockwell Farm overbridge will be of a size and scale to support farming machinery. A cross section plan was issued to Mrs Besterman for review. National Highways are awaiting confirmation from Mrs Besterman that her concerns about the Stockwell Farm Overbridge are addressed.
4	Accommodation Works	Accommodation works to be provided as part of the scheme are to be agreed.	Accommodation works will be developed and agreed as the scheme progresses. Comments have been received from Mrs Besterman on draft accommodation works plans.

5	Land Acquisition	Land acquisition discussions to begin.	Land acquisition discussions will be progressed by the DVS. Land acquisition discussions have advanced with Mrs Besterman. Tim Broomhead submitted draft HOTs to National Highways on the 5th October 2021. National Highways are currently reviewing the draft HOTs received.
6	Weather Concerns	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the visibility for drivers using the part of the scheme to be constructed on her land.	National Highways recognises the concerns relating to operation during inclement weather conditions. The Cotswolds AONB is recognised as having an extensive area of naturally occurring dark night skies and it is therefore not proposed to light the scheme. The maintenance strategy for the scheme provides details of how the route would be maintained to mitigate weather risks. It is proposed to provide reflective road studs to ensure lanes are visible during the hours of darkness. It is not currently proposed to heat the road surface, however technologies which improve road safety are always considered during scheme development. The organisation responsible for maintaining the road and managing the road during periods of severe weather are required to produce a severe weather plan each year. However, it is recognised that due to the particular high-risk nature of elements along the scheme, a co-ordinated multi-agency response is required to ensure public safety and prevent motorists becoming stranded in their vehicles. This multi-agency response is detailed in National Highways A417 Vulnerable Location Plan Version 2.6 in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex B Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323).
7	Targeted Landowner Consultation Response – February 2021	Targeted landowner consultation response received from Mrs Besterman raising several concerns in relation to the scheme.	National Highways issued a response to Mrs Besterman's consultation response in email correspondence sent on the 21st April 2021. National Highways are awaiting a response from Tim Broomhead and Mrs Besterman as agreed at the landowner meeting on the 13th May 2021.

8	Route Selection	Mrs Besterman stated that the preferred route (Option 30) has insufficient justification from a cost and environmental perspective. It is considered that the previous route put forward as a solution (Option 12) along the existing A417 is less damaging than the proposed route.	Taking into account feedback received in response to the 2018 public consultation, Option 30 was selected, and a Preferred Route Announcement was made in 2019. Please refer to section 3.3 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) for further information. The Case for the Scheme (Document reference 7.1, APP-417) submitted with the DCO application sets out how the benefits of the scheme are balanced against its adverse impacts, and how the scheme complies with the National Planning Statement for National Networks.
9	AONB Impact	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the impact the scheme will have on the AONB and the wider environment. Mrs Besterman stated that Option 12 would have less of an environmental impact.	National Highways recognises the significance and sensitivity of the landscape. National Highways 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 (Document Reference 7.7, APP-423), whilst an assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects (Document Reference 6.2, APP-038).
10	Cowley Wood Lane	Mrs Besterman stated that the stopping up of Cowley Wood Lane and its replacement with a public right of way is unnecessary and detrimental to [redacted] for two reasons: • The removal of vehicular rights on the highway will increase the traffic on the Stockwell Lane from Cowley, damaging the hamlet of Stockwell and • Public highway [redacted] is used by the farm as access north/south. The closure of the highway to traffic will be detrimental to the farming business.	Following on from the 2019 public consultation events and a review of the roads surrounding Cowley, National Highways 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 WCH, 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. Traffic assessments completed do not suggest rat running will occur along the road at Stockwell Farm. The methodology and results of the traffic modelling is reported in the Transport Report (Document Reference 7.10, APP-426).

			Compensation will be paid to Mrs Besterman in instances where the scheme impacts the farming business.
11	Tree Removal	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the removal of trees on Stockwell Lane. Mrs Besterman stated that the removal of 6 trees; forming part of the avenue to the East of Stockwell, is excessive and reduces the amenity of the Stockwell hamlet. The re-routed Stockwell lane should be designed to retain as many avenue trees as possible.	The alignment of Cowley lane has been designed to minimise the removal of trees on the avenue and across the scheme in general. However, some trees will be lost to accommodate the mainline A417 and the realignment of Cowley Lane via the Cowley crossing. Replacement tree planting is proposed along the new section of Cowley Lane, with a 3m wide hedgerow across Cowley crossing. Further tree and woodland planting are proposed along the mainline carriageway to help mitigate for visual effects of the scheme. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been completed for the site (ES Appendix 7.6, Document Reference 6.4, APP-353).
12	Agricultural Land Impact	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the significant areas of land take at the following locations: • A strip of land south of Hardings Barn (land ref 6/5f); • Land between footpath 22 and the road cutting (land ref 5/6d); • Land south west of the Stockwell Bridge (land ref 5/3ae and 6/5d); • Land to the north west of the Stockwell Bridge (land ref 5/3ae); • Land south east of Shab Hill Junction (land ref 4/2p); • Land south of the Shab Hill lane (land ref 3/15a).	National Highways require land reference 6/5f for essential mitigation planting in the form of woodland edge/scrub. Detail about the mitigation planting proposed can be found on the Environmental Masterplan Sheet 16 (Figure 7.11 Document Reference 6.3, APP-183). National Highways require clarification from Mrs Besterman about her concerns regarding land reference 5/6d as it is not located on existing Land Plans (Document Reference 2.2, APP-006). National Highways require land reference 3/15a, 4/2p, 5/3ae and 6/5d for the reasons stated in the Statement of Reasons (Document Reference 4.1, APP-024).
13	Business Impact	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the impact the scheme will have on her farming business in the future.	Mrs Besterman would be eligible to make a claim under Part 1 of the Compensation Act if their business is negatively impacted by the scheme. Sufficient evidence needs to be provided to justify

		Mrs Besterman stated that the agricultural land is important to her sheep enterprise and the separation of the buildings created by the scheme will have a detrimental impact on her ability to run the agricultural enterprise.	compensation. National Highways continues to engage with Mrs Besterman on this matter.
14	Alternative PRoW Proposals	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the permanent right of access sought by National Highways through the farmyard to access the Stockwell overbridge and balancing pond. Mrs Besterman stated it limits the ability to use the yards and buildings. There are alternatives for National Highways from either Nettleton Bottom or the Cowley Lane junction which should be used in preference to imposing rights in the farmyard.	The PRoW on Mrs Besterman's land performs best in consideration of the assessments and consultation completed to develop the ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323). All proposals for WCH are detailed in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323). That includes consideration of local routes used by vehicles and WCH, and in the Shab Hill to Cowley junction area diverted, reclassified and new routes are proposed to help connect severed 'green lanes' or 'unclassified roads' in this location, and joining them to safe crossings of the A417 such as the Cowley and Stockwell overbridges and beyond.
15	PRoW Impact	Mrs Besterman raised concerns about the following PRoW proposed: • The reclassification of footpath 22 to a restricted byway • The reclassification of footpath 21 to a bridleway. • The diversion of restricted byway 26, when this route could follow the new Stockwell lane. • The new link between the Shab Hill lane and the former A417 near the Barrow Wake underpass, which could be achieved on highway land without land acquisition.	ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323) sets out the mitigation and enhancement for WCH and other users of rights of way/highway with public access. This includes a number of proposals to improve and increase safe connectivity, and addresses the suggestions made. The reclassification of Cowley footpath 22 to a restricted byway seeks to create continuous WCH route between Cowley overbridge and Cowley junction and beyond, as set out in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323). Cowley Restricted Byway 26 would be stopped up with its total severance by the mainline of the proposed scheme, with a minor diversion of that route on a similar alignment a few meters to the east to avoid the fence line. That is set out in ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plans (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323) which incorporates the Public Rights of Way

			Management Plan and sets out the mitigation and enhancement for WCH and other users of rights of way/highway with public access. This includes connecting restricted byway 26 to the overbridges and the proposed reclassification of footpath 21 to a bridleway as suggested. The new link between Shab Hill lane and the former A417 near the Barrow Wake underpass is a new restricted byway connected the re-purposed A417 with Cowley footpath 44 and realigned B4070. This is needed to provide a safe connection for WCH, given the differences in gradient and not wanting to put WCH directly through the proposed roundabout junction.
16	Attenuation Basin maintenance access	The designed route goes through the farm yard at Stockwell and would be detrimental to the farm. The proposed use of the existing maintenance track for the telecoms mast would still require a vehicle to pass along Cowley lane. The landowners preference is for a new route to be created from the east from Cowley Wood lane for the maintenance of the attenuation basin.	Alternative maintenance access routes are being sought. The current telecoms mast access track would provide a possible solution to avoid using the farmyard. The number of visits to carryout maintenance to the basin will be of a low frequency of around one visit every six months. The telecoms mast access track would address the concern of biosecurity and disturbance to the farmyard. Discussions ~~are ongoing~~ with the landowner are ongoing. ~~National Highways are continuing discussions with the land owner.~~

Appendix E Position Statement with Mr Dick

Landowner Position Statement – Dick

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Mr Dick as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mr Dick and/or his agents during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to his land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Mr Dick or his agents have been considered and responded to.

Table 1 Record of Key Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
01/08/2019	Meeting	Borehole locations and access routes were agreed.
27/09/2019	Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr Dick for 10 October 2019.
10/10/2019	Meeting	The following issues were discussed at the meeting with Mr Dick: • Old Pats Rugby club using Mr Dick's land as a training facility. • Soil waste created by the scheme being used at Cotswold Hills Golf Club for enhancement purposes. • Land agent fees. • Proposed tree planting for the purposes of landscape mitigation.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr Dick for 20 March 2020.
20/03/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	Mr Dick's main concerns at the meeting related to: • Land acquisition. • Compulsory acquisition. • Survey work and licences required. • Project timeline.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence was issued to Mr Dick to notify him of the beginning of statutory consultation.
14/10/2020	Consultation Response	Mr Dick submitted a consultation response in relation to the scheme. The following questions were asked in the consultation response provided: 1. Has the A436 access road been moved slightly west nearer the junction to Birdlip? 2. Is a footbridge proposed crossing the A436 and A417 just north of the major Birdlip village A417/intersection? 3. Does the bridge that forms part of the Cotswold Way pass over Mr Dick's land? 4. Is a construction compound proposed to the north of Mr Dick's land? 5. Mr Dick requested a face to face meeting.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
		6. Mr Dick requested clarification about land take proposed for the scheme.
03/11/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	Mr Dick requested clarification about the drainage infrastructure proposed for McCarthy Taylor Systems. It was explained that the drainage infrastructure and design is still being developed for the scheme. Detail will be provided to Mr Dick when available for review. Mr Dick raised concerns about the impact on his land proposed as part of the scheme. Land take proposed is currently being reviewed by the scheme solutions team. Land acquisition and compensation discussions to be led by the DVS.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Mr Dick for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Mr Dick notifying him of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
17/02/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting with Mr Dick as part of the targeted landowner consultation. National Highways explained to Mr Dick that his land is required permanently for the purposes of ecological mitigation. The ecological mitigation will consist of species rich calcareous grassland. The temporary land take identified is required to mitigate a pinch point adjacent to the Birdlip Radio Station. The works proposed consist of the construction of a slip road, land bunds and a drainage channel. National Highways are unable to amend the red line boundary to remove the temporary land impact on Mr Dick's land. Land is also required to gain access for the scheme construction and the drainage basin located near Mr Dick's land. The temporary land take required will also allow for working room to construct the ditch. The actions recorded at the meeting were: • Review of temporary land take proposed. • Draft or example environmental management plan to be issued to Mr Dick for review. • National Highways to provide further detail about the proposed S253 to Mr Dick. • National Highways to provide further information about the scheme construction phasing and proposed works to Mr Dick.
15/09/2021	Email Correspondence	Follow up of issue of position statement and request for comment land management requirements for S253.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
17/09/2021	Email Correspondence	Email correspondence from Mark Warnett (Land Agent – Carter Jonas) requesting the following: • Position Statement to be resent; • Detail about the ecological management agreement; and • Detail about the planned surveys in 2022.
23/09/2021	Email Correspondence	Position Statement provided to Mark Warnett and Mr Dick. Email correspondence provided detail about the ecological management. A draft investigation licence was provided for review and signature. This was issued to allow National Highways to undertake the required ground investigation and ecological surveys for the scheme.
06/10/2021	Telephone Call	Telephone call to Mr Dick to provide detail about the draft examination timetable. Mr Dick stated that he would contact Mark Warnett to provide feedback to National Highways on the ecological mitigation and compensation.
12/10/2021	Telephone Call	Telephone call with Mr Dick. Mr Dick stated that he would contact Mark Warnett to provide feedback to National Highways on the ecological mitigation and compensation.
25/10/2021	Email Correspondence	Response from Mark Warnett that more detailed information is required to enter a S.253 agreement and that sufficient justification for the permanent land take had not been provided.
16/12/2021	Email Correspondence	Updated site investigation work licence provided to Mark Warnett for review and signature.
22/12/2021	Email Correspondence	Request to Mark Warnett that the site investigation licence is reviewed and signed.
22/12/2021	Email Correspondence	Mark Warnett confirmed receipt of updated licence and stated will check and provide comments the first week in January 2022.
17/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Request to Mark Warnett that the site investigation licence is reviewed and signed.
19/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Comments provided by Mark Warnett on behalf of Mr Dick in regard to the site investigation licence.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
19/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Comments provided by Mark Warnett raising concerns in regard to the Position Statement. Mark Warnett requested that a Statement of Common Ground is produced in regard to Alan Dick's land interest rather than a Position Statement. Concerns raised in regard to the management requirements on Alan Dick's land in the absence of a management plan. Draft S253 agreement requested.
01/02/2022	Email Correspondence	Updated licence issued to Mark Warnett and Alan Dick for review and comment.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
1	A436 Access Road	Mr Dick questioned whether the A436 access road has been moved slightly west near the junction to Birdlip.	National Highways can confirm that the A436 has been moved west to reduce the space between the A417 and the A436.
2	Public Right of Way (PRoW)	Mr Dick asked if a footbridge is proposed across the A436 and A417 just north of the major Birdlip village A417/intersection.	National Highways can confirm that the Gloucestershire Way crossing has been included in the design to the north of the Shab Hill Junction. The crossing is proposed to provide essential ecology mitigation as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding link which would carry the Gloucestershire Way.
3	Construction compound	Mr Dick raised concerns about a believed construction compound to be located to the north of his land.	National Highways can confirm that the current design does include proposals for a construction compound to the north of Mr Dick's land.
4	Scheme red-line boundary	Mr Dick raised concerns about the small triangles of land that will not be taken by the scheme that could become "dead space" due to the scheme red-line boundary.	The scheme red-line boundary has been revised to include the small areas adjacent to the transmission mast identified by Mr Dick.
5	Ecology	Mr Dick requested the ecology survey report as agreed in exchange for access.	ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039) can be found on the planning inspectorate website ES Chapter 8 provides detail about all the ecological surveys and assessments completed for the scheme.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
1	Principle of the scheme	Mr Dick objects to the principle of the scheme on need and environmental grounds.	The objection to the principle of the scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7, APP-417) which sets out the environmental, economic and transport need for the scheme. The Scheme does not conflict with the UK's International commitments and domestic policy on climate change. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Dick on this matter.
2	Temporary Land Impact	Mr Dick questioned the need for the temporary land impact to plot reference 1143/2	National Highways are unable to remove the temporary land impact on Mr Dick's land. The temporary land take is a pinch point adjacent to the Birdlip Radio Station and the area is required to build the slip road, landform and a drainage channel. The land is required to gain access for the scheme construction and the drainage basin located near Mr Dick's land. The temporary land take will also allow for working room to construct the ditch. This has been identified following an assessment of likely working space required for the construction work. The temporary land take proposed will be given back to Mr Dick when the relevant scheme construction works are complete. A detailed programme of construction work on Mr Dick's land will be developed by the scheme construction contractor during the detailed design stage of the scheme. If Mr Dick requires access to the area of land impacted temporarily during the scheme construction, the contractor will be able to fence off and limit activities in

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
			the entirety of the area identified for an agreed period of time. National Highways will have an appointed liaison officer throughout the construction of the scheme who will be able to coordinate with the construction contractor on Mr Dick's behalf. The land identified will be given back to Mr Dick after the scheme has been constructed and he will receive the relevant compensation for the temporary impacts created because of the scheme. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Dick on this matter. National Highways await confirmation from Mr Dick that this matter has now been agreed.
3	Permanent Land Impact	Mr Dick requested that the land impact for the two large fields north and south of the Birdlip link road (plot reference 1143/2) is changed to from permanent to temporary.	National Highways have reviewed the land impact concerns. The two large fields are required permanently for the purposes of essential ecological mitigation. The two fields are required for species rich calcareous grassland creation. A Section 253 agreement (Highways Act 1980) has been identified as a possible option for Mr Dick to retain ownership of his land with certain agreements in place regarding its use. Further detail about the possible Section 253 Agreement can be found below.
4	S253 Agreement	Mr Dick has offered to enter into a management agreement with National Highways as an alternative to compulsory acquisition. Mr Dick states that no alternative agreement has been offered by National Highways. Mr Dick objects to the fact that site specific ecological mitigation management plans will not be developed until the detailed design stage of the scheme.	Mr Dick's land is required for essential ecological mitigation. National Highways are unable to provide the landowner with a site-specific management plan for a S.253 agreement at this stage of the DCO application due to further design and assessment being required. Site specific ecological mitigation management plans will be developed at the detailed design stage of the

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
		Mr Dick is already exploring ecological management proposals and states that alternative land should be acquired for the purposes of ecological mitigation for the scheme.	scheme. An indication of likely requirements has been provided below. The fields surrounding Mr Dick's land around the Shab Hill junction will be enhanced from their current state to a more species rich neutral grassland following the scheme works. Methods to achieve this may include harrowing and spreading of green hay from local meadows but this is yet to be determined and the exact nature of the works and the impact on the fields will determine this. Management regimes will depend on whether Mr Dick wishes to graze the land or not. Detail of an example management plan typical for species rich grassland meadow is set out below: • First 1-2 years: The grassland may require several cuts and/ or light grazing in years 1-2. This could be required to remove larger annuals and arisings, encouraging wildflower growth. • Subsequent years – if no grazing is proposed: Subsequent years could require a cut annually in autumn (no earlier than mid-July). This would allow the wildflowers and grasses to set seed and provide maximum value for invertebrates and small mammals. Cuttings will need to be wilted and turned in situ to allow seeds to drop before removal. Removing the cuttings reduces soil fertility, which will reduce dominant grasses and stop new seedlings from being smothered. This initial cut could be followed by a second aftermath cut • Subsequent years - if grazing is proposed: Grazing can occur after the main flowering period and continue throughout autumn and winter if the

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
			land is not too wet. Grazing should be stopped from April for the summer months to allow flowering of grass and flower species. A combination of cutting and grazing can also be used. This field contributes to scheme wide mitigation to replace grassland lost to the scheme. Whilst there are large gains in calcareous grassland throughout the scheme in accordance with the overall scheme vision which compensates for grassland loss, there is a net loss of neutral grassland of -1.38ha and a loss of approximately 4ha of species rich lowland meadow habitat to the north of Shab Hill. Enhancing the species diversity of this field and the adjacent fields will overtime partly compensate for the lowland meadow habitat lost to the scheme. With continued management as a grassland field, it will continue to provide ecological functionality and a wildlife corridor. National Highways provided a summary of how a Section 253 agreement could be used to manage newly created habitats in its Deadline 3 submission, Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) (Document Reference 8.17, REP3-009).
5	Accommodation works	Accommodation works discussions are to be advanced.	Preliminary accommodation works plans have been produced and shared with Mr Dick. These will be developed further during the detailed design stage of the scheme..
6	Land acquisition and compensation	Land acquisition and compensation discussions to be progressed.	Land acquisition discussions will be progressed by the DVS.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
7	Badger Fencing	Mr Dick requested the badger fencing proposed to the south of his land interest is removed and accommodation works reviewed so retained land will be practical to manage.	Detail about the badger fencing proposed on Mr Dick's land can be found in Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference 6.3, APP-166 to APP-192). The badger fencing proposed is essential to prevent badger access to the highway network and reduce the risk of road traffic mortality, and has been informed by the ecological surveys completed and detailed in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039). The exact location of the badger fencing could be potentially refined at the detailed design stage of the scheme, but it is generally scheme wide and Shab Hill is an area of high risk due to the activity of badgers in this general area. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Dick on this matter. National Highways await confirmation from Mr Dick that this matter has now been agreed.
8	Drainage and Utilities Infrastructure	Mr Dick requested detail of the drainage infrastructure proposed at McCarthy Taylor Systems as it impacts his service provision.	The foul water drainage infrastructure for Shab Hill Radio Station will be replaced as part of the scheme. This will be progressed during detailed design stage of the scheme.
9	PRoW	Mr Dick asked if the bridge that forms part of the Cotswold Way pass over his land. Mr Dick objects to the creation of a new right of way over his property. Mr Dick states that insufficient justification has been provided to justify the use of compulsory purchase powers on his property.	The proposed bridge will carry the Gloucestershire Way. A new Private Means of Access carrying a new PRoW will provide user access to the crossing. ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex F PRoW Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-323) sets out the mitigation and enhancement for WCH and other users of rights of way/highway with public access including crossing points for cyclists and pedestrians. This document includes detail about the need for the PRoW

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner Matters Comment	National Highways Position
			proposed and what has informed the development of the new right of way. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Dick on this matter. National Highways await confirmation from Mr Dick that this matter has now been agreed.
10	Statutory Undertaker Rights	Mr Dick raised concerns that no detail has been provided about the rights over his land being acquired for statutory undertakers.	Details about statutory undertaker rights being acquired can be found in the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3, APP-026) and Statement of Reasons (Document Reference 4.1, APP-024). These rights are required for ongoing maintenance of assets. National Highways continues to engage with Mr Dick on this matter. National Highways await confirmation from Mr Dick that this matter has now been agreed.

Appendix F Position Statement with Alexander and Angell

Landowner Position Statement – Alexander and Angell Ltd

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link (the scheme). These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Alexander and Angell Ltd as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Alexander and Angell Ltd during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to this land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Alexander and Angell are considered and responded to.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
27/10/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation – Letter	Meeting arranged with Alexander and Angell Ltd for the 18 October 2019.
18/10/2019	Meeting – As a result of the consultation invitation letter	Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about drainage and the position of the attenuation basin at the meeting. The DVS explained the potential compensation available to Alexander and Angell Ltd if crop losses occur. Alexander and Angell Ltd were worried about the potential impact the scheme will have on their business operation and the damage to their land as a result of the proposed works.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation – Letter	Meeting arranged with Alexander and Angell Ltd for the 30 January 2020.
30/01/2020	Meeting – as a result of the consultation letter invitation	The main concerns raised by Alexander and Angell Ltd at the meeting were: • Access to the farm during the construction and operation of the scheme; • Flooding; • The attenuation basin; and • Operational impacts on the farm. The following was agreed at the meeting: • Location of the access track; • Upcoming survey programme; and • Details relating to compensation. Arup and National Highways agreed to contact Mr Pither to discuss the scheme.
09/04/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	The requirement for the construction compound and the need for ecological mitigation was explained.

		Alexander and Angell Ltd preference is that an alternative area is used for the construction compound to minimise impact on their business operations. Options for land acquisition were discussed. Alexander and Angell Ltd to discuss the options for land acquisition with their land agent.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to Alexander and Angell Ltd notifying them of the beginning of the public consultation.
10/11/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	At the landowner meeting, it was explained to Alexander and Angell Ltd that the alternative locations for the attenuation basin have been considered and are not viable for the purposes of the scheme. It was explained that ecological mitigation in the form of calcareous grassland is proposed on Alexander and Angell's land. It was explained that low intensity grazing can take place on this land. It was explained that Alexander and Angell's land is required permanently for the ecological mitigation. Jonathan Perks (Land Agent) questioned why the land is required is required permanently. Jonathan requested detail about the management and restrictions for the environmental mitigation that will be in place. Jonathan is aware that compensation will be available but the preference for Alexander and Angell Ltd is that the land will be taken temporarily with permanent rights. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked whether horses will be allowed to graze on their land and can hay still be produced during the construction and operation of the scheme. It was explained the land needs to be managed appropriately for the purposes of biodiversity. A single hay cut, the use of no fertilisers and no horse grazing were suggested future uses of the land if Alexander and Angell Ltd were to maintain ownership through a S253 Agreement. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the land to be taken permanently for the scheme as it is high quality agricultural land. Jonathan Perks stated an appropriate management regime for the land to be acquired permanently for the scheme is required. Jonathan Perks requested alternative options to the design and land impact currently proposed. National Highways to review alternative design options on Alexander and Angell's land. Jonathan Perks requested further information about land impact as the area of land to be taken permanently for the purposes of the scheme has increased. Jonathan Perks questioned the access proposed around Alexander and Angell's field and the current location of the construction compound. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked what will happen to the footpaths during the construction of the scheme. It was explained that any footpaths will be temporarily diverted as appropriate. Oliver

		Kirkham to provide the draft Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan to show the proposed PRoW's as part of the scheme. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the rat-running that will be created by the scheme down Birdlip Hill to Brockworth. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns that another pinch point will be created coming off the A417 to the A436 due to the new housing at Brockworth. National Highways explained that the roundabout at Air Balloon will be removed as part of the scheme. This will help to improve traffic flow in the local area. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns that rat-running will be created going towards Brockworth. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked whether the scheme has considered the new housing that is to be built in the local area. It was explained that the additional housing to be developed has been considered as part of the scheme assessment. Alexander and Angell Ltd questioned the drainage impact the scheme will create. It was explained the overflow from the basin will connect to the culvert water course on Dog Lane. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the flooding that could be created and the level of mitigation to be installed. It was explained that the drainage attenuation basin will be bigger than what it is currently and considers future drainage requirements. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked if ~~about the~~ any excess ~~waste~~ top soil would become available from the construction of the~~that will be created by~~ the scheme. It was explained that top soil ~~waste~~ created will be used for landform elsewhere on the scheme. Alexander and Angell Ltd requested that land is provided for the purposes of grazing horses and making hay. National Highways to review Alexander and Angell's request to see if it is possible as part of the scheme works.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Alexander and Angell Ltd for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Alexander and Angell Ltd notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
11/02/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting with Alexander and Angell Ltd as part of the targeted landowner consultation. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised significant concerns and requested justification for the land bunds proposed on their field. Alexander and Angell Ltd challenged their land being acquired permanently for the purposes of mitigation for the scheme. It was explained to Alexander and Angell Ltd it is still intended that their land will be used for a construction compound for the scheme. It was explained that after the compound has been in

		place then the land will be used for the purposes of mitigation including the calcareous grassland and woodland. Further detail about the earth bunds proposed were provided. The earth bunds will be small mounds with a low gradient. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked for clarification about the gradient on the northern side of the earth bund closest to the scheme. The bunds are proposed for the purposes of landscaping. The bund's will create some planting and biodiversity benefits but is not ecological mitigation. Alexander and Angell Ltd strongly objected to the bunds and ecological mitigation proposed. These proposals would result in the loss of prime agricultural land. Jonathan Perks stated there is more appropriate land in the local area of the scheme. Jonathan Perks and Alexander and Angell Ltd disputed that their land being used for the compound should mean that their land is then used for ecological mitigation. The possibility of a Section 253 Agreement is to be explored further when the issues regarding the land bund and ecological mitigation are resolved. Jonathan Perks stated that if the earth bunds proposed are put in place, then there is an argument for the access track to be revised and the location of the pad on their land is revised. Jonathan Perks notified National Highways that Alexander and Angell Ltd object strongly to the proposed ecological mitigation and will object to the scheme at public enquiry if required. Jonathan Perks wishes to avoid making a representation at public enquiry but will do so if the mitigation proposed is not removed from Alexander and Angell's land. Jonathan Perks reiterated that Alexander and Angell Ltd dare not challenging the location of the compound, but land should not be degraded as a result of it being identified for such a use. Alexander and Angell Ltd stated that in a previous meeting National Highways said the land could be restored to a relatively good condition. It was explained that best efforts will be made to restore the land to its previous quality. National Highways to review these issues and respond appropriately on some of the more detailed questions. Jonathan Perks asked if the ditch between the two bunds is open or piped. It was explained it could be either. Design can be adapted to shadow existing drainage flow. National Highways explained that if the access track moves then the drainage ditch may also need to move. Alexander and Angell Ltd stated a preference for the drainage to be piped and pick up the existing drainage flow from the south. Jonathan Perks raised concerns about flooding created along the eastern boundary with FlyUp from when the road was constructed in the 90's. Jonathan Perks requested that National Highways reviews this as part of the scheme design.

		Future meeting to be arranged to discuss the land bunds and ecological mitigation proposed on Alexander and Angell's field.
19/03/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Follow up meeting with Alexander and Angell Ltd to discuss the issues identified at the meeting on the 11th February 2021. National Highways explained the landscaping and ecological mitigation proposed on Alexander and Angell's site. This includes the calcareous grassland and woodland (ecological) and landscape bunds (landscape). It was explained that the location of the basin has been moved as further information about existing drainage flow was received from Gloucestershire County Council. The new basin location allows for better drainage performance in consideration of existing and future flows. Jonathan Perks asked if the drainage flows went to Bentham. It was explained that the drainage flows head west down Crickley Hill. The bunds will be a maximum of one or two metres in height. The bunds are designed so Alexander and Angell Ltd can still have machinery on the field. The gradient of the bund will be 1 in 8 on the front (south) and 1 in 12 on the back (north) side. National Highways explained that the bunds will help to create ecological enhancement but will not be mitigation. Jonathan Perks raised concerns about the bunds proposed. National Highways agreed to review the provision of the land bunds at the detailed design stage of the scheme. Jonathan Perks and Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the ecological mitigation proposed on the site. The aim of the woodland planting is to maintain a woodland strip adjacent to the A417. Trees will be lost as a result of the scheme so need to be replaced. National Highways explained that the woodland planting and calcareous grassland proposed has been identified as essential ecological mitigation. The scheme ecologist stated that 4 rare species of bat would use the woodland corridor created for commuting. The calcareous grassland would be used for foraging for owls and bats. Jonathan Perks commented that quite a large area of woodland planting is proposed. Alexander and Angell Ltd stated the trees are encroaching a lot more than necessary on their field. The scheme ecologist stated the woodland tree line could be reviewed. Jonathan Perks stated that government guidelines do not recommend arable land being lost for the purposes of ecological mitigation. Jonathan Perks stated everything National Highways have done so far has been on the assumption that the Alexander and Angell's field will not be profitable in the future. Jonathan Perks explained that if this design had been put forward on day one then Alexander and Angell Ltd would have rejected it. Jonathan Perks stated unless National

		Highways are willing to accept that the mitigation and bunds can be moved then Alexander and Angell Ltd will object to the scheme. Jonathan Perks stated that Alexander and Angell Ltd will accept a thin line of trees for the purposes of mitigation. Alexander and Angell Ltd said experience from similar scheme suggests the land won't be profitable once the proposed works are complete. It was explained that a balance needs to be struck between environmental impacts and affecting arable land. Jonathan Perks stated that greater justification is required for the mitigation in this location. Land elsewhere in the local area would be more suitable for the purposes of mitigation. National Highways to prepare a summary note providing justification for the ecological mitigation proposed as part of the scheme. The scheme ecologist stated there is a drive to create calcareous grassland in this area. The other site identified as suitable for calcareous grassland relating to the scheme is being used for this purpose. Jonathan Perks stated that the calcareous grassland proposed on Alexander and Angell's land is not replacing like for like and they oppose that strongly. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns that barn owls did not roost in the areas identified. Ecological surveys identified roosting spots for barn owls in the area. Jonathan Perks raised concerns that the justification for the land take changes at each meeting. The justification previously related to the compound and now it's about ecological mitigation. It was explained that it wasn't intended for the site's only use to be for the purposes of a compound. Financial schemes could be available for Alexander and Angell Ltd to manage their site to create environmental benefits. Jonathan Perks stated these schemes aren't confirmed so can't be relied upon. Jonathan Perks stated the grazing proposed on the site is very restrictive for Alexander and Angell Ltd and will damage their business. Alexander and Angell Ltd would lose money currently to manage the site in the way proposed. A Section 253 agreement and means of compensation is to be explored with the DVS. DVS to contact Jonathan Perks to discuss. Jonathan Perks raised concerns that issues raised at previous meetings aren't being addressed. Jonathan Perks stated he could recommend alternative sites in the local area for environmental mitigation. Alternative site locations to be provided. Jonathan Perks asked if the access road to FlyUp (which passes through land owned by Alexander and Angell Ltd) will be wide enough for the purposes discussed previously. National Highways confirmed it will be wide enough.

		Jonathan Perks asked about the water pipe going through Alexander and Angell's field. The scheme drainage specialist said the pipe can be changed to suit the final shape of the land. General improvements can be made to consider the land bunds and design. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked if they will be responsible for drainage. Land drainage will mirror existing flows. Jonathan Perks raised concerns about the negative drainage impact created by the scheme in the 90's. The drain never did the job it was supposed to on the border with FlyUp. The scheme drainage specialist stated the drainage will be intercepted by a new ditch. Alexander and Angell Ltd explained the issues with the existing drainage infrastructure. National Highways to review the concerns raised and check what was done previously. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked if they were to take their land back could they do some restricted grazing. Some grazing could occur and it would likely be allowed in the autumn/spring time. Justification for the ecological mitigation was provided. Alexander and Angell Ltd requested further detail about why Alexander and Angell's site is the most appropriate for calcareous grassland use when other sites in the local area are more suitable. Further detail to be provided by National Highways. The location of the bunds proposed will be reviewed during the detailed design stage of the scheme. S253 and land acquisition discussions are to be advanced by the DVS.
28/04/2021	Email Correspondence	National Highways provided an updated Position Statement to Alexander and Angell Ltd for comment.
28/05/2021	Email Correspondence	Email correspondence issued by Jonathan Perks to National Highways. Concerns were raised about the Position Statement being one sided. Further issues raised in the correspondence included concerns about the quality of engagement completed by National Highways, justification for the land take proposed and environmental mitigation. Proposed updates were provided for the Position Statement to address Alexander and Angell's concerns.
16/08/2021	Email Correspondence	Ecological mitigation note was issued to Alexander and Angell. The note provided detail about the ecological works proposed as part of the scheme mitigation works.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Intrusive site investigation works licence - 2020	The licence for the intrusive site investigation works was reissued to Alexander and Angell Ltd for review and signature.	The intrusive site investigation works licence was signed and agreed by Alexander and Angell.
2	Attenuation Basin Positioning	Alexander and Angell Ltd wish to use the field where the attenuation basin is proposed. Alexander and Angell Ltd requested that the basin is moved to the east to reduce the level of impact it could create. Alexander and Angell Ltd wish to install a reservoir south of the basin location.	The attenuation basin has been moved on Alexander and Angell's land. The basin has been moved following discussions with Gloucestershire County Council and further review of existing drainage systems.
3	Concrete Pad	Mr Hope explained Alexander and Angell Ltd need to retain the use of the concrete pad that is shown as part of the construction compound/ ecological mitigation.	The concrete pad has been retained for Alexander and Angell's use.
4	Access Track	Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about access to their farm because of the scheme. If the northern access routes proposed are used for the construction compound, access will be required to enter the field from the west. This will need to avoid the concrete pad that's currently used for farm operations. The new access point should also allow for access to the southern fields.	The access route and the dimension proposed are considered appropriate after review. It was National Highways understanding that Alexander and Angell Ltd approved the access to the south of their land interest impacted by the scheme. The issue regarding the access track was not included in Alexander and Angell's relevant representation response. National Highways position is that this matter is now agreed.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Matter Position
1	Ecological Mitigation – Calcareous Grassland	Alexander and Angell Ltd object to the creation of calcareous grassland proposed on their land. Alexander and Angell Ltd accepted the sites use as a construction compound but object to the assumption that land will be incapable of reinstatement to productive arable use so should be used for ecological mitigation. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the Wildlife Trust's Nature Recovery Map being used to inform the decision to plant calcareous grassland on their site. Alexander and Angell raised concerns about this matter at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH1) held 26 January 2022 and in their subsequent written submission (REP3-026).	The proposed calcareous grassland is essential ecological mitigation and serves two purposes: • Scheme wide – To provide replacement grassland for grassland lost during construction within the DCO boundary, focussing on provision of priority habitat type - lowland calcareous grassland in line with the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and overall scheme vision. • Local – Provision of replacement foraging habitat in a location where bats and barn owls are known to be, based on ecological surveys completed. The attenuation basin is likely to attract invertebrate species and therefore bats to this area. Creating grassland adjacent to the attenuation basin maximises this foraging habitat provision and biodiversity delivery. The calcareous grassland will provide foraging habitat for bats. The attenuation basin will provide ephemeral habitat for invertebrates therefore increasing the foraging resource for bats. The calcareous grassland will also provide foraging habitat for barn owl's known to be roosting in the area. In collaboration with key environmental stakeholders, the Wildlife Trust's Nature Recovery Map has been carefully considered in the design of habitat as ecological mitigation. The Map suggests open habitat or woodland as a lower priority is appropriate for the Alexander Angell land. The planting proposed in this area responds with this.

			As part of the proposed scheme mitigation, the area of calcareous grassland across the scheme is increased by approximately 70ha. Although this is a large gain of calcareous grassland, there is not a large gain in grassland habitat overall. In total there is a loss of 82.41ha of all grassland types during construction of the scheme and replanting of 83.01ha. This results in a gain of only 0.5ha of grassland habitat throughout the scheme. The reason for creating calcareous grassland habitat is to provide a gain in priority habitat that is appropriate and typical of the AONB and to provide additional benefit to biodiversity. This approach has been agreed with key environmental stakeholders, as recorded in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419). As well as providing ecological mitigation for bats, the land will be restored to create species rich grassland habitats, woodland belts, additional hedgerows and scattered trees to provide a greater benefit to biodiversity than the previous arable field. Alexander and Angell Ltd did not provide detail or supporting evidence for alternative locations for the calcareous grassland. Recommendations were provided as general comments and suggestions in landowner meetings. National Highways ecological mitigation site selection assessments have identified Alexander and Angell's land to be the most appropriate for the woodland planting and calcareous grassland proposed as set out in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039). Habitat creation of either woodland or grassland for ecological mitigation has been maximised within the rest of the DCO boundary as shown in Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference 6.3, APP-166 to APP-192). Alternative locations for essential mitigation have been considered but discounted. For example, a previous field

			identified for a compound towards the eastern end of the scheme was ruled out for compound use and for subsequent habitat creation (both of which would require top-soil stripping) due to the discovery of archaeological features. National Highways provided a detailed account of the above position in Appendix A of its Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010).
2	Ecological Mitigation – Woodland Planting	Alexander and Angell Ltd object to the woodland planting required for the purposes of ecological mitigation currently proposed. Alexander and Angell Ltd accepted some woodland planting for the purposes of site-specific ecological mitigation for bats. Alexander and Angell Ltd requested that the existing woodland planting proposals is reduced to a “thin line of trees” on their land.	The woodland planting and calcareous grassland creation serves a local and scheme wide need. The proposed woodland planting is to maintain and improve a woodland strip adjacent to the existing A417 which is being lost because of the scheme. This woodland planting forms essential ecological mitigation in terms of woodland replacement and specifically about bats as a European Protected Species. ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039) states that bats use the wooded corridor to the north and south of the A417 to cross the road where the tree canopies create the most cover. Bats also cross under the existing road underpass using the tree lines either side. Woodland planting is proposed along the northern boundary of Alexander and Angell’s field to provide connectivity for bats to continue commuting. The tree line will create a dark and sheltered route which bats can follow away from the mainline of the scheme. Hedgerows proposed along the adjacent field boundaries offer further connectivity of habitat for bats and other wildlife to the wider landscape.
3	Land for agricultural purposes	Alexander and Angell Ltd request that as much land as possible is provided for agricultural purposes.	National Highways have explained that low intensity grazing can take place on Alexander and Angell’s land. Alexander and Angell’s land needs to be managed appropriately for the purposes of biodiversity. A single hay

			cut, the use of no fertilisers and no horse grazing have been suggested future uses of the land if Alexander and Angell Ltd were to maintain ownership through a Section 253 Agreement. Alexander and Angell Ltd do not consider the ecological management requirements to be economically attractive.
4	Accommodation works	At the landowner meeting on 10 November 2020 accommodation works to be provided as part of the scheme were discussed. Accommodation works plans were issued to Alexander and Angell Ltd in January 2021.	Accommodation works are to be developed and agreed during the detailed design stage of the scheme.
5	Land Acquisition	Alexander and Angell Ltd object to the permanent acquisition of their land for the scheme.	The requirement that only limited grazing would be able to take place and that the field cannot be used is economically unattractive to Alexander and Angell Ltd. As such they object to the permanent land acquisition and the option of a S253. Control of the land is required to ensure that essential mitigation can be delivered and maintained.
6	Proposed Landform Creation	Alexander and Angell Ltd request that the land bunds proposed are removed from their field.	National Highways have agreed with Alexander and Angell Ltd that the bunds will be removed at the detailed design stage of the scheme. This commitment is included in this Position Statement as agreed with Alexander and Angell.
7	Landowner Engagement and Consultation	Alexander and Angell Ltd stated that the scheme consultation has been defective. Concerns were raised about the engagement completed being a 'box ticking' exercise as to consulting with landowners rather than entering meaningful discussions with them.	Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the quantity and quality of the landowner engagement completed in relation to the scheme. The Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) evidences how National Highways has complied with all statutory requirements for conducting consultation prior to submitting an application for development consent. National Highways has undertaken an extensive programme of engagement with stakeholders and landowners including Alexander and Angell, as evidenced

			in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027), Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419) and Position Statement with Alexander and Angell. This has included engagement during formal periods of statutory and non-statutory consultation, and informal engagement that has taken place throughout the development of the DCO application. The following landowner meetings and site visits have taken place with Alexander and Angell Ltd throughout the Application stage of the DCO: • 30th January 2020; • 9th April 2020; • 10th November 2020; • 11th February 2021; and • 19th March 2021. Email correspondence was sent to Alexander and Angell Ltd throughout the development of the scheme to address concerns raised. This has included updates at key stages during the scheme development. As well as the meetings recorded in the list above, telephone calls have taken place with Alexander and Angell Ltd and Jonathan Perks to provide updates. Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the length of time it took to receive information and detail when requested at landowner meetings. Due to the complex nature of some of the concerns raised by Alexander and Angell, appropriate research and consideration was required to provide a full response to concerns raised. This meant time was required to prepare an appropriate response. With the acceptance of the DCO into the examination process by the Planning Inspectorate the consultation undertaken by the scheme in the past has been found to be adequate under the Planning Act 2008.

8	Agricultural Land Impact	Alexander and Angell Ltd have stated that the scheme conflicts with government guidance and policy regarding agricultural land impact.	National Highways considers the scheme will comply with government guidance and policy regarding agricultural land impact, with details provided in Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027). Paragraph 5.168 of the NPSNN refers to agricultural land and the Case for the Scheme cross refers to the conclusions made in ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (Document Reference 6.2, APP-043). It also sets out how, with measures in the ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317), the scheme would seek to minimise potential effects on soil quality where temporary land take is proposed. It is therefore considered that the scheme complies with the NPSNN in relation to agricultural land. The assessment of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) is provided in ES Chapter 9 Geology and soils (Document Reference 6.2, APP-040). Alexander and Angell's land is 'Grade 3A' agricultural land. The identification of baseline conditions for soils is primarily based on the ALC survey information included within ES Appendix 9.6 Agricultural land classification report (Document Reference 6.4, APP-389) and presented in ES Figure 9.6 Agricultural land classification (Document Reference 6.3, APP-389). ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (Document Reference 6.2, APP-043); in accordance with DMRB standard LA112, assesses the Alexander and Angell Ltd land holding as development land and a business. It concludes that it would be of low sensitivity and experience a minor magnitude of impact, given the proposals involve a small proportion of permanent land take that is unlikely to compromise the overall viability of the holding, whilst there would be no change in relation to accessibility. 6.19ha of 34.73ha land (18%) would be permanently taken. Overall, it concludes there would be a slight adverse effect, which is not significant.

9	Drainage	Alexander and Angell Ltd raised concerns about the drainage issues the 1990's scheme created on their land. Alexander and Angell Ltd asked whether the drainage proposed between the two bunds will be open or closed. Alexander and Angell Ltd stated a preference for existing drainage paths to be followed.	National Highways can provide an open or a closed drain in this location. Existing drainage routes will be followed where possible. National Highways are awaiting confirmation from Alexander and Angell Ltd that this matter is closed.
10	Design evolution	Alexander and Angell raised concerns regarding the design amendments and evolution made in relation to their land at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH1) held 26 January 2022 and in their subsequent written submission (REP3-026). Subsequently, the Examining Authority requested under Hearing Action Point CAH1-AP8 that National Highways provide an explanation of how the design iteration evolved and its justification, including consideration of the suitability of the land (EV-036).	National Highways has provided a response to Hearing Action Point CAH-AP8 in its Deadline 4 submission Comments on responses received by Deadline 3 (Document Reference 8.24, REP4-035). This includes at Appendix A an account of the design evolution process.

Appendix G Position Statement with Mr and Mrs Ford

Landowner Position Statement – Ford

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project (the scheme). These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement regarding Mr and Mrs Ford's position as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mr and Mrs Ford during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to his land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Mr and Mrs Ford have been considered and responded to.

~~1.1.5 This document has been updated in December 2021 in order to capture any matters raised through Relevant Representations or Written Representation submitted at the relevant Examination Deadlines.~~

Table 1 Record of Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed
27/09/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr & Mrs Ford for 22 October 2019.
22/10/2019	Meeting	Mr & Mrs Ford's main concerns related to access, damage to his land as a result of the construction compound and delays in compensation. A summary of the issues and topics discussed were: • Use of the land for a construction compound • Land productivity after compound use • Mr & Mrs Ford requested for the construction compound and the small section of land to the north of the main land parcel to be moved. • Mr & Mrs Ford expressed concern that his costs have not been met regarding completion of the land interest questionnaire • Area to the west of Mr & Mrs Ford's land plot to be used for temporary works and could potentially be a storage site during construction.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr & Mrs Ford for ~~the~~ 30 January 2020.
30/01/2020	Meeting	Mr & Mrs Ford had concerns regarding the location of the construction compound and the impact the scheme construction would have on his farms ability to operate as vehicle access would be required at all times. A summary of the issues and topics discussed were: • Use of the land for a construction compound • Vehicle Access Mr & Mrs Ford explained that he had no objection to the principle of development. National Highways took an action from the meeting to explore alternatives for the construction compound location.
04/08/2020	Meeting	The purpose of this meeting was to explain the design changes for the scheme relating to the 8% gradient change and the removal of the green bridge.

		A description of the proposed archaeological works on Mr & Mrs Ford's land was provided. It was confirmed that the majority of the land take for Mr & Mrs Ford would only be temporary for the purposes of the construction compound. Small sections of Mr & Mrs Ford's land are required permanently for the new Cowley Junction that leads to the underpass at the eastern end of the scheme. It was agreed that the archaeological licence for the site investigation works would be reissued to Mr & Mrs Ford for signature. Mr & Mrs Ford raised concerns that his land would be used as a soil dump for the scheme construction works. It was confirmed to Mr Ford that it is not intended to use his land for this purpose.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to Mr & Mrs Ford notifying him of the beginning of the public consultation.
13/11/2020	Meeting	Mr & Mrs Ford agreed in principle to sign the licence. Land acquisition meeting to be arranged when the licence has been signed.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Mr & Mrs Ford.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Notification	Correspondence issued to Mr & Mrs Ford notifying him of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.

Table 2 Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Land acquisition	At the landowner meeting on ~~the~~ 13~~th~~ November, land acquisition discussions began. Your agent has stated that as land values may change in the intervening time period the decision has been taken to wait for compulsory acquisition.	Land is to be acquired by GVD.
~~2~~	~~Cowley Wood Lane~~	~~Mr & Mrs Ford raised concerns about the planned stopping up of Cowley Wood Lane to become a private means of access and public right of way. This route is currently used for agricultural purposes and no detail has been provided on whether this may continue.~~	~~Access to Mr & Mrs Ford's fields would be maintained as part of proposals to designate a Private Means of Access. Access to the two residential properties would also be maintained.~~ ~~The exact nature of how Daisy Bank road / Cowley Wood Lane is to be stopped up is subject to detailed design.~~
3	Access	Mr & Mrs Ford stated that access to his land~~property~~ should not be impinged at any point during the construction of the road or after completion.	Access will be maintained to Mr & Mrs Ford's land~~property~~ during the construction and operation of the scheme ~~phase~~.

Table 3 Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Compound compensation	Concerns raised that no compensation would be paid for the compound being located on the land holding.	National Highways can only compensate for losses incurred from the use of the field as a construction compound. A detailed summary of the compensation available will be provided prior to the commencement of works and will be agreed by the District Valuer Service.
2	Accommodation works	Mr & Mrs Ford has outlined that accommodation works remain a matter for agreement.	Draft accommodation works plans were issued to Mr & Mrs Ford on ~~the~~ 26 ~~th~~ January 2021 and these will continue to be developed with Mr & Mrs Ford as the detailed design progresses.
3	Compound location	The location of the planned construction compound has been disputed given its location on an arable field (Grade 3a). Mr and Mrs Ford have raised their objection to the size of the land required for the construction -compound ~~location~~, and related concerns around drainage, in their submissions during Examination, including at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) on 26 January 2022 and the Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1) on 24 January 2022 and their subsequent written submissions (REP-029/30). The Examining Authority subsequently set a Hearing Action Point CAH1-AP7 in which National Highways was asked to explain the location of the construction compound.	~~Following this, the compound location has been reviewed.~~ ~~It's location on Mr & Mrs Ford's land was selected on balance in light of other key constraints on other areas available to the scheme and is considered essential for the purposes of construction. The land would be managed in line with the submitted EMP and Soil Management Plan.~~National Highways responded to Hearing Action Point CAH1-AP7 in the Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010), paragraph 7.1.16 to 7.1.18, as below: *The main compound for the Scheme is at the Eastern end of the works and a smaller compound is at the Western end. The main reasoning for this is that both locations provide easy access from the existing Strategic Road Network and also easy access to the new works. Due to the physical constraints of the Scheme it is not possible to access all of the works from one end and so the two compounds are required.*

			The land available at the Western end of the Scheme is not large enough to accommodate the area required for the main compound. These compounds also have to facilitate the vehicle rescue requirements and, due to logistical constraints, it is not feasible to have a single location. The main compound is required for a main office, parking, vehicle rescue, material storage, plant storage etc. and requires a single location so this can be done securely and safely. This location has been included since the Statutory Consultation in September 2019. *Several other locations have been considered and discarded for the main compound, these include the redundant Birdlip Quarry and the land west of Cowley Wood Lane. Birdlip Quarry was disregarded because, although a brownfield site, the area of land available is only half that required for the main compound and is surrounded by trees that are required to be environmentally protected, further reducing the useable land area. An alternative greenfield site therefore had to be located to provide the required area and the required facilities for access, resulting in a disjointed compound, greenfield impacts and multiple locations of local road disturbance. The area west of Cowley Wood Lane was considered but discounted to avoid impacts on the buried remains of a probable Roman-British settlement identified by geophysical survey and by previous excavation in 1999. Extensive archaeological investigation would be required in advance of this area being available for use as a compound and, as this compound is required from the start of the works, this will import risk to the programme. Namely, there could be constraints imposed on the use of certain areas of the land due to existing archaeology, so reducing the*

			area available, and the risk of damage to the archaeology in constructing the compound. *In response to the Fords' drainage concerns, the Applicant confirmed that such considerations will be taken into account in the detailed design of the compound, alongside the environmental impacts of the same. The Applicant does not foresee any consequential impacts on the remainder of the land however, as previously submitted, if this were to transpire this could be addressed through the compensation regime.*
4	Access to property	At the Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1) on 24 January 2022 and their subsequent written submissions (REP-020), Mr and Mrs Ford raised concern that they would lose access to their property via Cowley Wood Lane. The also raised concern over the proposals to close Cowley Wood Lane to general traffic, with concern as to how the residents-only access would operate, be secured and be maintained.	In respect of access to the Ford's property, National Highways refers to commitment PH2 of the Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317] which states: *Where the construction works would affect access to any of the existing receptors identified in ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Document Reference 6.2, APP-043), temporary alternative access arrangements would be provided in agreement with the receptor, landowner and/or tenant(s). This is to be detailed within the Construction Traffic Management Plan to be refined at detailed design.* In relation to the proposed private means of access at Cowley Wood Lane, paragraphs 2.15.16 to 2.15.20 of the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (Document Reference 8.3, REP1-008) set out how this would be managed. In particular, paragraph 2.15.20 states: *At this preliminary stage of the scheme design, it is not possible to confirm in detail what signage, surfacing and enclosures (such as gates and bollards) would be implemented. This would be determined at the detailed design stage following the approval of the scheme, if*

			granted. Accordingly, National Highways will engage with its contractor, the local highways authority (GCC) and residents affected by this matter at the detailed design stage. National Highways would also work with relevant interested parties including but not limited to the Parish Councils.
5	Professional fees	At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) on 26 January 2022 and their subsequent written submissions (REP-029), Mr and Mrs Ford queried who would pay professional and legal fees in representing them and transacting the property.	As set out in the Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010), National Highway's position is that it is a public body and subject to value for money considerations. It will consider applications for reasonable professional fees incurred, but is not able to fund all professional fees that may be incurred.
6	Thin slither of remaining land	At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) on 26 January 2022 and their subsequent written submissions (REP-029), Mr and Mrs Ford identified that they would be left with a thin slither of land between their neighbour and their land to be acquired.	As set out in the Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010), National Highways explained that the statutory blight regime may be applicable based on the particular facts of their case. To the extent the Fords suffer loss due to the compulsory acquisition of land that is a compensation matter for which there is an appropriate regime.

Appendix H Position Statement with Robert, Patricia and Sarah de Lisle Wells

Landowner Position Statement – de Lisle Wells

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement regarding Robert, Patricia and Sarah de Lisle Wells position as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Robert, Patricia and Sarah de Lisle Wells during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to this land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 ~~This Position Statement has been updated in December 2021 in order to capture matters raised in Relevant Representation and Written Representation submitted into the Examination at the appropriate deadline~~ This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Robert, Patricia and Sarah de Lisle Wells are considered and responded to~~s~~.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
10/10/2019	Meeting	A meeting was arranged with the landowner on the 10 October 2019. The following actions were taken by National Highways from the meeting: • Identify what specialist legal advice can be provided in relation to the scheme. • Send a new copy of the land plans to Mr and Mrs de Lisle Wells and Bruton Knowles. • Mitigation measures close to de Lisle Wells land are to be explored.
6/5/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	The following main points were discussed: • Landscape planting • Land form bund • Access • Noise • Land take • Scheme design
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to the de Lisle Wells' notifying them of the beginning of the public consultation.
26/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to the de Lisle Wells for comment.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to de Lisle Wells notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
22/02/2021	Meeting	Meeting took place with the de Lisle Wells on site to discuss noise, traffic and landscaping.
15/04/2021	Meeting	Meeting took place with the de Lisle Wells on site to discuss design and impacts of the scheme. In addition, the discretionary purchase application.
23/02/2022	Meeting	Meeting to address points raised in relation to southern field access.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matters	National Highways Position
1	Public Transport	The existing bus stop on the A417 above the Air Balloon roundabout will be lost as a result of the scheme. The de Lisle Wells stated that the Local Parish Councils have expressed support for this being re-located to the new access road. The de Lisle Wells ask that the scheme project team engages with the local authority on this matter to see if a bus stop can be provided.	The scheme stakeholder team have had discussions with the Parish Council. It has been explained to them that future bus service routes are to be determined. Gloucestershire County Council will have discussions with the bus operators to help determine future bus routes. Replacing the existing bus stop on the air balloon roundabout has been identified as a potential opportunity for future bus stop provision.
2	Additional Plans	The de Lisle Wells requested additional plans to show the level of impact created by the scheme.	Additional plans requested have been provided.
3	Face to face site meeting	Face to face site meeting requested to discuss the scheme.	Face to face meeting took place on 22nd April 2021.
4	Visual Imagery	Landowner requested visual 3D imagery for the scheme from Cuckoopen Farm, the centre of the proposed road at the nearest point and the highest point from the bridge that will carry the pedestrian crossing/bridleway/cycle route.	3D visual imagery produced and issued to the landowner.
5	Ecology Surveys	The landowner requested a summary of the ecology surveys completed to date.	ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039) provides an assessment of how the scheme would affect wildlife and habitats.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Landscaping	The landowner requested further information and provided landscaping recommendations to be included as part of the scheme design. The landowner requested a mix of native species is used as part of the scheme landscaping.	The landscape design is shown in ES Figure 7.11 Environmental Masterplan (Document Reference 6.3, APP-166 to APP-192). Woodland planting has been proposed to the edge of this property to provide a level of landscape integration and visual screening. Species selection for new planting would include a diverse mix of native trees of local provenance where appropriate and characteristic of the local area. The use of some non-native species or native species of provenance between 1 degree and 5 degrees south is considered to provide resilience against the effects of climate change. Further detail about the planting proposed as part of the scheme can be found in the Environmental Masterplan that will be submitted in support of the DCO application. National Highways have noted the landowners request for no Yew or Silver Birch Trees to be planted.
2	Drainage	The de Lisle Wells requested that the drainage proposed on their land to be taken permanently has a covered drain to prevent blockages.	The effects of the scheme in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water, have been sufficiently assessed and consider potential impacts to flows and impacts on water quality. This is reported in ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Document Reference 6.2, APP-044). The detail of the drainage and associated infrastructure to be installed will be confirmed at the detailed design stage of the scheme.
3	Accommodation works	Accommodation works to be provided as part of the scheme to be agreed.	Accommodation works to be developed and agreed as the scheme progresses.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Draft accommodation plans have been provided to the de Lisle Wells for comment.
4	HGV Access	The de Lisle Wells requested a passing to allow HGV access on the new access route proposed as part of the scheme.	National Highways has looked at the provision of passing places to allow for better access for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to Cuckoopen Barn Farm. A passing place has been provided on the new private means of access from Shab Hill Junction. National Highways has provided passing places in locations where traffic assessments recommend them to do so.
5	Land acquisition	Land acquisition discussions to begin.	The land required by the scheme has been agreed to be acquired by a discretionary purchase application. The remainder has not at this time. The ~~D~~discretionary purchase application is still progressing.
6	Traffic	The de Lisle Wells requested information on traffic management approach during construction.	National Highways will maintain access to impacted landowners whose sites remain operational throughout the construction and operation of the scheme. Any required access road closures would be agreed in advance with the landowner. Access to properties will be managed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted in support of the scheme. National Highways has and will follow the appropriate design standards to accommodate Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)s in terms of gradient and turning radii. The access/exit will be designed to accommodate Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)s and ensure there is no blocking back onto the roundabout.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Roundabouts that form part of the scheme have been designed and assessed to accommodate the predicted peak hour traffic flows for the 2041 design year. Unfortunately, the access road cannot be widened to two lanes, however, it will be wider than the existing road. The requirements of the businesses at Cuckoopen would be discussed in detail between National Highways and its appointed contractor should the DCO be granted.
7	Noise Mitigation	The de Lisle Wells requested further information about the noise mitigation to be installed at Shab Hill Junction. The de Lisle Wells requested that additional bunding is provided to shield their property from the scheme. This includes a small section at the south-east boundary of the current land take.	Additional landform on the boundary north of Rushwood Kennels would not provide any additional noise attenuation and therefore the land take required by the scheme cannot be justified. Woodland planting has been proposed to the edge of this property to provide a level of landscape integration and visual screening. Every consideration has been given in order to minimise the noise impact in this area, including low noise road surfacing, and by maximising noise screening as far as reasonably practicable from the use of earth bunding. The increase at this location is assessed as a 'not significant' noise effect. This is set out in ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.2, APP-042). The mitigation proposed as part of the current scheme design is considered to appropriately mitigate the noise impacts created for the de Lisle Wells'. The impact of the scheme on noise is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.2, APP-042). The new road would include a lower noise surface and specific noise mitigation, in the form of earth bunding and Cotswold

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			stone walls to act as noise barriers. This has been incorporated to further reduce noise effects. The ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317) and ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex B Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Document Reference 6.4, APP-319) outlines how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed.
8	Access	The de Lisle Wells raised concerns about the proposed new access to their property required as a result of the scheme severing existing access. Such an access will need to be of sufficient width, gradient and no weight limits must be imposed on our client. In particular, the route design of the new access road would need to allow for articulated vehicles to pass and use Shab-Hill junction safely. Our client is concerned as to the future ownership of the access road and requires confirmation, once the scheme has completed, that it will remain as public highway in perpetuity, with full and unfettered permanent rights of access directly on to the public highway granted to my client.	Access requirements for this property have been discussed at landowner meetings and subsequently accounted for within designs. The proposed land acquisition within this area includes land for the construction and maintenance of the access road, landform / bund and landscape planting. Permanent land take is only proposed where necessary. Details of this proposal have been provided to the landowner in the form of land interest plans denoting land for permanent acquisition, temporary acquisition and temporary acquisition with permanent rights. Plot 2/35 of the book of refence maintains a right of access for Ernest Field Shepherdson and his successors in title.
9	Footpath Impact	The de Lisle Wells stated that the decision to install a new bridge over the road for the footpath has the potential to cause unnecessary disturbance and trespass on their land.	Should the scheme proceed to construction, there would be a detailed design phase, when surfacing and other detailed matters such as enclosures would be agreed. PRoW's are considered as part of a Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review, undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which is submitted as part of the ES (Document Reference 6.2, APP-032 to APP-049). Detail relating to fencing and gates to be agreed as part of the accommodation work discussions.
10	Traffic Impact	The de Lisle Wells stated that the class 5 highway that passes the end of their drive will be used as a rat-run by motorists avoiding traffic on the surrounding roads and this will only get worse during construction. The de Lisle Wells stated the roads use classification should be changed to a restricted byway.	National Highways is committed to keeping the A417 open to traffic, however acknowledges concerns expressed over the potential for disruption to the local road network and communities during scheme construction. National Highways will seek to reduce disruption while maintaining highway safety and has produced ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex B CTMP (Document Reference 6.4, APP-319), which sets out how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed. National Highways has worked with the local highway authority, Gloucestershire County Council, to identify any potential mitigation measures required for
11	Consultation	Mr de Lisle Wells stated that there has not been a full consultation with landowners impacted by the scheme.	National Highways has continued to consult and engage with affected landowners throughout the design of the scheme. This is set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027), which evidences how National Highways has met the statutory consultation requirements for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008.
12	Light Pollution	Mr de Lisle Wells raised concerns about light pollution created by the scheme.	National Highways recognises concerns regarding the light pollution from construction of the scheme and will seek to reduce light spill while maintaining highway safety. National Highways has produced ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317) and a

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			draft Traffic Management Plan as part of the DCO application which outline how the impact of construction on the environment and local communities will be managed.

Appendix I Position Statement with National Star College

Landowner Position Statement – National Star College (NSC)

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with NSC's as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by NSC during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to their land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination ~~in December 2021~~ in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by ~~within the Relevant and Written Representations submitted by~~ NSC and their agents have been considered and responded to.

Table 1 Record of key landowner engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
27/09/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged for ~~the~~ 10 October 2019.
10/10/2019	Meeting	At the meeting with NSC, the following issues were discussed: • Blight and compensation • Construction works mitigation. • Environmental impact • Land access • Noise impacts; and • Public Right of Way routes.
09/11/2019	Statutory Consultation Response	NSC submitted a Section 42 response letter for the statutory consultation for the scheme.
10/01/2020	Meeting	Site meeting to discuss consultation. The meeting began but it was agreed that further work was required to help inform discussions. Meeting date rearranged for ~~the~~ 30~~th~~ January 2020.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged for ~~the~~ 30 January 2020.
30/01/2020	Meeting	The main concerns raised by the NSC at the meeting were: • Construction impacts and mitigation required. • Land impact on NSC's land • The schemes impact on the College's existing drainage infrastructure. It was agreed that an additional meeting was to be arranged between Arup and National Highways specialists to cover Air Quality, Noise, Construction, Traffic Management and Drainage.
23/03/2020	Meeting	Meeting cancelled due to Covid-19.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
09/06/2020	Meeting	A project team meeting was arranged with NSC but was cancelled due to key scheme design changes occurring resulting in landowner meetings being rescheduled.
28/07/2020	Email Correspondence	Meeting invite issued to NSC. Meeting date requested by NSC was ~~the~~ 10~~th~~ September 2020.
08/09/2020	Email correspondence	Updated Land Interest Plans and meeting agenda shared.
10/09/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	The purpose of the meeting was to review the recent design changes for the scheme. It was explained that the green bridge has been removed as part of the scheme design. Two separate crossings; at the Air Balloon Cottages and connecting to the Gloucestershire Way, will be constructed instead. Issues relating to noise, drainage, traffic, air quality, landscape and access were discussed. An action from the meeting was for a call to be arranged between the ~~District Valuer Services~~DVS, Arup, National Highways and the ~~College~~ NSC to discuss accommodation works, land acquisition and compensation. ~~The College~~NSC requested that communication between the project team and National Star is improved.
13/10/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	Financial support available for land agent fees was explained to NSC. It was agreed that National Highways will provide financial support for two land agents if sufficient justification that two land agents are required. NSC agreed to provide justification in writing.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to NSC notifying them of the beginning of the statutory consultation.
11/11/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	The purpose of this meeting was to review the recent design changes for the scheme and the issues discussed at the landowner meeting on ~~the~~ 10~~th~~ September. NSC submitted a statutory consultation response outlining concerns relating to the scheme including air quality, noise, traffic management, drainage, disabled access, landscape, compensation, land take and the European Convention on Human Rights. Issues relating to drainage was the key focus of the meeting, but other concerns were also discussed including construction works, disabled access and landscape proposals.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		A number of actions were taken at the meeting for the project team. Follow up discussions are to be arranged when the relevant technical specialist guidance has been sought.
04/12/2020	Email Correspondence	Consultation Response and Drainage Note issued to NSC for comment.
09/12/2020	Meeting	An in-person site walkover of NSC's site took place to discuss the drainage design proposed. The alternative drainage designs at the College were discussed. It was agreed that infiltration testing will be completed to determine the viability of the 100% highway infiltration design option. NSC stated that the permanent easement proposed as part of the current drainage design was the main reason for their objection. The College raised concerns that the permanent easement would impact future development opportunities on their site.
23/12/2020	Email Correspondence	Comments received from NSC about the Consultation Response and Drainage Note issued.
13/01/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the drainage design at NSC with Gloucestershire County Council (GCC). The drainage technical note issued to NSC was discussed and further detail was provided to address issues identified by the College. NSC stated they would object to the scheme if the permanent easement proposed was not removed. Detail was provided about the proposed 100% infiltration design option. Work to be undertaken to determine the viability of the 100% infiltration design.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to NSC for comment.
29/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Comments provided by NSC about the accommodation works plans. NSC raised concerns that the plans do not contain any accommodation works in relation to the College's land. NSC's understanding is that the works relate to National Highways land that they are proposing to acquire on a permanent basis from the College. NSC requested a post and rail fence on the boundary of the permanent land take and the colleges' retained land. NSC requested that appropriate screening in the form of tree planting needs to be provided.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to NSC notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation. NSC were impacted by the targeted landowner consultation as a result of the half width land designated to the College. Letter issued to NSC making the commitment to not require a

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		permanent easement across the Colleges land in response to concerns about the drainage route. Sent 23/03/21.
10/03/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to provide an update on the drainage design works at NSC with GCC in attendance. It was explained that the preliminary testing to determine the viability of the 100% infiltration design has been positive. Infiltration design and results to be shared with NSC when available for issue (April/May 2021). Meeting to be arranged when further update on the drainage design is available.
07/05/2021	Site Visit	Site visit to discuss air quality and landscape proposals and impacts as part of the scheme. The scheme landscape specialist explained that the trees proposed as part of the landscape works will focus around the boundaries of NSC's land impacted by the scheme and the northern section of the infiltration dip in the landform discussed. The scheme air quality specialist explained that if the scheme mitigation is carried out in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan and construction best practice there is predicted to be no significant effect from dust at any receptors within 200m of the DCO boundary. The scheme air quality and landscape specialist agreed to provide further detail at the Microsoft Teams Meeting on ~~the~~ 19~~th~~ May.
19/05/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	An overview of the DCO process from the point of submission for the application was provided. The DCO was confirmed to be on course to be submitted late May/early June 2021. NSC will have opportunities throughout the DCO process to engage and comment on the application. National Highways confirmed that engagement with NSC will continue post DCO submission. NSC stated that their financial concerns are not about valuation but other matters including but not limited to financial loss under disturbance. It was explained that NSC can submit compensation claims for loss of earnings, but appropriate evidence needs to be provided. Design works for the proposed 100% infiltration for the drainage infrastructure at the College show positive results. Good infiltration characteristics have been found and assessments show that pollution levels are within acceptable limits. Yet, additional treatment is required. No significant changes are proposed to the ponds which differ from the previous design. The planned maintenance and operation of the basins on NSC's land has not changed. This is GCC will maintain and operate basin group 5 and basin group 3a will be maintained and operated by National Highways.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		NSC requested a conclusive letter stating that a permanent easement will not be provided as part of the scheme and that addresses their comments provided previously to Michael Goddard. The scheme landscape specialist stated that the trees proposed as part of the landscape works will focus around the boundaries of NSC's land impacted by the scheme and the northern section of the infiltration dip in the landform discussed. The ponds on the northern side of the field will not be permanently full of water and will have a parkland like character. 3D imagery to be produced showing the landscape proposals in greater detail. A plan showing the temporary and permanent areas to be pegged out to be shared with NSC. Air Quality Assessments have been completed at the College which includes a consideration of dust generated from the construction site. National Highways explained that if the scheme mitigation proposed is carried out in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan and construction best practice there is predicted to be no significant effect from dust at any receptors within 200m of the DCO boundary. The DCO will include air quality commitments that National Highways will need to adhere to. NSC raised concerns about the assessments completed. Air quality monitoring (typically used on high impact air quality construction projects in areas where existing air quality levels are poor) is to be provided throughout the duration of the scheme. A commitment for this will be included within the Position Statement which will later be submitted at DCO acceptance. National Highways explained a meeting to discuss the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be arranged when the construction contractor contractually begins working on the scheme. Their appointment is imminent, so a meeting is likely to take place in the next few weeks. National Highways agreed to provide a written response explaining professional fee compensation for the scheme. NSC raised concerns about the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) completed for the scheme. Concerns related to the methodology adopted for the assessment and why NSC were not considered in greater detail throughout. National Highways to provide a separate response to the concerns raised. A summary of the Environmental Designated Fund opportunities relating to the scheme were provided. NSC stated they would be interested in reviewing these opportunities further and request a further meeting is arranged to discuss.
27/05/2021	Virtual Noise Demonstration	NSC are considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise during the construction of the scheme in consideration of DMRB guidance, although significant noise effects from construction or operation of the proposed scheme have not been identified in the assessment. However, if there are rooms that the College considers to be particularly critical, such as speech therapy rooms, this can be

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		examined further and, if appropriate, measures taken to allow windows to remain closed during summer months. National Highways provided an overview of what will be heard at the College during construction works as part of an online, virtual noise demonstration. It was explained that the virtual noise demonstration has been organised instead of attending an in-person acoustic sound lab presentation because of Covid safety constraints at the time of the demonstration). The sound demonstration has been taken from the most southerly building of the site as it's the closest to the works. The main noise sources that NSC will experience are from the haul road route along the line of the scheme and the cutting excavation works. It was explained that the rock breaker would create the highest noise level in relation to the scheme but the need for the rock breaker would be occasional and may not be required for much of the cutting works. For example, in some instances, it may be used for a week and then not used for several weeks after that, depending on ground conditions encountered deep in the cutting. The noise levels presented at the demonstration were: • Ambient level outside of the southern building • Construction noise sources of cutting excavation and haul road. • Occasional breaking noise. • Move listening location inside (with windows open) to hear the same noise sources. NSC asked if there will be a record that the College accept the noise impact created by the scheme during construction relative to the existing traffic noise in consideration of what was presented in the noise demonstration. National Highways agreed to include a commitment in the Position Statement (see Table 2 below). Noise levels will be monitored throughout the construction of the scheme and, if considered necessary by the College, appropriate mitigation measures will be reviewed, as described above for affected rooms. NSC can contact National Highways at any point during the construction of the scheme if they have any issues with the noise levels created. National Highways to explore possibility of doing face to face noise demonstration in the future when possible in consideration of a reduction in COVID restrictions.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
08/06/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting between the DVS and NSC to discuss blight and compensation. NSC stated they do not feel they are able to continue blight and compensation discussions until other matters outstanding are addressed in relation to the scheme.
05/08/2021	Email Correspondence	Updated Position Statement issued to NSC for review.
01/09/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the EqIA completed for the scheme. Detail about the EqIA methodology, data sets and results were provided. Agreed actions were: • HE EDI Lead to attend future NSC landowner meetings where EDI and the EqIA is on the agenda. This will help to support collaboration between the landowner and EDI project teams; • NSC to be added as an identified group with protected characteristics in the next iteration of the EqIA; • Data on the College's students to be requested from NSC. This data will be reviewed as part of future iterations of the EqIA. Personal and sensitive data requirements will be considered if this data is used. • Further details about landowner discussions with NSC will be included in future iterations of the EqIA; and • HE EDI Lead to send the Stage 1 and Stage 2 EqIAs to NSC.
21/09/2021	Email Correspondence	Minutes from the meeting on ~~the~~ 1~~st~~ September 2021 issued to NSC for review and comment.
06/10/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting arranged to discuss relevant representation response submitted by NSC. Meeting notes relating to EqIA and a non-vehicular crossing at Leckhampton Hill were issued to NSC on the 5th October 2021. NSC requested that the meeting is rearranged for autumn 2021 to allow more time to review the notes produced. Meeting cancelled and to be rearranged.
15/10/2021	Telephone Call	A telephone call to discuss rearranging the meeting that was scheduled for ~~the~~ 6~~th~~ October 2021. It was agreed that the agenda items proposed for the original meeting will be split up and discussed at two separate meetings. Comments on the EqIA minutes and note to be provided by Ian Miles.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		Verbal agreement made about arranging an in-person noise demonstration to showcase the level of impact the scheme. Concerns about the drainage outfall on NSC's land was discussed and it was agreed that the scheme drainage specialist would provide further detail on this issue at the meeting to be rescheduled (likely to be November 2021).
22/10/2021	Email Correspondence	Comments provided on the meeting minutes issued to NSC on ~~the~~ 21~~st~~ September 2021.
23/11/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting arranged to discuss the concerns NSC have about the EqIA. Data to be provided by NSC to help inform future iterations of the EqIA and discussions at the EqIA site visit to be arranged. This includes any data sources NSC believes to be relevant and appropriate to help inform future iterations of the EqIA and DCO Requirement documents (e.g. construction traffic management plans) to be produced when a formal contractor is appointed. This includes but is not limited to the following discussed on the call on Tuesday: • Traffic data on user journeys; • Data relevant to the nature and needs of the students; • Care Quality Commission Reports; • Roles and functions of NSC; and • Any other relevant information. A site visit will be arranged in December 2021 to discuss the EqIA. A meeting will be arranged to discuss the other matters outstanding NSC have relating to the scheme after the EqIA site visit takes place. NSC to provide a list of commitments they would like to be included in the Environmental Management Plan. National Highways to provide a response to NSC's request for professional fees to be covered by the scheme.
25/11/2021	Email Correspondence	Ian Miles requested the policy that states that National Highways are unable to provide the professional fees requested by NSC. Actions from the meeting on ~~the~~ 23~~rd~~ November 2021 issued NSC.
16/12/2021	Email Correspondence	NSC provided supporting information regarding the EqIA. The following information was provided:

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		• A Briefing Paper with Data for National Highways and its advisors • Annual Report 2018/2019 (the narrative and case studies will provide useful background and context) • Annual Report 2019/2020 (the narrative and case studies will provide useful background and context) • Care Quality Commission Report • Ofsted Report • NSC Annual Reports and Publications
13/01/2022	Meeting	In-person meeting to discuss NSC's concerns about the EqIA and other scheme wide matter's outstanding. NSC provided an overview of the services they provide, journey times for students and staff, and the financial and logistical impacts traffic delays could create. The scheme EqIA specialist provided an overview of the Assessment completed. This included detail about the specific risks, mitigation and recommendations contained in the document. It was explained that the purpose of the EqIA is to ensure people with protected characteristics, as defined by the Equality Act (2010), are suitably considered as part of National Highways projects. NSC raised concerns about a disconnect between the landowner engagement and the EqIA. Action agreed for the scheme Lands and EqIA specialist to work together collaboratively where appropriate to do so in the future. This would include reviewing and updating the EqIA in consideration of information provided by NSC during landowner discussions. Action agreed to review the EqIA in consideration of the information provided by NSC on the 16th December 2021 where appropriate to do so. NSC raised several scheme wide matters outstanding discussed previously. The following actions were agreed at the meeting relating to the outstanding matters separate from the EqIA: • National Highway's policy wording to be provided to NSC for professional fees and compensation. • National Highway's stated they will provide NSC financial cover to instruct professional specialists to review the relevant DCO documents submitted in relation to NSC's land interest. The terms and conditions of the specialists are to be agreed between National Highway's and NSC.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		• NSC to provide three quotes for each external professional specialist they would like to instruct to review the relevant DCO documents submitted. National Highways will review the quotes provided. • National Highways to contact the Environment Agency for an update regarding approval of the change of drainage design. Written confirmation will be provided to NSC when this approval has been received. • When a construction contractor contractually begins on the project, a meeting will be arranged to discuss NSC's concerns regarding access during construction. • Updated Environmental Management Plan (EMP) commitments to be shared. NSC to provide comment on the proposed commitments when provided. • Draft Heads of Terms to be provided regarding land acquisition and compensation. • DVS to contact NSC to discuss disturbance and compensation costs.
18/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Minutes from the meeting on ~~the~~ 14~~th~~ January 2022 issued to NSC for review and comment.
19/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Updated EMP containing additional commitments issued to NSC for review and comment.
20/01/2022	Email Correspondence	Draft Heads of Terms for land acquisition issued to NSC agent.
W/C 26/01/2022	Examination Hearing	Examination Hearing week one. NSC Land Agent spoke at the Open Floor Hearing (24~~th~~ January 2022), Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (26~~th~~ January 2022) and Issue Specific Hearing 2 (27~~th~~ January 2022).
01/02/2022	Email Correspondence	Dates for proposed in-person noise demonstration issued to NSC.
14/02/2022	Email Correspondence	Comments on the minutes from the meeting on ~~the~~ 14~~th~~ January 2022 provided by NSC. National Highways accepted the proposed revisions and agreed on the detail contained in the minutes.
23/02/2022	Meeting	In-person noise demonstration took place as a follow-up to the virtual demonstration on ~~the~~ 27~~th~~ May 2021. Key actions agreed at the demonstration were as follows: • Construction phasing to be discussed with NSC when known.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		• Noise monitoring to be located in the westerly boundary of the Christmas tree field. • NSC to be notified in advance of the loudest construction works relating to the scheme. • Noise demonstration to be held with appropriate NSC employees prior to commencement of construction. • Reporting of ~~N~~noise monitoring data to be agreed between the NSC and the construction contractor.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Public transport	NSC raised concerns about the poor public transport that exists in the local area. The College explained that they will welcome any coordination between relevant parties to enable the scheme to be a catalyst for the establishment of improved public transport routes.	The scheme seeks to improve travel conditions for all users of the strategic road network. Public transport facilities are not the responsibility of National Highways and are outside the scope of the scheme. As the local highway's authority, GCC would be responsible for any changes to the bus stops in the area, which could be progressed alongside, or following the completion of the scheme. NSC were invited to input into a meeting with GCC on ~~the~~ 29~~th~~ September 2020 to discuss the local public transport network. This provided an opportunity for NSC to inform the future local public transport network. NSC's comments were discussed at the meeting with GCC.
2	Ecology Survey	NSC made a request at the landowner meeting on the 10 September for the ecology survey findings reports relevant to their land to be shared.	Full details about the ecological findings at NSC can be found in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.2, APP-039) submitted as part of the DCO application.
3	Drainage Basin Management	NSC asked what drainage basins on their land will be managed by GCC and which ones by National Highways.	GCC will maintain and operate basin group 5. National Highways will maintain and operate basin group 3a.
4	Land take	NSC requested a plan showing the temporary and permanent areas required by the scheme to be physically marked out by wooden pegs or stakes.	The area of permanent land take was staked out for NSC in June 2021. T~~,~~ the stakes have ~~e~~ e now~~now~~ been removed to allow grass mowing.
5	European Convention on Human Rights	In the consultation response submitted by NSC, the College raised concerns that ECHR legislation has not been considered as part of the development of the scheme.	National Highways legal counsel reviewed the article's quoted by NSC in the consultation response. A response was issued to NSC explaining how the article's quoted are being achieved through the work done as part of the scheme.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			NSC raised further concerns about the scheme achieving the Human Rights Articles quoted in their response. National Highways legal counsel reviewed and provided further detail about how the article's quoted were being achieved through the work being done as part of the scheme. NSC equality, diversity and inclusion concerns regarding the scheme changed to focusing on the EqIA.
6	Surrounding road network impact	NSC believe that the A436 and Leckhampton Hill will become busier routes because of the scheme. NSC ask that the scheme improves road safety in the surrounding road network, in particular the Leckhampton Hill Road from Crickley Hill towards Cheltenham and the A436 from the scheme to Cowley Crossroads.	Transport impacts were explained to NSC at the landowner meeting on the 10th September. Detail was provided that traffic levels on Leckhampton Hill and the A417 are expected to increase as a result of the scheme. Yet, traffic on the wider surrounding road network is expected to decrease at a rate greater than the increase anticipated on Leckhampton Hill and the A417.The scheme will result in improvements to the road network in the area surrounding the College. The scheme should reduce congestion and improve road safety more generally in the local area. A note was issued on ~~the~~ 4~~th~~ December 2020 to NSC providing detail about the traffic impacts and management. The note contained detail about the traffic modelling completed to inform the design of the scheme and looked at traffic impacts with and without the scheme. Journey times on Leckhampton Hill are included in the note from the traffic model to demonstrate the impact scheme has on the road. The traffic model shows that there has been limited impact of the scheme on those travelling northbound from the Air Balloon roundabout with only a decrease of one or two seconds as a result of the scheme in 2024. Southbound, the scheme decreases 2024 journey times by 15 to 18 seconds. This decrease is due to the removal of the A417 traffic from passing through the new Ullenwood junction and that this junction is designed to accommodate the predicted traffic flows. In 2039, the traffic model results show that northbound there is an increase in journey time for traffic flow peaks during the day. This increase is due to the increase in traffic on Leckhampton Hill.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Southbound, there is a decrease in journey times between 21 and 31 seconds. As with 2024, this is due to the scheme removing the A417 traffic from Ullenwood junction and the junction is designed to cope with the predicted traffic flows. GCC will be responsible for managing localised issues on the network around the scheme. ~~It should be noted that the scheme aims to improve traffic flow by reducing congestion and improving road safety.~~
7	Environmental Impact	NSC request that the scheme design has a minimal environmental impact. NSC raised concerns that only Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessments have been completed to date for the scheme.	A technical note was issued to NSC on ~~the~~ 4~~th~~ December 2020 to help address environmental concerns the College have about the scheme. Full detail of the environmental impacts and mitigation proposed as part of the scheme are included within the ES submitted in support of the DCO application.
8	De-trunking of the current A417	In their 2020 consultation response, NSC sought clarity and commitment that National Highways will provide disability access to the new recreational areas.	At the meeting on 11~~th~~ November 2020, National Highways explained to NSC that the proposals for the 'Air Balloon Way' would be suitable and accessible for disabled users. The Disabled Ramblers have been represented as part of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) Technical Working Group and had been influential in shaping Public Rights of Way (PRoW) / WCH proposals more generally across the scheme.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Permanent Drainage Easement	NSC question the need for the permanent easement across the College's land. NSC state that the permanent easement proposed will impact NSC's long-term development plans. NSC raised concerns about the management of the easement when it is operational. NSC raised concerns that the drainage infrastructure proposed will create flooding issues on their land.	In consideration of the comments received from NSC, a 100% infiltration design alternative has been developed. ~~The testing completed for the infiltration design has found the ground at NSC to be appropriate for 100% infiltration but additional treatment stages are required.~~ ~~National Highways will look for opportunities for NSC to continue using their land once the drainage infrastructure is in place.~~ NSC requested conclusive correspondence from National Highways that a permanent easement won't be included as part of the scheme. Formal correspondence was issued to NSC on 23~~rd~~ March 2021 detailing that subject to appropriate testing and approval from statutory bodies, the permanent drainage easement will not form part of the scheme operational design. -The testing completed for the infiltration design found the ground at NSC is appropriate for 100% infiltration but additional treatment stages are required. Statutory approval on the 100% infiltration design has been received from GCC. NSC requested that the caveat of statutory~~required~~ approval from ~~GCC &~~ the Environment Agency ~~(EA)~~ is removed ~~from the letter~~. National Highways are unable to remove this caveat as the new drainage design cannot be formally agreed until regulatory approval is achieved. Issues relating to drainage were discussed at the meeting on the 14~~th~~ January 2022. ~~National Highways to contact GCC and the EA to achieve regulatory approvals.~~ ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss drainage; including the permanent drainage~~

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			~~easement, but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~National Highways to provide NSC a simplified drainage note to support understanding of design and an update upon receipt of statutory approval from the EA.
2	Temporary Drainage Easement	In their relevant representation response, NSC stated that National Highways have failed to provide any reasoning for the temporary easement. Concerns were raised about how the assessment of water will be dealt with at the outfall of the temporary drainage in the middle of the charity's site at the golf course.	~~Detail about the need for the easement has been explained to NSC in the drainage note issued to NSC on the 4th December 2020 and at the meeting on the 7th May 2021.~~ ~~It was explained that the contractors will have the appropriate site and drainage management plans in place during construction.~~ A piped outfall will be required to manage surface water flows from the site during construction. During this phase an outfall will be required from temporary basins and water treatment facilities. Although basins will have a flood benefit the primary function will be to manage silt and surface water quality. The temporary easement corridor is approximately 14m. This is to allow for temporary works and access during construction, and to allow for some variability in the surface levels versus the topographic survey. Further detail about the site and drainage management plans for the scheme will be confirmed during ~~the detailed design stage of the scheme~~ detailed design and ~~the~~ following the appointment of the scheme construction contractor ~~to develop the scheme~~. The construction contractors will have the appropriate site and drainage management plans in place during construction. Detail about the need for the easement was issued to NSC in the drainage note issued on ~~the~~ 4~~th~~ December

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			2020 and the information presented at the meeting on the 7th May 2021. Issues relating to drainage were discussed at the meeting on the 14th January 2022. National Highways to provide NSC a simplified drainage note to support understanding of the design and an update upon receipt of statutory approval from the EA. ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss drainage; including the temporary drainage easement, but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~
3	Landscape	NSC question the land re-instatement and landscape enhancements proposed. NSC believe that there should be consideration of extensive planting that will enhance the area in the long term. NSC request that the planting improves the screening of National Star's Ullenwood site from the scheme. NSC request that landscape mitigation works begin as soon as possible.	A technical note was issued to NSC on ~~the~~ 4~~th~~ December 2020 explaining proposed landscaping works. It was explained that a landscape bund could be put in place to provide some visual screening during construction works. At the landowner meeting on ~~the~~ 9~~th~~ December it was discussed that advanced planting could begin winter 2021 but could impact groundwork investigation. ~~Meetings took place in May 2021 to discuss scheme landscape proposals.~~ The trees proposed as part of the landscape works will focus around the boundaries of NSC's land impacted by the scheme and the northern section of the infiltration dip in the landform discussed. Further detail about the landscape design proposals at NSC will be determined during detailed design. A commitment for "woodland planting to integrate the attenuation basins at Ullenwood junction, within the grounds of National Star College and screen the new junction from sensitive users of the college" was included

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			in the updated EMP submitted for DCO Examination Deadline 2 (13~~th~~ January 2022). NSC yet to provide comment on this EMP commitment.
4	3D Landscape Imagery	NSC requested 3D imagery at the boundary of their field next to the Air Balloon to show the landscape proposals as part of the scheme.	National Highways to provide the 3D Landscape Imagery when the landscape design has progressed during the detailed design stage of the scheme.
5	Construction Traffic Management	NSC look to secure assurances and operational details about how National Highways will guarantee unimpeded access during the construction and operation of the scheme. NSC request that National Highways consider additional measures such as the provision of dedicated priority transport routes as part of the scheme's design. NSC stated that failure to adequately address access issues could lead to student placements being unsustainable, students and service users being deprived access to their provision and staffing levels not being met.	~~At the landowner meetings with NSC (issue raised at various meetings, see Table 1 for further information), it was explained that access~~Access will be maintained to the College ~~during the~~throughout the construction and operation of the scheme. Operational details and mitigation required for the construction works will be developed as part of the CTMP. The CTMP will be developed in collaboration with NSC as the scheme progresses. The preparation of a CTMP at construction stage is secured through Requirement 3 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, REP4-015). ~~NSC will have an opportunity as part of the DCO Examination process to raise their concerns. A preliminary exam timetable is set out in the Rule 6 letter. At the meeting to be rescheduled for November 2021, further detail about the examination timetable will be provided to NSC.~~ ~~A meeting will be arranged with NSC when the construction contractor for the scheme contractually begins working on the project.~~ National Highways have provided assurances that ongoing engagement will occur with NSC during the preparation of the CTMP and the scheme construction.~~construction of the scheme with final details~~

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			~~and arrangement to be drawn up between National Highways and the contractor (once appointed).~~ National Highways will appoint a landowner liaison for the scheme (currently Amy Day). One of their roles on the project will be to engage with NSC and provide a consistent point of contact into the later stages of the scheme, should the DCO be granted. ~~Meeting to be arranged between National Highways, NSC and the construction contractor in due course.~~ If financial losses are created by the scheme on NSC, National Highways will review and provide compensation if appropriate to do so. Evidence would need to be supplied by NSC to support a claim for compensation. A meeting will be arranged with NSC when the construction contractor for the scheme is contractually appointed. Issues relating to construction traffic management were discussed at the meeting on ~~the~~ 14~~th~~ January 2022. A commitment to maintain unimpeded access "throughout the construction of the scheme" was contained in the updated EMP submitted for DCO Examination Deadline 2 (13 ~~th~~ January 2022). NSC to provide comments on this EMP commitment~~s~~.
6	Air quality	NSC raised concerns about the potential impact on air quality for students during the construction and operation of the scheme. NSC explained that many ~~a number of~~ students who attend the College have respiratory issues. NSC are seeking commitments from National Highways that mitigation measures will be in place if unacceptable air quality levels are reached.	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 (Document Reference 6.2, APP-036). The assessment considers the impact of the scheme during both construction and operation and concludes that there are no significant effects on air

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
		The issue of air quality impact was contained in NSC's relevant representation response.	quality at the ~~College anticipated~~College anticipated during the operation of the scheme. During construction, it is not anticipated that the College would experience any significant effects on air quality. This means that NSC is not identified within the Schemes Environmental Assessment as being a sensitive receptor in relation to the effects on air quality. Appropriate DMRB guidance has been followed as part of the air quality assessments. To recognise ~~the~~ NSC's concerns regarding dust during ~~the construction phase appropriate~~scheme construction, air quality construction mitigation and on site ~~air quality~~ monitoring ~~-~~are included within the ~~Environmental Management Plan~~EMP for the level of impact created by the scheme. The monitoring to be provided would be typical to that of a construction site with higher air quality impacts anticipated in a location with poor existing levels of air quality. Issues relating to air quality were discussed at the meeting on ~~the~~ 14~~th~~ January 2022. ~~National Highways have committed to NSC that they will provide the monitoring throughout the duration of the construction works. This commitment is included in the Environmental Management Plan.~~ ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss air quality but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~A commitment for air quality monitoring at "appropriate locations at National Star College during construction of the scheme" was included in the updated EMP submitted for DCO

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Examination Deadline 2 (13 ~~th~~ January 2022). NSC to provide comments on this EMP commitment. A note is being prepared by the scheme air quality specialist providing detail about the proposed air quality monitoring.
7	Disturbance and Potential Financial Loss	NSC raised concerns about the negative financial impact the scheme could have upon the College. Particular concerns were noted about the financial impact that traffic delays caused by the scheme could create for the College.	A meeting ~~has been held~~took place between NSC and the DVS ~~istrict Valuer Service~~ to discuss disturbance, potential financial loss and compensation for the scheme. It was agreed that d~~D~~isturbance and potential financial loss conversations will be ~~to be~~ advanced when other matters outstanding relating to the scheme are addressed. At the meeting on ~~the~~ 14~~th~~ January 2022, NSC stated that they would like disturbance and potential financial loss discussions to commence. A meeting took place immediately after the compulsory acquisition hearing (26~~th~~ January 2022) between the DVS, National Highways and NSC to discuss land acquisition and financial loss. NSC and the DVS are currently discussing business disturbance and potential financial loss. NSC to provide detail regarding business disturbance claims.
8	Accommodation works	Accommodation works to be provided as part of the scheme are to be agreed with NSC.	Comments relating to the accommodation works ~~have been received from NSC.~~ have been provided by NSC during the scheme landowner discussions. Accommodation works ~~discussions will be progressed when a construction contractor contractually begins working on the scheme.~~ are being progressed as part of the scheme detailed design.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
9	Land acquisition	NSC statedfeel that entering into land acquisition negotiations would compromise their position at DCO Examination. On the 14th January 2022, NSC reversed this position and stated that they wished to enter into land acquisition discussions.	Land acquisition discussions commenced with the District Valuer ServiceDVS and were paused on NSC request. A meeting took place immediately after the compulsory acquisition hearing (26th January 2022) between the DVS, National Highways and NSC to discuss land acquisition and financial loss. Draft HoT were issued to NSC for review.These have now ceased. Timescales for temporary land acquisition to be provided to NSC when a construction contractor is appointed and has prepared a programme of works.
10	Professional Fees	NSC request financial compensation to instruct technical specialists to review the scheme.	National Highways are unable to financially compensate NSC to instruct their own technical specialists for the scheme. National Highways have reassured NSC that the technical specialists undertaking the relevant assessment's follow the appropriaterelevant guidance, legislation and working practices of a professional person. NSC concerns about not being compensated for professional fees were discussed at the meeting on the 14th January 2022. National Highway's stated they will provide NSC financial cover to instruct professional specialists to review the relevant DCO documents submitted for NSC's land interest. The terms and conditions of the specialists are to be agreed between National Highway's and NSC. At a meeting with NSC on the 6th and 19th May 2021, the College emphasised their

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			~~position that they request professional fees to review the scheme.~~ NSC to provide quotes for professional specialists to review the DCO documents submitted. National Highways will review the quotes provided. ~~National Highways property and compensation team (Alistair Reason) provided a written response to NSC on why the professional fees requested can't be reimbursed as part of the scheme in 9th June 2021.~~ ~~NSC's concerns regarding professional fee compensation was raised at the meeting on the 23rd November 2021. Ian Miles requested the relevant policy that has determined National Highways position on professional fees in email correspondence on the 25th November 2021.~~
11	EqIA	NSC raised concerns about the EqIA completed for the scheme. Concerns related to the assessment methodology and data sources. ~~NSC request that the EqIA is shared with the College in confidence.~~ ~~NSC asked if the EqIA could be shared with their legal representatives.~~ The issues regarding the EqIA were contained in NSC's relevant representation response. NSC raised concerns about a disconnect between the landowner engagement and the EqIA.	~~National Highways shared the EqIA in confidence with NSC on the 14th May 2021. The EqIA was shared with NSC's legal representatives on the 4th June 2021.~~ National Highways explained the EqIA adopts a standard methodology ~~through the use of~~using the EDIT Tool (equality, diversity and inclusion tool). The EDIT Tool is an industry accepted means of conducting EqIA's on other nationally significant projects National Highways are involved in. ~~Meeting to be arranged between National Highways and NSC to discuss the EqIA took place on the 1st September. At the meeting issues relating to methodology, data sources and assessment was discussed.~~

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			~~Several actions were agreed to address NSC's concerns.~~ A note was issued to NSC on ~~the~~ 5~~th~~ October 2021 providing ~~further detail about the concerns they raised at the meeting on the 1st September.~~further detail about the EqIA NSC provided detail about their student and staff demographics, and roles and services in email correspond on ~~the~~ 16~~th~~ December 2021. ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss EqIA but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~Meeting took place on 14~~th~~ January 2022 to discuss the EqIA. The scheme EqIA specialist provided an overview of the Assessment completed. This included detail about the specific risks, mitigation and recommendations contained in the document. It was explained that the purpose of the EqIA is to ensure people with protected characteristics, as defined by the Equality Act (2010), are suitably considered as part of National Highways projects. The scheme Lands and EqIA specialists to work together collaboratively where appropriate to do so, to review and update the EqIA in consideration of the information provided by NSC. An updated EqIA was submitted for DCO Examination Deadline 3 (2~~nd~~ February 2022).
12~~3~~	Non-Vehicular Crossing -Crickley Hill and NSC	NSC requested that National Highways explore the opportunity for a non-vehicular route between Crickley Hill and the College.	The proposed non-vehicular route cannot be provided as a traffic light-controlled crossing would be required. A crossing in this location would negatively impact traffic flows at the junction and would fail to accord with safety standards.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
		The request for a non-vehicular crossing was contained in NSC's relevant representation response.	A note providing further detail about the non-vehicular crossing was issued to NSC on ~~the~~ 5~~th~~ October 2021. NSC to provide comment on the non-vehicular crossing note issued/ ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss the non-vehicular crossing but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~
1~~3~~4	Noise	NSC raised concerns that the assessments completed to date have not addressed the noise concerns ~~NSC have~~ raised. NSC have students with complex disabilities or behavioural challenges which mean that they are more sensitive to the impact increased noise creates on health and wellbeing. The issues regarding the ~~EqIA~~ noise were contained in NSC's relevant representation response.	NSC are considered to be a sensitive receptor for noise during the construction of the scheme in consideration of DMRB guidance. Significant noise effects from construction or operation of the proposed scheme have not been identified in the assessment. However, if there are rooms that the College considers to be particularly critical, such as speech therapy rooms, this can be examined further and, if appropriate, measures taken to allow windows to remain closed during summer months. National Highways have made the commitment to monitor noise at the College throughout the construction phase of the scheme. The scope of this monitoring is to be agreed with the College. A virtual noise demonstration took place on ~~the~~ 27~~th~~ May 2021. NSC requested that National Highways make a commitment that the level of noise impact of construction work relative to ambient traffic noise won't exceed the levels in the noise demonstration. The project noise specialist explained commitments are made in the DCO and the E~~nvironmental Management Plan~~ MP to minimise and monitor construction noise. T~~, and t~~he level of impact indicated in the demonstration was considered realistic based on predictions of construction noise. NSC requested that a note is

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			recorded in this Position Statement that National Highways commit to make all efforts to contain the levels presented in the noise demonstration. This Position Statement acts as a record of the commitment agreed at the virtual noise demonstration on ~~the~~ 27~~th~~ May 2021. ~~National Highways agreed to this commitment at the noise demonstration. A commitment has also been included in the Environmental Management Plan as discussed at the virtual noise demonstration.~~ ~~An in-person noise demonstration to be arranged with NSC. This is likely to be arranged for late 2021 or early 2022.~~A commitment to provide construction noise mitigation provisions was included in the updated EMP for DCO Examination Deadline 2 (13~~th~~ January 2022). NSC to provide comment on this EMP commitment. In-person noise demonstration took place as a follow-up to the virtual demonstration on ~~the~~ 27~~th~~ May 2021. Key actions agreed at the in-person demonstration were as follows: • Construction phasing to be discussed with NSC when known. • Noise monitoring to be in the westerly boundary of the Christmas tree field. • NSC to be notified in advance of the loudest construction works relating to the scheme. • Noise demonstration to be held with appropriate NSC employees prior to commencement of construction construction.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			• Reporting of ~~N~~noise monitoring data to be agreed between the NSC and the construction contractor. ~~A meeting was scheduled for 6th October 2021 to discuss noise but NSC cancelled. Meeting to be rearranged after the site visit to discuss the EqIA scheduled for the 13th January 2022.~~

Appendix J Position Statement with Mr and Mrs Field

Landowner Position Statement – Field

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.

1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a 'live' document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Mr and Mrs Lisa Field as a landowners impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mr and Mrs Field during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to their land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.

1.1.5 ~~This Position Statement has been updated in December 2021 in order to ensure that matters raised through Relevant Representation and Written Representation submissions have been considered and responded to.~~ This Position Statement has been updated for Deadline 5 (9 March 2022) of the Examination in order to ensure that matters raised during the Examination to date through submissions made by Mr and Mrs Field are considered and responded to.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
27/09/19	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr Field for the 10/10/2019.
10/10/2019	Meeting	Meeting with Mr & Mrs Field to discuss the scheme and potential land take. The meeting included a discussion about the following: • Design request for existing trees established for landscaping for the 1993 A417 scheme to be reduced in height. • Concern about noise levels. • Request to remove a drainage basin from the Field's land. • Explanation about the compounds required during construction.
06/2/2020	Meeting	A meeting took place with the Field's at the National Star College. Discussion included: • Access concerns • Height of existing landscape planting from previous road scheme • Drainage design (it was established that the suggested route for drainage conflicts with existing soak away and septic tank).. • Impacts of construction. • Noise mitigation. • Request to redesignate and redesign lay-by.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to the Field's notifying them of the beginning of the public consultation.
02/11/2020	Meeting	A meeting took place on site to discuss existing drainage and landscaping issues for the scheme. The drainage and landscaping proposed was explained to the Field's. The Field's provided comments which will be considered and used to inform a review of the design proposed.
26/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Mr & Mrs Field for comment.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Mr & Mrs Field notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
16/02/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting as part of the targeted landowner consultation to discuss the lay-by, drainage and landscape. National Highways to review the proposed drainage design across the Field's land. Review to consider existing drainage infrastructure in place. Mr & Mrs Field object to the proposed lay-by on the southern boundary of their land interest. National Highways to review the justification and design of the lay-by as requested. Landscape discussions are ongoing with Mr & Mrs Field.
05/05/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the lay-by, drainage and landscape.
1/11/2021	Meeting in person	Meeting to update and discuss the scheme. Main points were: • Land take • Lay-by • Drainage route • Land boundary west • Land to the east • Field access
07/01/2022	Meeting in person	Meeting to update and discuss the scheme. Main points were: • Land take • Lay-by • Landscape
4/02/2022	Meeting in person	Meeting to update and discuss the scheme. Main points were: • Land take

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		• Lay-by • Landscape • Land acquisition

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Attenuation Basin	The Field's raised concerns about the proposed location of the attenuation basin proposed south of dog lane. The Field's were concerned that the attenuation basin would impact their own drainage infrastructure serving their property.	The impact that the attenuation basin would have on the Field's was assessed and the basin was moved south of the A417 off their land holding. This was the decided course of action after reviewing whether the existing pipes could be moved. The proposed relocation of the pipework is still being considered.
2	Access	The Field's request that the scheme is designed to allow for unimpeded access to their field for the land plot 845/1.	The Field's will be able to access their field during the construction and operation of the scheme. A permanent right is to be created to confirm this position.
3	Drainage	The Field's raised concerns about the drainage pipe going through their land for the purposes of the scheme. The Field's questioned why the pipeline could not run along the whole of the south side of their property on National Highways land and only enter their property after the last manhole on National Highways side of the boundary.	The route of the drainage pipe has been revised to take the minimum amount of land and also lie as far to the west of the Field's land holding as possible.
4	West Boundary Land	The Field's raised concerns about their western boundary land that they state was wrongly taken by National Highways for the scheme back in the early 90's. The Field's request that this matter is resolved before the end of the scheme's construction. The Field's stated that the trees should be cut down and left at the property and all roots removed by National Highways.	The previous scheme created an incorrect land ownership boundary. As such during the preliminary works for the A417 missing link scheme, the fence line will be moved and appropriate vegetation clearance undertaken to provide the land back to the Field's and show the correct land ownership boundary.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
5	Small additional Land Area U00275d	The Field's state that the land parcel U000275d; which has been assigned to them, should not result in any management burdens being placed upon them.	This area of land is a small area of road verge, consisting of some 12 square metres of woodland planting. There are no management requirements for the land in question.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Accommodation works	The Field's request that a permanent and secure structure is provided for security purposes next to the lay-by. The Field's suggest a Gabion fence is installed and the lay-by is used for 'emergency use' only.	Accommodation works are to be developed and agreed as the scheme progresses.
2	Land acquisition	No land acquisition discussions are to commence until the exact nature of the lay-by is known.	Land acquisition discussions cannot progress until the final nature of the lay-by ~~is known~~ on the land adjacent to the Fields is known. The landowner does not wish to engage in land acquisition discussions unless the layby is removed. Land to be acquired by GVD.
3	Landscaping	The Field's raised concerns about the landscape planting completed for the scheme in 1993 that has not been properly managed or maintained. The Field's state that it was promised that the tree planting would be kept at a certain height, but this has not happened. The Field's request that further trees are not planted on their land as part of the landscape mitigation works and is properly managed going forward. A low height or low growing species mix should be used. The exact nature of the boundary design needs to be established. This should be a fence and stone gabions adjacent to the layby.	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 environment in the local area and consider landowner concerns. National Highways have considered the comments received from the Field's in relation to planting. National Highways intend to maintain the height of the trees located on the north side of the east bound carriageway. An agreement between National Highways and the Fields' will need to be created for the management of the proposed planting. Full details of planting management and specifications and tree species proposed will be detailed within ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex D LEMP (Document

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			Reference 6.4). Tree species selected will be appropriate for the local character of the area. National Highways are currently reviewing ways to reduce visual impact and to allow for more appropriate species mix on their land. Details of which will be provided as part of the detailed design phase.
4	Lay-by	The Field's object to the lay-by proposed on the southern boundary of their land. The Field's believe that the lay-by will be used for anti-social purposes and will have a negative security impact on their land interest. Regardless of the size of the layby Mr and Mrs Field are opposed to having them located close to their land boundary due to the cited reasons.	National Highways is aware of the concerns the Field's have about the lay-by proposed. The lay-by has been positioned in consideration of DMRB guidance. Following these concerns and discussions with the Field's, National Highways has confirmed that the public layby will be removed from the scheme and replaced with a smaller Emergency Area subject to Traffic Road Orders to restrict public use. Alternatively, it will be removed from the scheme altogether. This has been confirmed to the Field's in writing on ~~the 01 11 21~~1 November 2021 and in the meeting minutes. The dimensions have now also been provided in a meeting on ~~4 03 22~~4 February 2022.~~.....~~ The final design of the lay-by is likely to be an emergency lay-by that is reduced in size and can only be used for emergencies. The lay-by will have a Traffic Regulation Order that allows the police to move people on. This prevents for instance the lay-by being used by refrigerator lorries overnight. The dimensions of an emergency layby have been provided to the Land owner through National Highways Summary of Applicants Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (CAH-1) which were submitted at Deadline 3 (Document Reference 8.18, REP3-010). ~

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
5	Security	The Field's requested security in the form of a Cotswold stone wall or caged stone gabions on the south side of their property. Also that the southern should be secure during construction.	National Highways will review the request for Cotswold Dry Stone walls to be used for the purposes of the scheme boundary works. Cotswold stone walling could be proposed on the landowner's side of the boundary to a height of 1.2m, in combination with the highways boundary fencing along the lay-by. The boundary design will be progressed during the detailed design stage. During construction the work area will be fenced off and appropriate security measures will be put in place by the contractor.
6	National Highways land to the east	The Field's request that if the triangle of land on the east side of their property (that currently belongs to National Highways) is sold, they get first refusal.	The land is currently identified as being required by the scheme on a temporary basis. This is because then exact nature of the utilities and drainage in this area are unknown. As the land is not required on a permanent basis by the scheme it will have to be declared surplus prior to any sale agreement. The land formerly belonged to Crickleigh Hill Farm, therefore it would have to be offered to any living descendants of the former owner before being sold.
7	Communication	The Field's raised concerns about the quality and quantity of the engagement completed for the scheme. The Field's requested minutes from meetings that took place as part of the landowner engagement.	National Highways has continued to consult and engage with affected landowners throughout the design of the scheme. This is set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1), which evidences how National Highways has met the statutory consultation requirements for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008. Ongoing engagement has occurred with landowners throughout the development of the scheme. National Highways will have a landowner liaison in place during the construction of the scheme.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			This person will be a point of contact to discuss issues relating to the scheme the landowner may have. National Highways continues to work through the matters outstanding in relation to the landowner. Detail of the matters outstanding and agreed and a record of key engagement is recorded in thise Position Statement. ~~developed for the landowner.~~

~~Appendix F~~Appendix K Position Statement with Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited

Landowner Position Statement – Hanson ~~Quarry~~

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 Highways England have prepared a series of position statements with landowners directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), Highways England Property and Compensation Team and Highways England Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions with landowners.

1.1.2 The purpose of the position statements is to provide a 'live' document which captures the key engagement held with landowners and a formal record of important matters raised and the Highways England position to such matters.

1.1.3 The detail recorded within this position statement relates to the communication and engagement regarding Hanson ~~Quarry~~'s position as a landowner impacted by the scheme.

1.1.4 ~~Further detail relating to the consultation responses submitted by Hanson Quarry during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report and associated appendices submitted in support of the DCO application (Document References 5.1 and 5.3).~~Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Hanson ~~Quarry~~ during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application.

~~1.1.4~~1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated at Deadline 5 (09 ~~February~~ March 2022).

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
27/9/2019	Land Interest Consultation Invitation – Letter	Correspondence issued to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ but no response was received.
13/01/2020	Land Interest Consultation Invitation – Letter	Meeting arranged with Hanson ~~Quarry~~ for the 06 February 2020.
6/02/2019	Meeting	Hanson ~~Quarry~~'s main concern was about how the scheme could impact the viability of the future operation of the ~~quarry~~. Rights across the ~~quarry~~ were required to work on an existing utility.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence was issued to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ to notify them of the beginning of statutory consultation.
11/11/2020	Meeting (Virtual)	Landowner meeting took place with Hanson ~~Quarry~~ on the 11 November 2020.
26/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation work plans issued to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ for comment.
01/02/2021	Telephone Call	Iain Macpherson raised concerns about the drainage rights underneath the ~~quarry~~ as part of the scheme. It was explained that the drainage infrastructure identified is an existing water main. Further detail to be provided.
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
10/02/2021	Email Correspondence	A response was provided to Iain Macpherson in regard to the drainage infrastructure located under the ~~quarry~~. Highways England can confirm that a full right exists for the free and uninterrupted flow and passage of water through the existing pipes located underneath Hanson ~~Quarry~~'s site. Title deed were provided to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ providing further detail about the existing right that exists.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and key outcomes
		It is planned that the existing main under Hanson ~~Quarry~~ will be abandoned. Highways England will acquire permanent rights to cap the water main at each end of the drain to allow for its planned abandonment. The right is to also allow for essential access if specific issues relating to the construction of the scheme occur. Rights currently exist for Hanson ~~Quarry~~ and Severn Trent Water to access the water main. Currently Highways England do not have the rights to undertake these proposed works, hence why they are being acquired by the scheme.
26/05/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the drainage infrastructure in situ and rights to be acquired as part of the scheme on Hanson ~~Quarry~~'s land. Severn Trent Water agreed to review historic information to determine whether an existing main is located on Hanson ~~Quarry~~'s land. Severn Trent Water to send an email to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ that a permanent easement is not required as part of the scheme. All It was explained to Hanson ~~Quarry~~ that it's too late to change the rights to be acquired as part of the DCO. Rights to be acquired to be explored at the Lands Hearing as part of the DCO Examination. Hanson ~~Quarry~~ stated Highways England will required a right of support along the scheme red-line boundary. Highways England to review rights to be acquired as part of the existing red-line boundary proposals.

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Comment	Highways England Response
1	Utility Diversion ~~Drainage Easement~~	Hanson ~~Quarry~~ requested that no permanent rights are sought for the utility diversion across the site. This would create an ~~formal drainage easement is provided as part of the DCO. A permanent~~ easement on their land could impact future work on their land.	Severn Trent Water ~~(Matthew Dockrell)~~ have confirmed that the asset through Hanson Quarry is abandoned and therefore they do not require access rights moving forward. Should National Highways confirm that no ongoing maintenance or inspections would be required through the construction process, no rights would be sought post construction stage. Through preliminary works, National Highways are seeking acquisition which provides for a worst case but are happy to only seek temporary possession if no further need for access if confirmed through the detailed design and construction phases.
2	Existing ~~Drainage Infrastructure~~Utility Infrastructure	Hanson questioned the second water main ~~drainage main~~ shown on the Ground Investigation Plans produced in September 2021.	Highways England have removed the second water ~~drainage~~ main from the Ground Investigation Plans. STW confirmed that the second ~~drainage~~water main is not shown on their records.

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Comment	Highways England Response
1	Site Investigation	~~Hanson Quarry raised concerns relating to the deep excavation works that have been completed near their land and what this could mean in relation to the scheme~~. Hanson have raised a concern in relation to the road structure and the new carriageway being in proximity to the potential future workings.	~~Highways England to review Hanson Quarry's concerns about excavation works.~~ Should a licence be granted to reactivate the site and the detailed information on excavation become known Hanson will need to consult National Highways safe guarding team to establish required offsets.
2	Accommodation works	Accommodation works to be agreed with Hanson ~~Quarry~~.	Accommodation works will be developed and agreed as the scheme progresses.
3	Land acquisition	Land acquisition discussions to be advanced with Hanson ~~Quarry~~.	Land acquisition discussions have been~~will be~~ progressed by the DVS and discussions are ongoing.
4	Right of Support	Hanson ~~Quarry~~ requested clarification about a right of support along the scheme main line next to their land.	Highways England to review the rights acquired as part of the scheme red-line boundary.
~~5~~	~~Existing Drainage Infrastructure~~	~~Hanson Quarry raised concerns about whether an existing drainage main exists across their site.~~	~~Highways England confirmed that an existing full right exists for the free and uninterrupted flow and passage of water through the existing pipes located underneath Hanson Quarry's site. The title deed was provided to Hanson Quarry providing further detail about the existing right that exists.~~ ~~After the title deed was provided, a meeting took place in May 2021 to discuss the existing drainage infrastructure.~~ ~~Severn Trent Water stated there may be an error in their historic plans. Matthew Dockrell to review existing plans to see if a historic drainage main is in place.~~ ~~XXX~~

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Comment	Highways England Response
~~6~~	~~Proposed Drainage Rights~~	~~Hanson Quarry raised concerns about a proposed drainage right in perpetuity as part of the scheme proposals.~~	~~Highways England will acquire permanent rights to cap the water main at each end of the drain to allow for its planned abandonment. The right is to also allow for essential access if specific issues relating to the construction of the scheme occur. Rights currently exist for Hanson Quarry and Severn Trent Water to access the water main.~~ ~~Currently Highways England do not have the rights to undertake these proposed works, hence why they were proposed as part of the scheme.~~ ~~Issues relating to the existing drainage infrastructure being in situ or not are to be confirmed.~~
7	Drainage Ditch	~~-~~Hanson have raised the concern that a drainage ditch appears to connect to an attenuation basin and drain onto their land.	The drainage ditch intercepts surface water flows from the north from reaching the new carriageway. Attenuation basin 11a is not connected to the ditch and does not drain onto Hanson's land. Drainage ditches and networks are all contained within the site boundary. All drainage is managed within the scheme boundary and there is no drainage discharge onto Hanson land.