

M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

Consultation Report

Appendix J - Reporting on additional targeted consultation responses

TR010063 - APP 5.2

Regulation 5 (2) (q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 5

December 2023



Gloucestershire
COUNTY COUNCIL

THIS PAGE IS LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Infrastructure Planning Planning Act 2008

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

M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme Development Consent Order 202[x]

5.2 Consultation Report

Appendix J - Reporting on additional targeted consultation responses

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010063
Application Document Reference	TR010063/APP/5.2
Author:	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	December 2023	DCO Application

Appendix J. Reporting on additional non statutory targeted consultation responses

J.1. Prescribed consultees

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
43	St Modwen	Jubb has undertaken an assessment of the Scheme amendments and whilst it is noted that none of the amendments have a direct impact on my client's Golden Valley Development site, there are some significant changes to the junctions on the A4019. Therefore, and given that the Housing Infrastructure Fund monies are to enable suitable infrastructure to come forward to enable development, we expect the Development Consent Order application to be supported by refreshed transport modelling reflecting the proposed amendments, in order to ensure there is no detriment to the highway network and that the junctions are within capacity when the committed development comes forward.	Traffic Modelling has been undertaken and forms part of the Development Consent Order Application. The modelling supports a Scheme which ensures junction capacity. Infrastructure requirements will be in place to allow a suitably sized future access to the Allocated and Safeguarded Site.	N/A	
45	Historic England	The revised Scheme now removes the need to connect Moat and Cook Lane. This will remove some of the harm we identified with the original proposed design. There are still concerns regarding the widening of the road and an agreed landscaping and noise abatement mitigation is needed to reduce that impact.	With regard to the revised recommendations, the Applicant has undertaken the following assessments/changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A settings assessment of the Moat House Scheduled Monument has been undertaken and reported in the Environmental Statement. This includes consideration of the 	No	Comments have been addressed through the existing design.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		Please refer to our letter of the 14 February 2022 for detail of those concerns. We also set out four recommendations in conclusion to that letter.	<p>noise modelling carried out for the Scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of the water system that feeds the moat has been undertaken and reported in the Environmental Statement. The landscape design includes hedges in this area along the southern side of the A4019 so as to provide screening between the A4019 and the scheduled monument. 		
46	Historic England	A more thorough settings assessment of this designated heritage asset is undertaken.	A settings assessment of the Moat House Scheduled Monument has been undertaken and reported in the Environmental Statement.	N/A	
47	Historic England	Further work is needed on understanding the water system that feeds and drains the moat to ensure there is no loss of levels, flow or quality through the proposed works.	An assessment of this has been undertaken and reported in the Environmental Statement.	N/A	
48	Historic England	Further work is needed on providing suitable noise and visual screening between the new road and the Moated Site. This should be in the form of natural barriers (hedges and trees) to retain the rural character.	The landscape design includes hedges in this area along the southern side of the A4019 to provide screening between the A4019 and the Moat House Scheduled Monument. The speed limit will also be reduced from 50mph to 40mph through Uckington which will reduce traffic noise levels in this area.	No	No further design change required at this stage.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
50	Robert Hitchens	Please confirm that the proposed access track serving Robert Hitchens Ltd land north-east of Junction 10 as shown coloured red on drawing DR-CH-000007 will be deemed highway, including the grass verge up to the proposed highway fence?	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed, and it is intended that the track is placed back into the ownership of the landowners. Notwithstanding this, the comment about future maintenance liability was made, prior to the development coming online. The Applicant will investigate further and provide clarification as part of ongoing liaison.	No	No further design change required at this stage.
51	Robert Hitchens	The arrangement of this access track with the proposed new access stub road requires further details on how this will work?	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed, and the current Scheme ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place for future access to the Safeguarded Site. Following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a substantial access due to the likely timeframe for the development of the Safeguarded Site and the additional cost involved for the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown future layout of the Safeguarded Site. The current access represents	No	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed, and the current Scheme ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place for future access to the Safeguarded Site. Following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a substantial access due to the likely timeframe for the development of the Safeguarded Site and the additional cost involved for

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			an appropriate 'interim' solution for agricultural access to the fields until such time as the Safeguarded Site comes forward for development. It is not intended to be the final access that serves the Safeguarded Site in the long term.		the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown future layout of the Safeguarded Site. The current access represents an appropriate 'interim' solution for agricultural access to the fields until such time as the Safeguarded Site comes forward for development. It is not intended to be the final access that serves the Safeguarded Site in the long term.
52	Robert Hitchins	The access road off the A4019 appears to be significantly downgraded from the previous version, please explain the reasoning.	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed, and the current Scheme ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place for future access to the Safeguarded Site. Following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a substantial access due to the likely timeframe for the development of the Safeguarded Site and the additional cost involved for the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown	No	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed, and the current Scheme ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place for future access to the Safeguarded Site. Following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a substantial access due to the likely timeframe for the development of the

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			future layout of the Safeguarded Site. The current access represents an appropriate 'interim' solution for agricultural access to the fields until such time as the Safeguarded Site comes forward for development. It is not intended to be the final access that serves the Safeguarded Site in the long term.		Safeguarded Site and the additional cost involved for the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown future layout of the Safeguarded Site. The current access represents an appropriate 'interim' solution for agricultural access to the fields until such time as the Safeguarded Site comes forward for development. It is not intended to be the final access that serves the Safeguarded Site in the long term.
53	Robert Hitchins	Is the access track to become a bridleway as part of the bridleway diversion? If so, we foresee conflict between horses, people and agricultural vehicles, what assessment has been carried out?	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed. The GG 142 walking, cycling and horse riding review concluded the route of the bridleway did not record any notable concerns due to it being separate from the access track. It is understood this was not shown on the general arrangement drawings at the time the original comment was made. The design of the crossing point will be further developed at the detailed design with the mitigation of possible conflicts being a paramount consideration. The Applicant notes the comment regarding bridleway	No	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed. The GG 142 walking, cycling and horse riding review concluded the route of the bridleway did not record any notable concerns due to it being separate from the access track. It is understood this was not shown on the general arrangement drawings at the time the original comment was made. The design of the crossing point will be further developed at the detailed design with the mitigation of

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			usage and the desire for this access to be adopted. This will be investigated further, and clarification provided as part of the ongoing liaison with the stakeholder.		possible conflicts being a paramount consideration. The Applicant notes the comment regarding bridleway usage and the desire for this access to be adopted. This will be investigated further, and clarification provided as part of the ongoing liaison with the stakeholder.
54	Robert Hitchins	The new underpass shown on the A4019 located just east of Junction 10 is suggested to be used by horses and the public. Can the underpass be located further east to align with Withybridge Lane reducing the diversion route.	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed. The vertical alignment of the A4019 and available headroom prohibit moving the underpass to align with Withybridge Lane. As discussed, the Applicant considered “at-grade solutions” but the safest route for pedestrians and riders is through the underpass. This avoids potential conflict with the dual carriageway. This does not dismiss the comment regarding the longer route, but it is the Applicant's opinion that this is the safest solution.	No	As part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder this was discussed. The vertical alignment of the A4019 and available headroom prohibit moving the underpass to align with Withybridge Lane. As discussed, the Applicant considered “at-grade solutions” but the safest route for pedestrians and riders is through the underpass. This avoids potential conflict with the dual carriageway. This does not dismiss the comment regarding the longer route, but it is the Applicant's opinion that this is the safest solution.
55	Robert Hitchins	The tree landscape buffer to south-west	As part of ongoing engagement	No	As part of ongoing

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		of Junction 10 our request is circa 20m – 30m in width. We would also be content to have this reside within our ownership and maintain in perpetuity. I understand this is with your Landscape team.	with the stakeholder, this was discussed. The Applicant would be satisfied to include an additional 10m to the landscaping up to the pond, in the south-west quadrant. This would be on the outside of the highway fence. This is in addition to what is required for the development, and as such the planting work will need to be carried out under a separate temporary licence. The future maintenance would not be carried out by Gloucestershire County Council, and it is understood that Robert Hitchens Ltd would safeguard and maintain this strip in perpetuity. The Applicant will provide a draft plan to show these proposals for information in due course.		engagement with the stakeholder, this was discussed. The Applicant would be satisfied to include an additional 10m to the landscaping up to the pond, in the south-west quadrant. This would be on the outside of the highway fence. This is in addition to what is required for the development, and as such the planting work will need to be carried out under a separate temporary licence. The future maintenance would not be carried out by Gloucestershire County Council, and it is understood that Robert Hitchens Ltd would safeguard and maintain this strip in perpetuity. The Applicant will provide a draft plan to show these proposals for information in due course.
56	Robert Hitchens	The access road that will serve our land on the northeast of the junction. Our preference is this would be an adopted highway until it reaches our ownership along the lines of the attached plans. We have also moved the access track that runs parallel to the boundary closer to the edge of the highway to save on 'lost'	The Applicant considered the request to make the access track "adopted highway" but decided not to progress with this option as it would entitle the public at large to use the access track. Rather, the access track will be to a "private means of access" with right and	No	The Applicant considered the request to make the access track "adopted highway" but decided not to progress with this option as it would entitle the public at large to use the access track. Rather, the access track will be to a

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		land.	<p>permissions to be applied, including maintenance of the track. This is to be agreed as part of ongoing liaison.</p> <p>Regarding moving the track closer to edge of the highway, the plan does not show landscaping or other drainage features. It should be noted that the design is worst case, and there may be scope to reduce land take in the future. This would be carried out during detailed design. The finalised land take for the Scheme would be realised during this design stage.</p>		<p>"private means of access" with right and permissions to be applied, including maintenance of the track. This is to be agreed as part of ongoing liaison.</p> <p>Regarding moving the track closer to edge of the highway, the plan does not show landscaping or other drainage features. It should be noted that the design is worst case, and there may be scope to reduce land take in the future. This would be carried out during detailed design. The finalised land take for the Scheme would be realised during this design stage.</p>
57	Robert Hitchens	You were to share with me the improved flood zone to Robert Hitchens Ltd land on the northeast of Junction 10.	<p>The Applicant has shared details of the flood modelling carried out for the Scheme. The flood modelling has been reviewed and accepted by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Engagement with the stakeholder is ongoing and the Applicant will continue to provide further details if requested.</p>	N/A	
58	Persimmon Homes and	The standalone pedestrian/cycle crossing included in the Elms Park	The pedestrian crossing has been included in the Safeguarded Site	No	The pedestrian crossing has been included in the

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
	Bloor Homes	application has been removed, and is not reinstated in the updated Scheme. This crossing must be fully reinstated, and this objection therefore remains.	access junction. This has been discussed with Gloucestershire County Council. This will be agreed as part of the Scheme through the Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire County Council.		Safeguarded Site access junction. This has been discussed with Gloucestershire County Council. This will be agreed as part of the Scheme through the Statement of Common Ground with Gloucestershire County Council.
59	Persimmon Homes and Bloor Homes	The amended Scheme includes existing hedgerows within Elms Park within the Scheme boundary. These hedgerows are noted as to be retained for ecological mitigation. This requires further discussion to understand any implications for Elms Park, and until then is a further objection.	The design amendments are intended to complement the Elms Park proposals. The Applicant is aware updated proposals are available on the planning portal and are currently in review. The Applicant will arrange further liaison with the stakeholder to discuss.	No	The design amendments are intended to complement the Elms Park proposals. The Applicant is aware updated proposals are available on the planning portal and are currently in review. The Applicant will arrange further liaison with the stakeholder to discuss.
60	Persimmon Homes and Bloor Homes	There has still been no publication of any supporting traffic modelling information. This is particularly important as the amended Scheme seeks to remove Homecroft Drive from 'Site Access A', and relocate 'Site Access B' to include the civil service club. The implications of this change need to be fully understood before PJA can support or provide any commentary on the acceptability of this change.	Modelling information will be discussed as part of the ongoing series of meetings held with the developers and their representatives; and, if necessary, addressed in a Statement of Common Ground.	N/A	
61	Persimmon Homes and	The Scheme design has changed to include areas of verge which could	Provision of bus measures within the Development Consent Order	No	Provision of bus measures within the Development

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
	Bloor Homes	widened in future to provide bus lanes. It is not clear how these bus lanes, when delivered, would offer any meaningful reduction in public transport journey times. There are not any measures at the signalised junctions themselves to provide bus priority. Providing public transport priority measures, and reducing bus journey times compared to car journeys, is a fundamental element of the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan (2020 – 2041), and of the transport strategy for development at North West Cheltenham. The Scheme as currently presented still has insufficient regard for public transport and this objection is still strongly maintained.	limits at opening year is not considered necessary due to the increased capacity provided by the Development Consent Order Scheme. Future provision needs to be considered holistically with other measures east of the Development Consent Order Scheme as shown in the Elms Park planning application. However, there is uncertainty regarding the timing of when the measures in the Elms Park planning application will be implemented. The Applicant will continue to discuss this further as part of the Statement of Common Ground process.		Consent Order limits at opening year is not considered necessary due to the increased capacity provided by the Development Consent Order Scheme. Future provision needs to be considered holistically with other measures east of the Development Consent Order Scheme as shown in the Elms Park planning application. However, there is uncertainty regarding the timing of when the measures in the Elms Park planning application will be implemented. The Applicant will continue to discuss this further as part of the Statement of Common Ground process.
71	Bloor Homes	The current additional Targeted Non Statutory Consultation proposes to alter access to the Safeguarded Land for a third time. In 2020, this was proposed as a roundabout. Earlier in 2022, it was a signalised junction onto Tewkesbury Road extending into the Safeguarded Land as shown in the Statutory Consultation brochure. And now it is a much smaller signalised junction onto Tewkesbury Road extending only as far as an access track which is to be formed	The design and alignment of the Scheme have undergone several key reviews, commencing with alternative alignments and options for the Scheme that were considered in the October – November 2020 non statutory consultation. At the non statutory consultation stage several options were tabled, including an option for a new junction to the north of Junction 10 with an access road	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		parallel to Tewkesbury Road.	connecting back to the A4019 across the Safeguarded Site. This option was among others that identified a roundabout to cater for the new motorway traffic. As reported in the Preferred Route Announcement in June 2021, these options were discounted following the non statutory consultation and further design development and the Scheme now proposes a revised Junction 10 in its current location and a signalised junction on the A4019 to serve the West Cheltenham development (the West Cheltenham Link Road) to the south and landowner access to the north. Subsequent to the statutory consultation, and following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It was concluded that it would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a significant access due to the likely timeframes for the development of Safeguarded Site and the additional cost involved for the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown future layout of the Safeguarded Site. Whilst it is recognised that the precise access arrangements will		

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			need to be subject to more detail if and when the land is brought forward, it is considered that the proposed signalised junction represents the most proportionate solution until such time as the Safeguarded Site is consented for development, potentially post 2031 and beyond. No other alternative options have been raised by third parties as part of the consultation exercises.		
72	Bloor Homes	Whilst it remains the case that no traffic data has been published to enable consideration of the capacity of this new proposed junction, the nature and scale of what is proposed plainly has limitations when compared with the previous proposed arrangements. Without doubt, future works and upgrading of this junction will be required to make it fit for purpose to serve as a satisfactory access for traffic associated with development of the Safeguarded Land at the scale proposed. As such, this new proposed junction is deficient and will not meet the Scheme's objectives.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken and included in the Transport Assessment which forms part of the Development Consent Order submission. This information supports a Scheme which ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place to allow a suitably sized future access to the Safeguarded Site. If in due course a larger access is needed to deliver the planning proposals for the Safeguarded Site, this will no doubt form part of the associated planning application and the access arrangements can be designed accordingly.	No	Traffic modelling has been undertaken and included in the Transport Assessment which forms part of the Development Consent Order submission. This information supports a Scheme which ensures junction capacity and infrastructure requirements will be in place to allow a suitably sized future access to the Safeguarded Site. If, in due course a larger access is needed to deliver the planning proposals for the Safeguarded Site, this will no doubt form part of the associated planning application and the access arrangements can be designed accordingly.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
73	Bloor Homes	The proposed new junction stops on land owned by Gloucestershire County Council and does not extend to the boundary of that land to enable access to the land beyond. This raises the unsatisfactory spectre of a further length of road being required to be constructed across land owned by Gloucestershire County Council in order to access the overwhelming majority of the future development area. The consequence of this is that it creates uncertainty, and potentially an impediment, to delivery of an access to the remaining development areas. In particular, loss of direct access onto adopted public highway in this location will significantly compromise our client's ability to properly design and optimise the use of the Safeguarded Land. Once again, in these terms, this proposed new junction does not meet the Scheme's objectives.	It is the position of the Applicant that the proposed infrastructure (culverts, ducts etc.) allows for an expanded junction to be constructed on land designated as part of the Safeguarded Site, should that be required in due course, which does not prejudice the development of the Safeguarded Site as identified by the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of access to the highway, the Scheme will ensure that an equivalent level of access to what landowners currently have to the Safeguarded Site is maintained. In relation to any future access arrangements needed for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the position of Gloucestershire County Council as landowner is separate from Gloucestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority and the Applicant but the Council will look to help facilitate private development coming forward where it can, in line with its statutory duties.	No	It is the position of the Applicant that the infrastructure (culverts, ducts etc.) allows for an expanded junction to be constructed on land designated as part of the Safeguarded Site, should that be required in due course, which does not prejudice the development of the Safeguarded Site as identified by the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of access to the highway, the Scheme will ensure that an equivalent level of access to what landowners currently have to the Safeguarded Site is maintained. In relation to any future access arrangements needed for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the position of Gloucestershire County Council as landowner is separate from Gloucestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority and the Applicant but the Council will look to help facilitate private development coming forward where it can, in line with its statutory duties.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
74	Bloor Homes	If the proposed new junction is delivered as part of the Scheme, then there will inevitably need to be another highway improvement scheme to provide access to the development. The additional traffic management, delays to road users and substantial costs of a second improvement scheme shortly after the first is completed, will result in unnecessary and significant disruption and economic dis-benefit to road users. This cannot be considered as the best way to meet the Scheme's objectives or provide the best use of public funds.	Any future further access works as a result of planning proposals for the Safeguarded Site can be implemented off the main carriageway with minimal traffic management for through traffic. It is unlikely that these works will be required shortly after the signalised junction works have been completed, given the proposed timescales for delivering the Scheme as compared with the likely timescales for securing planning consent and undertaking development of the Safeguarded Site.	No	Any future further access works as a result of planning proposals for the Safeguarded Site can be implemented off the main carriageway with minimal traffic management for through traffic. It is unlikely that these works will be required shortly after the signalised junction works have been completed, given the proposed timescales for delivering the Scheme as compared with the likely timescales for securing planning consent and undertaking development of the Safeguarded Site.
75	Bloor Homes	The proposed new access to the Safeguarded Land does not provide a satisfactory means of access and creates uncertainty and doubt as to the deliverability of the access to facilitate the development of the Safeguarded Land and to realise future economic and housing development. The Scheme's objectives will consequently not be achieved.	It is the position of the Applicant, that the proposed infrastructure (culverts, ducts etc.) allows for an expanded junction to be constructed on land designated as part of the Safeguarded Site, should that be required in due course, which does not prejudice the development of the Safeguarded Site as identified by the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of access to the highway, the Scheme will ensure that an equivalent level of access to what landowners currently have to the Safeguarded	No	It is the position of the Applicant, that the infrastructure (culverts, ducts etc.) allows for an expanded junction to be constructed on land designated as part of the Safeguarded Site, should that be required in due course, which does not prejudice the development of the Safeguarded Site as identified by the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of access to the highway, the Scheme will ensure that an equivalent

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			Site is maintained. In relation to any future access arrangements needed for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the position of Gloucestershire County Council as landowner is separate from Gloucestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority and the Applicant but Gloucestershire County Council will look to help facilitate private development coming forward where it can, in line with its statutory duties.		level of access to what landowners currently have to the Safeguarded Site is maintained. In relation to any future access arrangements needed for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the position of Gloucestershire County Council as landowner is separate from Gloucestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority and the Applicant but the Council will look to help facilitate private development coming forward where it can, in line with its statutory duties.
76	Bloor Homes	It is understood that the costs of the Scheme are proposed to be recovered in part from future development (e.g. by way of an infrastructure recovery scheme). In the circumstances where the Scheme does not facilitate development of the Safeguarded Land north of Tewkesbury Road, it is difficult to see how costs from that development can be fully justified and recovered given that any additional costs which those landowners would need to bear to upgrade the means of access and construct an additional length of road would clearly be germane to whether	The Applicant's position is that the Scheme does facilitate development of the Safeguarded Site through the proposed provision of infrastructure and capacity to the local and national route network. Existing Joint Core Strategy policy enables the Applicant to request contributions to the delivery of infrastructure where such infrastructure is a necessary mitigation for the associated development.	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		and to what extent such a contribution could be justified. In the circumstances Bloor Homes requests that the Applicant to reconsider the proposed new access to the Safeguarded Land and reverts to the proposed access as set out in the Statutory Consultation brochure. In the absence of the above, Bloor Homes requests that the Applicant explains how the objectives of the Scheme will be realised with the proposed new access and provides assurances as to how access from the public highway at the proposed new junction to the Safeguarded Land will be delivered to ensure that there is no impediment to development coming forward. For instance, will the Applicant dedicate a corridor of land from the access to the boundary of its land as public highway or will the Applicant grant unencumbered rights for the landowner beyond its boundary to construct a public highway from the proposed new access.			
78	Bloor Homes	The Scheme as now proposed will consolidate several existing farm accesses and an access road to a traveller site into a single access, served via an access track from the new signalised junction. The issues associated with this arrangement have already been well articulated by the owner of the land in question. In particular, the design, as currently	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road Junction. This has been designed to accommodate the anticipated farm traffic. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on	No	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road Junction. This has been designed to accommodate

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		proposed, is fundamentally unacceptable as it is inappropriately sized to accommodate frequent large vehicle access to multiple properties and, as a consequence, creates potential conflicts and danger of accidents with vehicles accessing the traveller site. Please confirm that the proposed new access has been signed off by highways officers as being fit for its intended users and that they are satisfied that it does not propose a safety risk. Further, the existing farm accesses onto Tewkesbury Road benefit from a high level of natural surveillance and this will be removed, placing the landowners at a significant risk of fly tipping, anti-social behaviour and crop damage. It is also not clear from the Scheme plans who will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the shared access track. Any requirement for the landowner to fund, or part-fund its maintenance is unacceptable.	this, and additional details have been provided as required.		the anticipated farm traffic. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.
79	Bloor Homes	The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (July 2021) for the Scheme sets out the alternatives considered by the Applicant in developing the Scheme. However, no alternatives were considered for the location of the access to the Safeguarded Land- the only solution presented provides access into land	The Scheme facilitates the potential need for alternate or further access points (for example via the widened central reservation) however it is not part of the Scheme to deliver alternate or secondary access points to the Safeguarded Site, which will form part of the proposals for the development of the	No	The Scheme facilitates the potential need for alternate or further access points (for example via the widened central reservation) however it is not part of the Scheme to deliver alternate or secondary access points to the Safeguarded Site, which

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		under the control of Gloucestershire County Council. A reasonable alternative would have been to locate the access slightly further east into land under the control of our client. The Applicant has consequently failed to consider all reasonable alternatives, without which, there can be no rationale or justification for this being the optimum solution.	Safeguarded Site in so far as is necessary in due course. Discussion of secondary access requirements should be taken up with Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management.		will form part of the proposals for the development of the Safeguarded Site in so far as is necessary in due course. Discussion of secondary access requirements should be taken up with Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management.
80	Bloor Homes	The amended Scheme includes a number of additional provisions which will prejudice efficient delivery of development on the Safeguarded Land. The Scheme plan indicates that an existing Public Right of Way which crosses the Safeguarded Land will be diverted via a new underpass beneath Tewkesbury Road. The exact diversion route is unclear, but it has the potential to prejudice efficient delivery of housing and employment within the Safeguarded Land. The existing Public Right of Way terminates at Tewkesbury Road. It is unclear why it is necessary to extend the Public Right of Way to utilise the new underpass, which would make it more difficult to divert or extinguish within the Safeguarded Land in the future.	It is proposed to divert the Public Rights of Way route along a new private means of access to the underpass as this would provide active travel users, particularly equestrians, with a safer crossing of the A4019. Provision of a Pegasus crossing has been considered but is not currently being taken forward due to issues with providing a safe waiting area for horses in the central reserve (at or away from the West Cheltenham Link Road Junction). The proposed diversion is not considered to prejudice any future proposals for the Safeguarded Site.	No	It is proposed to divert the Public Rights of Way route along new Private Means of Access to the underpass as this would provide active travel users, particularly equestrians, with a safer crossing of the A4019. Provision of a Pegasus crossing has been considered but not currently being taken forward due to issues with providing a safe waiting area for horses in the central reserve (at or away from the West Cheltenham Link Road Junction). The proposed diversion is not considered to prejudice any future proposals for the Safeguarded Site.
81	Bloor Homes	The amended Scheme proposes	The extent of the hedgerow and the	No	The extent of the hedgerow

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		additional ecology mitigation in the form of hedgerow planting within the Safeguarded Land, including on part of the land under the control of our client. No consideration has been given as to how this hedgerow planting could be retained as development comes forward and whether this might risk severing development and/or result in inefficient or isolated development. These additional provisions are contrary to the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy.	need for the mitigation will be discussed as part of the ongoing series of meetings held with the developers and their representatives; and if necessary, addressed in a Statement of Common Ground. However the proposed mitigation aligns with the concept plan for the Safeguarded Site shared with the Applicant.		and the need for the mitigation will be discussed as part of the ongoing series of meetings held with the developers and their representatives; and if necessary, addressed in a Statement of Common Ground. However the proposed mitigation aligns with the concept plan for the Safeguarded Site shared with the Applicant.
82	Bloor Homes	The flood storage area south of Tewkesbury Road is noted as offering potential to contribute to the open space and biodiversity requirements of Site A, as well as mitigating the flood risk within the site. Further details of this potential arrangement need to be provided before Bloor Homes is able to respond.	The Development Consent Order Application does not apply for public access for the flood storage area, due to the uncertainty around the position on land acquisition, with the landowner previously indicating a desire for the land to be returned post construction and would not want land returned with public access rights. Public access is not considered a justifiable reason for a Compulsory Purchase Order of the land. Additional details are being shared as part of the ongoing liaison between the Applicant and the stakeholder.	No	The Development Consent Order Application does not apply for public access for the flood storage area, due to the uncertainty around the position on land acquisition, with the landowner previously indicating a desire for the land to be returned post construction and would not want land returned with public access rights. Public access is not considered a justifiable reason for a Compulsory Purchase Order of the land. Additional details are being shared as part of the ongoing liaison between the Applicant and the stakeholder.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
83	Bloor Homes	Bloor Homes has repeatedly reiterated the need for a second point of access to the Safeguarded Land. It is highly unusual for a development of this size to have a single point of access, with a second access specified wherever possible to provide resilience to the highway network, to spread the impact of development traffic, and to enable emergency vehicle access.	The Scheme facilitates the potential need for further access points (for example via the widened central reservation) however it is not part of the Scheme to deliver secondary access points to the Safeguarded Site, which will form part of the proposals for development of the Safeguarded Site in so far as is necessary in due course. Discussion of secondary access requirements should be taken up with Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management.	N/A	
84	Bloor Homes	The amended Scheme provides a widened central reservation so that a second access could be provided in the future. The potential design of the second access has not been presented, and, as such, there is no comfort that this could, in fact, be provided to an appropriate standard.	The Scheme facilitates the potential need for further access points (for example via the widened central reservation) however it is not part of the Scheme to deliver secondary access points to the Safeguarded Site, which will form part of the proposals for development of the Safeguarded Site in so far as is necessary in due course. Discussion of secondary access requirements should be taken up with Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management.	N/A	
85	Bloor Homes	If a single access to the Safeguarded Land is considered appropriate, Bloor Homes would expect to have seen	Traffic modelling has been undertaken and included in the Transport Assessment which forms	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		technical evidence demonstrating that this is the case. However, so far as Bloor Homes is aware, neither a full design for the main access, nor any traffic modelling information has been provided.	part of the Development Consent Order submission. Further design detail has been made available and discussed as part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder and if necessary, addressed in a Statement of Common Ground.		
86	Bloor Homes	Bloor Homes understands that Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management has advised the Scheme designers that a single access is acceptable. It is not known how this judgement could possibly be made without any design or modelling information, which calls this advice into question. Any technical information available as to the acceptability of one main site access should be disclosed by the Applicant as soon as possible to justify and demonstrate the robustness of the design of the Scheme. This would be expected to include, but not be limited to, consideration of several design options, trip generation, distribution and assignment, and the outcomes of any junction capacity testing.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken and included in the Transport Assessment which forms part of the Development Consent Order submission. Modelling information and further design details have been made available and discussed as part of ongoing engagement with the stakeholder, and if necessary, addressed in a Statement of Common Ground. The Scheme facilitates the potential need for further access points (for example via the widened central reservation) however it is not part of the Scheme to deliver secondary access points to the Safeguarded Site, which will form part of the proposals for development of the Safeguarded Site in so far as is necessary in due course. Discussion of secondary access requirements should be taken up with Gloucestershire County Council Highways Development Management.	N/A	

J.2. Local Authorities s43

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
3	Gloucestershire County Council	We have been involved previously in agreeing that a bat underpass was required. This drawing shows proposals for this in a plan and cross-section view. Given this is to be a shared feature with some 'daytime' public use, a visualisation of the inside of the underpass or its entrances may be useful to include in the environmental statement submitted for the Development Consent Order. This would be indicative only to show the space available for public use during the day with some lighting that would then not hinder bat movements at night (i.e., timed dimming or switching off and/or a more red colour temperature). A visualisation of the entrances of the underpass again for day and night would be helpful for the Development Consent Order.	This is noted and visualisations will be provided in the Environmental Statement as part of the Development Consent Order Application.	N/A	
4	Gloucestershire County Council	Regarding details of Change 3 of the red line boundary extensions in various places for ecological mitigation, without seeing the detail behind these decisions, it is difficult to comment except that more land available provides better mitigation and scope for some Biodiversity Net Gain, which is a target for the scheme.	The extension to the Development Consent Order Limits is to provide new habitat or enhance existing habitat to allow directly impacted ecology to be re-located or to have access to a wider habitat network.	N/A	
5	Gloucestershire	Of particular note is the junction of the	Swept path analysis has been	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
	County Council	A4019/The Green and the interaction of the proposed service roads and the revised junction layout. We remain concerned about the tracking of vehicles in and out of here. Whilst it is appreciated from the Statement of Common Ground, that the number of movements is likely to be small, there are real concerns that the interaction of vehicles turning from the A4019 mainline into The Green will be hampered by any vehicles waiting on the service roads. This will be particularly pertinent for any service vehicles including waste refuse vehicles, and we would welcome more discussion on this point.	carried out as part of design development, including checks for various vehicles likely to use the junctions. Further details will be provided as part of ongoing liaison. The Scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit and the design has been updated in response to the Road Safety Audit comments.		
6	Gloucestershire County Council	Proposed changes to 8&9 Elms Park access look good with good width for all users. One query on side access is where two white lines go across a junction (to Site Access B at the Elms Park development for instance). What priority do the white lines give to pedestrians and cyclists here in line with the new Highway Code? Do they have the right of way? Will there be extra signage to clarify?	The two junctions are under traffic signal control, which includes phases for pedestrians and cyclists.	N/A	
8	Gloucestershire County Council	We are pleased to see that some consideration has been given to the feasibility of providing bus priority measures in the revised Scheme, albeit that the Scheme seeks to reserve curb	Provision of bus measures within the Development Consent Order limits at opening year is not considered necessary due to the increased capacity provided by the	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
		space for future measures to be implemented. Again, we would reiterate our previous comments that, where possible, the Scheme should provide measures for bus priority. We would welcome further discussion on this point as the Scheme evolves.	Development Consent Order Scheme. Future provision needs to be considered holistically with other measures east of the Development Consent Order Scheme as shown in the Elms Park planning application. However, there is uncertainty on the timing of when the measures in the Elms Park planning application will be implemented. The Applicant will continue to discuss this further as part of the Statement of Common Ground process.		
9	Gloucestershire County Council	Generally positive giving more room for the River Chelt at a low level. Proposals for further hard bank protection are noted, but they will need to take account of any implications for riverine habitats and species. Can green materials or solutions be found for this where possible?	Hard bank protection has been included in the assessment presented in the Environmental Statement, including options for how it could be implemented, so that a worst case assessment has been made. Noting that when the requirement for hard bank protection is considered further at detailed design stage, then the requirement for this may be scoped out of the design.	N/A	
10	Gloucestershire County Council	Query on shared used path which narrows significantly, which could cause a potential conflict and safety issue with pedestrian/cyclists using this section of the route. Is there another solution here?	This has not changed from the design shared at statutory consultation. The Scheme provides a new shared-use path, as currently there is no provision. Whilst the 2m width is the absolute minimum for a shared-use path, this design was	No	No design change considered necessary.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
			necessitated by the constraints with adjacent properties and other features required within the highway. The safety of path users has been assessed and it has been concluded that, due to the anticipated low number of pedestrians and cyclists at this location, their safety would not be compromised by the compliant but less-than-desirable width.		
11	Gloucestershire County Council	The further detail here is welcomed, and a series of indicative 'ponds' wetlands' is better than one single large area here. Noted there will be a certain amount of access around these. It is important to ensure the underpass to Withybridge is accessible and safe in all seasons. The removal of a culvert under the A4019, states that it "has the potential to impact volumes within the Leigh Brook in high flow events" but hasn't gone into any detail as to what these impacts are. This needs to be clarified.	The layout of the flood storage area will be finalised as part of the detailed design following liaison with key stakeholders on interim and long term use and ownership. Removal of the culvert reduces the flood and the extent of flooding around the Leigh Brook. Details can be found in the Flood Risk Assessment (part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report) provided at the statutory consultation and will be confirmed within the Development Consent Order application.	N/A	.
12	Gloucestershire County Council	It is important to ensure that the underpass to Withybridge is accessible and safe in all seasons.	The level of the underpass has been set so that it would not be flooded during the 100 year flood event (with allowance for climate change). It should be noted that other bigger flood events could occur.	No	A design change is not required. The level of underpass has been designed to take into account resilience to flooding.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
13	Gloucestershire County Council	We have previously raised concerns in respect of how the side roads will interact with the proposed widening of the A4019, and these concerns still remain with the revised plans.	Swept path analysis has been carried out as part of design development, including checks for various vehicles likely to use the junctions. Further details will be provided as part of ongoing liaison. The Scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit and the design has been updated in response to the Road Safety Audit comments.	N/A	
14	Gloucestershire County Council	From an archaeological perspective, any additional areas in the revised red line boundary need to be included in the areas surveyed for the Environmental Statement.	Archaeological investigation will only be required where the Scheme is making a physical impact of the ground surface - either permanently or temporarily. The changes to the Development Consent Order Limits that have been made to address changes in drainage pattern would not need to be assessed for archaeology as no physical works will be undertaken in these areas. The Development Consent Order Limits is not determined by the archaeological assessment required.	N/A	
16	Tewkesbury Borough Council and Cheltenham Borough Council	The Joint Councils have no concerns with this change, although they would like to understand if any vegetation clearance is required in these locations and what, if any impacts on ecology will occur and what mitigation would be proposed.	Vegetation clearance may be required in locations within these areas for the installation of signage and equipment, and for visibility of the signs. When the specific locations for the works are identified, ecological surveys will be undertaken, and mitigation	No	Vegetation clearance may be required in locations within these areas for the installation of signage and equipment, and for visibility of the signs. When the specific locations for the works are identified,

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to scheme
			measures will be identified. If needed, the specific locations of the signage or equipment can be moved to avoid direct impacts, for example to a badger sett. A commitment to undertake this survey work is included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, within the Environmental Statement.		ecological surveys will be undertaken, and mitigation measures will be identified. If needed, the specific locations of the signage or equipment can be moved to avoid direct impacts, for example to a badger sett. A commitment to undertake this survey work is included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, within the Environmental Statement.
21	Tewkesbury Borough Council and Cheltenham Borough Council	The Joint Councils support this change and welcome the mitigation to reduce the visual impacts on Moat House. The Joint Councils would also welcome confirmation if any tree planting has been proposed along the southern verge of the A4019 in the area as outlined in the statutory consultation response.	The landscape design includes hedges in this area along the southern side of the A4019.	N/A	

J.3. People with Interest in Land (PwIL)

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
88	PwIL 2	The amended Scheme, as currently proposed, closes several existing farm accesses from Tewkesbury Road. These accesses enable the fields within the site to be efficiently and safely accessed by the required large modern farm vehicles, and have done so for many years. The Scheme would replace these with a single, shared access from Tewkesbury Road, with spurred access tracks into the surrounding fields on the western boundary of my clients' land. No consideration has been given as to whether the routes are appropriately sized for the necessary farm vehicles, or how these routes could be maintained in the future as the Safeguarded land is developed in phases for employment and residential uses. This is not an acceptable situation and risks prejudicing the safe continuation of farming of the site in advance of later development. We require detailed plans setting out the dimensions of the access on the western boundary of my clients and the specifics of the gateway to be installed.	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the Link Road Junction. This has been designed to accommodate the anticipated farm traffic. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.	N/A	
89	PwIL 2	Ownership of the red track leading to the access on the western boundary: this is non-negotiable as the proposed entrance on the western boundary	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		appears to be an adopted public highway. This will mean we only have access over another private landowner which is unacceptable and will be crippling to the continued ownership and future use of my clients' land. This either needs to be an adopted highway or it needs to be shared ownership by all the landowners who have use of the track, we have raised this issue previously at all opportunities and it continues to be ignored.	control provided by the Link Road Junction. This has been designed to accommodate the anticipated farm traffic. The current proposals are for the accesses to be designated as "rights of way" over third party land. Gloucestershire County Council will have third party rights on the land to carry out maintenance of the track. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.		
90	PwIL 2	The amended Scheme also proposes additional ecology mitigation in the form of hedgerow planting within the Safeguarded land, including within part of the land under option to Bloor Homes. No consideration has been given as to how this hedgerow planting might need to be retained within a mixed use development, and whether this might risk severing development within the site and result in inefficient or isolated development. In my email dated Thursday 25th August 2022 I have recommended a solution which my clients would consider, but if these alterations are not made our position with regards to the hedgerow planting will continue to be an objection.	The proposals (removal of the additional east/west orientated hedgerow and ensuring there are gaps for gates in the north/south orientated hedgerow) that were set out in the email of August 25 2022, have now been incorporated into the design. The design proposed has been accepted.	Yes	The design proposed has now been accepted with the removal of additional hedgerow.
91	PwIL 2	The second entrance proposed on the southern boundary of my clients' land to	Additional details were required to understand why the size of the	No	Further information from the landowner is required

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		replace two existing entrances, again the size and specification to be included on the plans for future reference and the size of the access needs to be double gated to compensate for the loss of one access and to ensure it is suitable for modern agricultural machinery. Finally as previously discussed this needs to be both a left and right turning which has previously been indicated can be achieved.	existing access needs to be significantly increased. The accesses have been designed to accommodate the anticipated farm traffic. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.		before understanding if the change can be accepted.
92	PwIL 2	Please can you specify the width of the opening in the south east corner of my clients' land and as above confirm the future ownership of the track marked in red? If this is not onto an adopted highway, we will need legal confirmation on the future ownership title of my clients' land and the adjoining land that there are no restrictions on use or access to their land.	The current assumption is that it will be a highway up to the proposed gate (i.e. the track marked in red in the targeted consultation material will be within the highway). This final layout and position will be reviewed as part of detailed design.	N/A	
93	PwIL 2	To save the scheme some cost following discussions with my clients, there is no need for a fenced track to the field on the eastern corner, instead we just require an entrance gate on the side of the road.	Noted. The design has been updated to include removal of the access track.	Yes	The design has been updated to include removal of the access track.
96	PwIL 1	In Kathryn Haworth's letter of May 12 2022 responding to previous representations, she stated "We will continue to liaise with you to develop and agree a solution prior to our submission of the Development Consent	The design and alignment of the Scheme have undergone several key reviews, commencing with alternative alignments and options for the Scheme that were considered in the October –	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		<p>Order (DCO) application.“ There were several similar comments throughout that document, as well as previous ones/meetings; these gave us confidence that a sensible series of solutions were forthcoming. However, the most recent information provided through your liaison with Bloor Homes (who have a Land Registry registered interest of their option agreement over the subject land) cause serious concern given that many elements completely turn previous changes on their head with no explanation, calculations or detailed information as to why there have been these amendments, which can only lead us to conclude they are simply on financial cost cutting grounds. These changes would lead to my clients being in a substantially worse position than before the proposed Development Consent Order and certainly do not show any regard to the above mentioned liaison and concept of working together.</p>	<p>November 2020 non-statutory consultation. At the non-statutory consultation stage several options were tabled, including an option for a new junction to the north of M5 Junction 10 with an access road connecting back to the A4019 across the Safeguarded Site. This option was amongst others that identified a roundabout to cater for the new motorway traffic. As reported in the Preferred Route Announcement in June 2021, these options were discounted following the non-statutory consultation and further design development, and the Scheme now includes a revised M5 Junction 10 in its current location and a signalised junction on the A4019 to serve the West Cheltenham development (the Link Road) to the south and landowner access to the north. Subsequent to the statutory consultation, and following a design and costing review, the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site. It was concluded that it would not be appropriate for the Scheme to provide such a significant access due to the likely timeframes for the development of Safeguarded Site</p>		

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
			and the additional cost involved for the Scheme. It also would not be appropriate given the unknown future layout of the Safeguarded Site. Whilst it is recognised that the precise access arrangements will need to be subject to more detail if and when the land is brought forward, it is considered that the proposed signalised junction represents the most proportionate solution until such time as the Safeguarded Site is consented for development, potentially post 2031 and beyond. The Applicant has liaised with Bloor Homes on this matter.		
97	PwIL 1	If this current basis represents the final position, then I regret to inform the Applicant that we will not be able to support the Development Consent Order and will object and fight it as necessary in order to protect the landowners' position. The Applicant's proposals take away both of the owned access points, to be replaced by a multi-user small single junction which conveniently leaves control to the land that is safeguarded for development in your own council's hands. I repeat our view that there would be inevitable serious accidents from these poorly thought out and dangerous designs.	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road junction. This has been designed to accommodate the anticipated farm traffic. The Applicant's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
98	PwIL 1	Removal of two owned access points and their replacement with a right of way: given this land is clearly reserved for development given its safeguarded status, the proposal to leave my clients land locked, save for a right of way owned by the council, will have a substantial risk of impact on the value of the site and the flexibility in terms of master planning any future development scheme. This will therefore result in us having to make a substantial claim for this loss as part of the Development Consent Order process, which is a major backwards step given that the Development Consent Order acquisition had been looking likely to be achieved on a consensual basis. It is of utmost relevance that the short extension required up to the boundary of my clients' land is entirely within the ownership of the council, so an owned access could easily be provided for the main access. I suspect that the compensation claim for the significant effect on the diminution in value of the retained land will far outweigh any perceived savings on junction design and access road length. There may also be a claim due to the reduction in control over master planning the site's development layout with a resultant loss in the footprint of developable area; this is against the methodology that should	These comments have been noted however the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site.	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		be carried out both under the Development Consent Order and in terms of the Joint Core Strategy policies on the safeguarded land. My understanding of the Development Consent Order and Joint Core Strategy is that there should be a fairness test whereby my clients' land should not be prejudiced in its relativity to other development land. In particular where one of the main nearby landowners is the council; the current proposals seem to set development up very nicely for the council itself, to the detriment of my clients and other private landowners.			
99	PwIL 1	Danger of the narrow junction dimensions proposed for the agricultural access: the reasons behind this have been explained in detail within previous correspondence that serve no benefit in being repeated here. We are disappointed, to put it mildly, to not be provided with the courtesy of explaining this abrupt change of position. We struggle to believe that if this junction was a standalone one submitted by the farmers that it would ever be approved, certainly on the thin to non-existent (as far as we are aware) supporting data.	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road junction.	N/A	
100	PwIL 1	The M5 Junction 10 improvement scheme is aimed at facilitating growth: installing a new sub-standard access for one of the main housing (and	These comments have been noted however the access that was included in the statutory consultation was deemed too	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
		employment) areas that is supported by Housing Infrastructure Fund grant aid will only slow down the delivery of this site, especially when adding to the requirement to further negotiate with Gloucestershire County Council over extending the road across your land to my clients' boundary will only slow the process and delivery further.	substantial given the planning status of the Safeguarded Site.		
101	PwIL 1	The proposals in the Additional Targeted Consultation: the proposed Public Rights of Way and underpass, as well as the ecological mitigation should not be contentious, but given they are put forward in isolation from the development proposed on the safeguarded land they represent potential obstacles to the delivery of that land due to their possible impact and need to relocate to maximise the efficient utilisation of the land. Hence, they are objected to. Proposals (listed below):	These comments have been noted.	N/A	
102	PwIL 1	Return to the previous 2022 larger junction design that connects up to my clients' land.	The Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road junction.	No	As stated above, the Scheme has consolidated the existing farm accesses in order to provide safe left and right turning manoeuvres under the traffic signal control provided by the West Cheltenham Link Road junction.

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
103	PwIL 1	Retain a secondary access, in a position to be agreed and documented as acceptable to your highways department.	If the proposal relates to second access for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the central reserve between the Link Road Junction and Uckington Junction has been widened to accommodate the potential for a future junction and right turn lane.	No	If the proposal relates to second access for the development of the Safeguarded Site, the central reserve between the Link Road Junction and Uckington Junction has been widened to accommodate the potential for a future junction and right turn lane.
104	PwIL 1	Any shared access must be adopted given the number and range of type of user, it would be unlikely to secure payments on a maintenance according to user basis.	The Applicant's proposal is that "rights of way" will be given over third party land. However, the Applicant has continued to discuss this matter as part of ongoing liaison. The Applicant's Local Authority's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.	No	The Applicant's proposal is that "rights of way" will be given over third party land. However, the Applicant has continued to discuss this matter as part of ongoing liaison. The Applicant's Local Authority's land agents have liaised with the landowners on this, and additional details have been provided as required.
105	PwIL 1	Provide detailed data to support all the proposals and confirm their acceptability in design terms.	The Applicant's Development Consent Order submission provides Scheme details, and their acceptability will be confirmed during the Development Consent Order examination period. However, the Applicant can provide specific details requested by the landowner as part of any ongoing liaison.	N/A	

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
106	PwIL 1	The new underpass and changes to the Public Rights of Way on the North side of the Uckington Road should only proceed on the basis that their designs are subject to agreement by Bloor Homes and my clients so as not to prejudice the development of the land to the North.	The diversion is not considered to prejudice any future proposals for the Safeguarded Site. However, the Applicant has been in liaison with Bloor Homes and will confirm the final position once it becomes available.	N/A	
107	PwIL 1	Likewise for the planned ecological mitigation works and planting.	The Applicant has liaised with Bloor Homes on the proposed changes and provided updates as and when required.	N/A	

J.4. Statutory undertakers

Ref	Consultee	Matter raised	Response	Scheme Change	Change or no change to Scheme
105	Gigaclear	Gigaclear may need to make minor diversion alterations to cover the changes in relation to improved turning facilities for the Forge and changing access to Cooks Lane, and the change to Uckington junction and realignment of A4019 east of junction. A check will need to be made at next review against revised large scale drawings, when they are available. Gigaclear have no other comments on other changes listed below.	This comment is noted, and will be picked up by the Applicant as part of the utilities diversions process.	N/A	

5th Floor, Block 5
Shire Hall
Bearland
Gloucester
GL1 2TH