

M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

Consultation Report

Appendix G - Reporting non statutory 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 G - Reporting non statutory 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 G. Reporting non statutory consultation (autumn 2020) responses

G.1. Matters raised from the non statutory consultation survey

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
1	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can the new junction provide better access to north Cheltenham as well as west by linking to the A435?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
2	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Why do none of the options help with tailback on the motorway during Race Week? Would it not make sense to make the slip roads longer to avoid this?	Longer slip roads will help with tailback on the motorway, but for a normal weekday traffic it is expected that the proposed arrangements will have sufficient capacity. Planning for special events is outside the current scope of works.
3	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Why are gyratory roundabouts proposed, these are worse for cyclists compared the roundabouts?	A gyratory is a road system that consists of one-way links connected together; this system is not being proposed. A grade separated gyratory roundabout is being proposed for Junction 10, spanning the motorway. The geometric design of this will follow the requirements for normal roundabouts. Segregated facilities and crossing points are currently being considered to allow all non-motorised users, including cyclists, to safely travel across the motorway. These will be developed in the next stage of design.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
4	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Why were options 1A and 5 so far north; why was it not kept as close to the existing A4019 bridge as fitting in the slip roads would allow this?	Option 1A was positioned in the same location as Option 1 in the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid made to Homes England but incorporated an elongated roundabout rather than a circular one over the motorway. Option 5 was a variation of Option 1, but was moved as far south as possible, with the slip roads starting immediately north of the existing A4019 bridge avoiding its demolition.
5	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	As Options 2A and 2B propose to retain the existing bridge and as this is a dual carriageway, can the redundant carriageway be used as a cycle track?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.
6	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can the whole junction move westwards and a new junction provided, similar to Junction 13?	It is not possible to relocate M5 Junction 10 west as it would not meet the scheme objectives of supporting development west of Cheltenham with an effective connection to the M5 at Junction 10.
7	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can a junction using the existing unused slip roads between Junction 10 and Junction 11 be provided?	It is not possible to relocate M5 Junction 10 south to the existing unused slip roads as it would not meet the scheme objectives of supporting development west of Cheltenham with an effective connection to the M5 at Junction 10.
8	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can a lilo junction using the existing loop be provided? A similar arrangement could be built in the opposite quadrant. A dumbbell roundabout arrangement with free-flow filter lanes for Cheltenham to the north and from the	A dumb-bell roundabout junction (lilo junction) would not meet the forecast traffic flow requirements. This was previously investigated and rejected as an option.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			north to Cheltenham could be used.	
9	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can Withybridge Lane be upgraded to dual carriage with a roundabout connecting to junction 10, with an on-ramp south and an off-ramp north, by means of a single pile bridge which would connect to the link road, be provided?	The Design Team are reviewing the use of Withybridge Lane in relation to the proposed scheme.
10	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can a single bridge scheme similar to M5 Junction 14 be provided using the existing bridge?	Retaining the existing bridge as the single crossing of the M5 would not meet the forecast traffic flow requirements. This was previously investigated and rejected as an option.
11	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can a jug-handled crossing of slip roads be provided?	Unfortunately, not enough information has been provided to deliver a response to this matter.
12	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Can the southbound off-slip be upgraded to match the northbound on-slip?	A southbound off-slip upgraded to match the northbound on-slip would not address the traffic flow requirements.
13	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10	Q4	Why has a new roundabout with 'access for future development' be proposed onto farmland that floods	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme. Information about future development sites proposed under the JCS can be found here: www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/46/planning_policy/464/joint_core_strategy

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
	& link road to west Cheltenham		and is therefore entirely unsuitable for development?	
14	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	Why has a viaduct been proposed on the new link road, this is likely to be raised and will be an eyesore in the countryside?	A structure is required on the proposed link road to enable flood water from the River Chelt to pass under the road and not cause greater flooding upstream, which would occur if the flow of water was blocked by an embankment. The form of the structure will be determined during the next stage of design. Options could include a low viaduct, a series of box culverts, a series of piped culverts, etc. The choice of option will be informed by flood modelling.
15	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q4	If you're concerned about the taking of valuable agricultural land in the Elmstone Hardwicke area to make a distributor road eastwards (to provide access into the north side of Elms Park and eventually beyond), then why are you not equally concerned about the taking of valuable agricultural land in Boddington parish to make a link road southwards (to provide access into the west side of the Cyber Park)?	The use of agricultural land to develop a link road southward (to provide access into the west side of the Cyber Park) will be considered as part of the west Cheltenham Development.
16	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can a noise reduction surface be used on the M5 near to existing and proposed residential properties?	It is our intention to specify a Thin Surface Course System (TSCS) (low noise surfacing) across the Highways England extents of the site (the strategic road network), apart from surfacing on bridge decks which will likely be Hot Rolled Asphalt (HRA). Surfacing types within local authority extents will need to comply with our material requirements; this will be developed during the preliminary design stage.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
17	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can signage (smart technology) be provided on the M5 for people approaching Cheltenham in both directions? These could advise if there is a problem at Junction 10 or Junction 11 (and hence to take the other junction), reducing queues.	We are proposing a full suite of Variable Message Signs (VMS) for the new junction 10. These would be complemented by the existing VMS at Junction 11 therefore road users will benefit from information to help them choose the best Cheltenham exit to take regardless of their direction of travel.
19	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Regarding the stretch of road over the M5 junction; this currently has two lanes of traffic in both directions, will this be maintained with the new junction?	The proposed roundabout will have at least two lanes on the circulatory carriageway in both directions. Traffic modelling will determine whether any sections of the roundabout will need additional lanes.
19	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can the junction be built just south of the current junction? Then only farm land has to be acquired.	Relocating the junction south of the existing M5 Junction 10 location would not address the needs of the development west of Cheltenham and the proposal to dual the A4019.
20	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can a bypass route be considered for the A435 and Bishops Cleeve traffic to access the new Junction 10?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
21	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Why is the layby being removed if the road is not going through it? It is used by a lot of lorries and vans for breaks and overnight	The layby is not currently shown in our concept design as we need to consider the safety implications of having a layby close to the roundabout. We will be reviewing the provision of the layby, including potential alternative locations, in the next stage of the design development.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			resting. etc. Could the roundabout be moved closer to Junction 10 to allow the layby to remain?	
22	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can a separate bridge over the motorway, which is simpler and more direct route be built for pedestrians / cyclists?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.
23	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can facilities to allow horse riders to safely cross the new motorway junction roundabouts be provided, like the tunnel crossing of Junction 12 at Haresfield and Summerhouse Farm?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.
24	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Will there be a dedicated cycle and pedestrian pathway for people to continue their walk / cycle at J10?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.
25	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	What will happen to the old Junction 10 and trees?	Existing trees will be retained as part of the new scheme where possible.
26	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Will the old materials be recycled with the concrete being used under new carriageways?	The expectation is that materials from existing structures would be re-used as part of the scheme if they are assessed as suitable.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
27	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can the drainage and waterways / culverts under the M5 be upgraded as part of the works?	The existing culvert under the M5 is out of scope and will therefore not be changed as part of the proposed Scheme.
28	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Will wildlife experts give advice on mitigation and ways to protect wildlife?	Natural England have been sent a Consultation Document which outlines the ecological survey work undertaken to-date, the results and conclusions drawn so far. The Scheme is working towards Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10%. We will reach out to BNG experts for support on this, including 3D landscaping. A tri-part approach to BNG would be possible. However, as the Environment Bill (which sets out the requirements for BNG) is not yet in place, there is no legal mechanism to manage such an approach. But, establishing an agreement with a third party, such as a Local Wildlife Trust, would be a potential approach to finding suitable locations off-site to enable the required BNG threshold to be achieved. We will also endeavour to follow the GCC Biodiversity and Highways Guidance where possible.
29	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can small mammal pipe tunnels be provided under carriageways?	The Scheme is working towards Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10%. We will reach out to BNG experts for support on this, including 3D landscaping. The initial step will be to understand the baseline biodiversity value of the Scheme. We can then determine whether it will be possible/how will it be possible to achieve this within the Scheme boundary, and if not, the amount of off-site habitat that will be required. Impacts to all of ecological receptors are being considered, as well as the impact of lighting, opportunities for biodiversity along segregated footways/cycleways where possible, and opportunities for an underpass are also being discussed, to improve permeability for species across this road. We will also endeavour to follow the GCC Biodiversity and Highways Guidance where possible.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
30	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Why has no analysis on the impact of increased traffic from the south of Tewkesbury, from parishes north of Gloucester and from parishes by or to the west of the River Severn using the Haw Bridge B4213 been undertaken?	A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.
31	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Will traffic from north / west Cheltenham wanting to go south on M5 want to use the new junction? It is too far out the way to the north to access Junction 10 to then come back south on the M5.	With no direct access to the south from the M5 at this location, the only alternative is Junction 11. Depending upon which area within north / west Cheltenham trips (north of town centre/around Princess Elizabeth Way/Bishops Cleeve) are originating and their final destinations, traffic modelling shows that majority of trips will use the new junction to access the M5 southbound. The aim of the scheme is to ensure any forecasted development related traffic doesn't lead to unacceptable performance at local roads and junctions.
32	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	What are the plans for noise mitigation from the link road?	Noise modelling will be undertaken as part of the Stage 3 work which will identify requirements for noise mitigation.
33	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	What are the plans to stop speeding on the link road (and the A4019)?	Speed enforcement is managed by the Gloucestershire County Council Road Safety and Camera Enforcement Team. This team will be consulted during the next stage of design and any of their requirements will be considered for inclusion in the design.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
34	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Light pollution is an issue in the area, will streetlights be installed on the link road?	Carriageway lighting along the majority of the link road is not being proposed at present. A short section of lighting is proposed (approximately 100m) on the approach to each roundabout to enable drivers to identify hazards on the approach to the junction.
35	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Does the link road need to be a dual carriageway (except for very short distances adjacent roundabouts)? Many A-roads in the county are single carriageway including parts of the A40.	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
36	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Will the distributor road you've proposed heading southwards towards the Cyber Park continue further to meet the A40; and if so, will it do so at a new junction west of Arle Court (maybe meeting Corinthian Way) or will it merely meet up with Telstar Road (adding to congestion near GCHQ)?	Continuation of the proposed link road will be considered separately as part of the proposed west Cheltenham development.
37	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can improvements to Withbridge Lane be made instead of a new access road?	The design team are reviewing the use of Withybridge Lane in relation to the proposed scheme.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
38	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q15	Can the link road connect to the racecourse to take all that traffic out of residential areas and the town centre?	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in JCS rather than addressing wider traffic issues. An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will be provided in line with current guidance.
39	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Will the Cheltenham peripheral link road be constructed simultaneously with the new Junction 10?	It is assumed that this comment is in regard to the 'West Cheltenham Transport Improvement Scheme - UK Cyber Business Park' which is not part of the M5 Junction 10 improvements scheme. Information about the 'West Cheltenham Transport Improvement Scheme - UK Cyber Business Park' can be viewed here: www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects-list/west-cheltenham-transport-improvement-scheme-uk-cyber-business-park/
40	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Can a bypass north of Junction 10 be built?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme
41	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Can the junction be moved westwards, and the existing bridge used as a cycle, footway, bridleway and an ecological corridor?	Retaining the existing bridge for an WCH / ecology corridor would become a maintenance issue. WCH access will be provided in the proposed solution.
42	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Can the existing junction and bridge be used with improvements to the feeder roads?	It is not possible to meet the scheme objectives of supporting development west of Cheltenham and providing an effective connection to the M5 at Junction 10 if the existing junction and bridge were used with improvements to the feeder roads.
43	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10	Q14	Can a dedicated bicycle / pedestrian bridge / underpass that completely	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
	& link road to west Cheltenham		avoids the junction be provided?	
44	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	With regard to the new road / roundabout east of Jn10 parallel to Withybridge lane, can the B4634 be continued across to the B4063 to enable an effective link from Junction 10 (and traffic in the areas east of the M5 between Junctions 9&10) across to Junction 11?	Continuation of the proposed link road will be considered separately as part of the proposed west Cheltenham development.
45	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Can Fiddlers Green / Springbank be linked through to Hayden Road?	A link from Fiddlers Green / Springbank to Hayden Road will be considered separately as part of the proposed west Cheltenham development.
46	Scheme Element 1: Improvements to M5 Junction 10 & link road to west Cheltenham	Q14	Can a parallel pedestrian / cycle route (of at least shared space standard) be provided along the new link road, with roundabout designs at each end compliant with current infrastructure guidance on segregated crossings?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
47	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction	Q15	Why are wider lanes for traffic to queue being proposed, this is not an improvement as it does not	The carriageway would be widened for the proposed cycle facilities, creating better turning facilities for HGVs and increasing capacity of the junction. Additionally, the widening should reduce the frequency of traffic blocking left turning lanes on the A4019 and A38 north.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
	Improvements at Coombe Hill		add any significant capacity to the junction?	
48	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Can the left (north) lane be kept as give way?	In providing new pedestrian facilities across the A38 north exit, additional carriageway width is required as the central islands (pedestrian refuges) will need to be enhanced to accommodate traffic signal equipment. This means that the size of the carriageway needs to be increased, particularly across the A38, meaning additional land take if the give-way were to be retained. The proposed design incorporates the left turn into the junction arrangement, reducing the amount of land required and improves accessibility for pedestrians. The removal of the give-way will introduce a slight delay for this movement, but this would be offset by providing a left turn filter within the signalling arrangement and new detection, which will make the junction more responsive to varying traffic demands.
49	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Will an intelligent traffic light system be used both north and south and onto the A4019 at Coombe Hill?	The proposed junction will have traffic lights that run using a Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation, which dynamically alters signal timings depending on live traffic demands and flows. Additionally, the proposed junction will use kerbside detection, meaning that pedestrian facilities will not be given green lights if someone were to push the button and then walk away, for example. On-crossing detection will also be used, in order to ensure that the time given for pedestrian crossings is optimised for both pedestrians and traffic.
50	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Will low level lighting be used at Coombe Hill?	We are aware there are environmental considerations relating to lighting provision at Coombe Hill and have incorporated mitigation measures. The existing junction is being enlarged to accommodate increased traffic flows and will be provided with lighting to aid road safety. Facilities for WCH will be provided and junction lighting will be introduced to also aid their safety during hours of darkness. Lighting extents will be the minimum available to comply with standard requirements and mounting heights will be restricted as far as practicable. Lighting levels will also be the minimum required to meet the needs of users to help mitigate environmental impact. Luminaires will be mounted to ensure that no upward light is emitted - louvers may also be installed to reduce back light if required.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
51	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	At Coombe Hill junction, the filter left hand lane is currently a give way, is this an option to continue to be a give way just with the increased length?	In providing new pedestrian facilities across the A38 north exit, additional carriageway width is required as the central islands (pedestrian refuges) will need to be enhanced to accommodate traffic signal equipment. This means that the size of the carriageway needs to be increased, particularly across the A38, meaning additional land take if the give-way were to be retained. The proposed design incorporates the left turn into the junction arrangement, reducing the amount of land required and improves accessibility for pedestrians. The removal of the give-way will introduce a slight delay for this movement, but this would be offset by providing a left turn filter within the signalling arrangement and new detection, which will make the junction more responsive to varying traffic demands.
52	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Will cycle lanes leading to Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) be provided at Coombe Hill?	Feeder lanes on the immediate approach to Advanced Stop Lines are being considered at Coombe Hill as part of the ongoing design development.
53	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Why are pedestrian facilities being proposed Coombe Hill, no one walks here?	There is currently demand for crossing provision the A38 and the opportunity is being taken to improve existing crossing facilities. Limited existing facilities may be discouraging use of the junction by pedestrians.
54	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Can just a pedestrian route be added to the side of an improved road between the Coombe Hill junction and the Coombe Hill Nature Reserve instead of improvements being made to the junction?	The improvements at Coombe Hill are to address changes to traffic as a result of the construction of the development sites given in the JCS. The opportunity is being taken to also improve crossing facilities for WCH.
55	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction	Q15	Are there significant plans to alleviate noise, in particular by using noise	Noise modelling will be undertaken during the preliminary design stage. This will identify any requirements for noise mitigation.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
	Improvements at Coombe Hill		reducing tarmac, tree planting or screening? This needs to extend back some distance from the CH junction due to queuing	
56	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Has the traffic leaving the petrol station and the workshop garage at Coombe Hill been considered in the plans?	Traffic leaving from smaller developments including Petrol Station or Garage hasn't been explicitly considered within the scheme and this is a standard practice. Current study shows that impact of the scheme on Coombe Hill junction is minimal and proposed design takes into consideration all the traffic approaching the junction from the north. As the scheme progresses through future design stages, the layout of accesses and egresses to and from properties and businesses will be designed in increasing levels of detail.
57	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	Traffic flows well at Coombe hill junction so does not require improvement, why has this been proposed?	Initial traffic modelling undertaken showed that with M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme in place, some of the traffic using the local road network between Coombe Hill and Gloucester will switch to using the M5 motorway, whilst there will be some additional traffic between Tewkesbury and Coombe Hill. Overall, the traffic reaching the Coombe Hill Junction will be less when the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme is in place. Thus, with some minor alterations to traffic signal timings, the junction should be able to cope with the estimated traffic volumes. A further traffic assessment of the local road network will be undertaken which will allow us to determine if additional mitigation measures will be required.
58	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	The data about collisions at Coombe Hill junction on A38 next to the Swan Pub is incorrect. Insurance Companies deal with 2-5 claims a week from minor knocks due to the petrol station access at the site.	Standard practice is that collision data recorded by the police only includes those that have resulted in injuries to people (Personal Injury Collisions). Minor collisions which resulted in damage only are not included in the data.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
59	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q15	A signalised left turn from A38(S) into A4019 is not necessary, why has this been proposed?	In providing new pedestrian facilities across the A38 north exit, additional carriageway width is required as the central islands (pedestrian refuges) will need to be enhanced to accommodate traffic signal equipment. This means that the size of the carriageway needs to be increased, particularly across the A38, meaning additional land take if the give-way were to be retained. The proposed design incorporates the left turn into the junction arrangement, reducing the amount of land required and improves accessibility for pedestrians. The removal of the give-way will introduce a slight delay for this movement, but this would be offset by providing a left turn filter within the signalling arrangement and new detection, which will make the junction more responsive to varying traffic demands.
60	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Can the speed limit through Coombe Hill be 30 mph?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
61	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Can pedestrian improvements such as additional footpaths and a crossing near the bus stop where the service goes towards Tewkesbury to get to the Old Spot pub be provided?	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
62	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Can the proposed cycle path be extended up through Coombe Hill and the dual carriageway towards Tewkesbury, joining up with the existing cycle path that ends at the A38/B4213 lights?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities through Coombe Hill and the dual carriageway towards Tewkesbury is out of scope for this scheme.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
63	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Will a separate 4m-wide cycle lane be provided through / leading into Coombe Hill?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities through Coombe Hill is out of scope for this scheme.
64	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Can a cycle lane be built through Knightsbridge?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities through Knightsbridge is out of scope for this scheme.
65	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Will a crossing for all at Coombe Hill be provided?	We are investigating how to provide a crossing for all users within the constraints of the current site. We will also review and take into consideration potential "future proofing" if another future scheme improves WCH facilities along A4019 and A38.
66	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Will pedestrian and cycle facilities extend from Coombe Hill to The Gloucester Old Spot and to the road to Boddington?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities extending from Coombe Hill to The Gloucester Old Spot and to the road to Boddington is out of scope for this scheme.
67	Scheme Element 2: A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill	Q14	Will consideration be given to the general uplift in traffic volumes towards Coombe Hill, which is an area ridden by horse riders?	Initial traffic modelling undertaken showed that with M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme in place, some of the traffic using the local road network between Coombe Hill and Gloucester will switch to using the M5 motorway, whilst there will be some additional traffic between Tewkesbury and Coombe Hill. Overall, the traffic reaching the Coombe Hill Junction will be less when the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme is in place. Thus, with some minor alterations to traffic signal timings, the junction should be able to cope with the estimated traffic volumes. A further traffic assessment of the local road network will be undertaken which will allow us to determine if additional mitigation measures will be required.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
68	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q4	Why has severance for cyclists on the A4019 not been addressed? The parallel cycle and pedestrian route should continue across the new J10 until at least the single carriageway section is reached.	We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users.
69	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can trees / scrubs planted to screen the duelled road / new houses?	A landscape design is being developed that will provide visual mitigation of the Scheme where appropriate.
70	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can the speed limit be below 40mph on the A4019 between J10 and the Coombe Hill Junction?	Speed enforcement is managed by the Gloucestershire County Council Road Safety and Camera Enforcement Teams so is outside the scope of the scheme, however, appropriate speed limits will be considered for all proposed roads and interfaces with existing roads during the next stage of design.
71	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why has a central reservation been proposed near the fire station? It is essential that the fire station and homeowners on the south side of the main road are able to turn right on the A4019.	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage)
72	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has consideration been given to access and exit from Homecroft drive without causing undue delay or extended journey times?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
73	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will there be safe access to the A4019 layby (GL51) which has several houses and businesses?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
74	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can Old Gloucester Rd to the West of the large lay by be blocked off ('no through traffic route'), and a new access road run to the new developments?	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in JCS rather than addressing wider traffic issues. An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will provided in line with current guidance.
75	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can the Stoke Orchard to Piffs Elm road be upgraded? It is used very heavily and is unsuitable for increased traffic without an upgrade	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
76	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has consideration been made to traffic turning right on to Withybridge Lane? This is potentially an accident hotspot.	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
77	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will there be a road surface that reduces noise levels?	It is our intention to specify a Thin Surface Course System (TSCS) (low noise surfacing) across the Highways England extents of the site (the strategic road network) apart from surfacing on bridge decks which will likely be Hot Rolled Asphalt (HRA). Surfacing types within local authority extents will need to be agreed with the local authority and comply with their material requirements which will be developed during this preliminary design stage.
78	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Have traffic lights been considered coming out of the lane (From Stoke	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			Orchard) next to the Old Spot pub on to the A4019?	
79	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will there be a roundabout every 200 yards; this will create poor air quality?	The current design proposals do not include a roundabout every 200 yards. Air quality modelling will be undertaken during the preliminary design stage.
80	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why has no improvement been made to the A4019 exit left on to the A38? This is too tight for a 40ft articulated vehicle to manoeuvre without moving on to the adjacent carriageway	Improvements have not been proposed on the A4019 exit left on to the A38 as the radius is constrained by the existing property on the corner of this junction. The design of the junction will be designed using vehicle tracking software to determine the swept paths (the simulation of a vehicle movements) of large vehicles.
81	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can an electric vehicle charging station be provided along the A4019?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
82	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	What is the proposed speed of the dual carriage?	Speed enforcement is managed by the Gloucestershire County Council Road Safety and Camera Enforcement Teams so is outside the scope of the scheme, however, appropriate speed limits will be considered for all proposed roads and interfaces with existing roads during the next stage of design.
83	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	How will residents on the south side of the A4019 safely access the bus stop?	Pedestrian crossings will be incorporated into the proposed signal-controlled junctions where necessary. Crossing points will be developed further during the next stage of design.
84	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has a review of the speed limits on the A38 and the A4019 on the approaches to Coombe Hill and around the junction at Piffs Elm and the road to Boddington and	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			in- depth safety audits been undertaken?	
85	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why are the proposed new locations for the bus bays at Uckington further east than the current bus bays? This could lead to potential bus users crossing at inappropriate and unsafe places.	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
86	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why has a right-turn not been considered outside the fire station?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
87	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will the speed limit on the new dual carriageway be 50mph or lower to allow vehicles to turn in and out of the layby safely?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
88	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will there be breaks in the flow of traffic to allow drivers to pull out of laybys safely?	Next stage of work; the outputs of this modelling will help to inform the preliminary designs of the A4019.
89	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can traffic lights at both the Gloucester Old Spot junction and the Uckington/Elmstone Hardwicke junction be provided?	The current proposals include new traffic signals at the Uckington/Elmstone Hardwicke junction. There are currently no plans to install traffic signals at the Gloucester Old Spot junction as part of the scheme.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
90	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Have low lying fogs in Cheltenham while the sun is shining been considered?	Low lying fogs have not been considered at this stage, however, the Road Safety Audit process that will take place during upcoming design stages will consider environmental conditions.
91	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has consideration been given to completing the link from the A4019 at Sainsburys by passing Swindon village and linking to Bishops Cleeve? Traffic from the north would then be able to south towards junction 10 without using Stoke Orchard.	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in JCS rather than addressing wider traffic issues. An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will provided in line with current guidance.
92	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can a roundabout between the fire station and the sports arena be introduced?	The widening of this section of the A4019 is part of the Elm Park Development proposals, so is therefore out of the scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
93	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can the Uckington junction be made a roundabout? This would decrease speeding, create an even traffic flow and be less visually intrusive than traffic lights.	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
94	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can another road and entrance be built into the back of the new site by Elmstone Hardwick, away from the fire station and towards the new proposed roundabout to ease	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			congestion between Homecroft drive and Sainsburys?	
95	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can the dual carriageway extend to the junction of the Gloucester Old Spot, and could this junction be made a traffic light or roundabout junction?	An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will be provided in line with current guidance.
96	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Where the southbound slip road off the M5 meets the A4019; can this area be lengthened and widened as it is dangerous here?	It is proposed that the existing southbound slip road is removed and replaced with a new southbound off-slip road connecting to a new grade separated gyratory roundabout.
97	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can traffic light controls, at Piffs Elm Junction be part of this overall scheme? Or a central refuge, and speed restrictions?	An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will be provided in line with current guidance.
98	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can the A4019 be a dual carriageway from Coombe Hill to Cheltenham?	Initial traffic modelling did not identify significant traffic increases to warrant upgrading the A4019 west of M5 Junction 10.
99	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why have large roundabouts been proposed, these are dangerous for cyclists?	We are reviewing the roundabouts (including changing to a different form of junction) to provide safe facilities for cyclists

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
100	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why are footpaths and Cycle ways from Bishops Cleeve through Stoke Orchard and then to Cheltenham and Coombe Hill via the Old Spot Junction and Tewkesbury via Tredington not included?	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
101	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	How will residents on the south side of the A4109, access the segregated footpath and cycleway on the north side of the A4019?	Residents at Uckington would be able to use the proposed crossing facilities at the Uckington Junction. We are reviewing provision for residents east of Uckington.
102	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can a cycle path to Tewkesbury via Elmstone Hardwicke be provided?	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
103	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	A major route for cyclists seeking a quiet alternative to A38 is Staverton - Boddington - Piff's Elm - Hardwicke - Stoke Orchard. Crossing the A4019 at The Old Spot can be difficult and the increase in traffic that this scheme will encourage can only make it worse. Can accommodation for them at this staggered	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			junction needs to be included in the plan? Possible solutions include a short, widened section with a central reservation/refuge and a Toucan crossing with an off-carriageway path on the southern side of A4019.	
104	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Can a cycle and pedestrian lane from the Glos Old Spot towards Stoke Orchard be provided?	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
105	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will there be a decent height noise reducing fencing?	Noise modelling will be undertaken as part of the Stage 3 work. This will identify requirements for noise mitigation. Noise fences will be considered as a noise mitigation measures where appropriate.
106	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	This area has flooded due to poor maintenance of drains and ditches - will new future proofed drains be provided?	Flood modelling is being undertaken to allow us to assess the impact of the scheme. This will allow us to determine if any mitigation will be required.
107	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	If the deceleration lane for Homecroft Drive is to become a lane of the dual carriageway, what mitigation for noise, light and pollution will there be?	Noise and air quality modelling will be undertaken as part of the Stage 3 work. This will identify requirements for mitigation. Lighting design is also being developed as part of Stage 3. Minimising light spill beyond the areas that are required to be lit is a key component of the lighting design.
108	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	If you put in traffic lights at the end of Homecroft Drive what will be the increase in pollution levels?	The junction of the A4019 and Homecroft Drive is outside the scope of the Scheme. It is being addressed by a separate planning application.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
109	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	How will residents on the south side of the A4019 be protected in terms of privacy, increased noise, air pollution and safety?	Noise and air quality modelling will be undertaken as part of the Stage 3 work. This will identify requirements for mitigation.
110	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	What will be done to mitigate the vibration caused by an increased volume of traffic?	It is difficult to mitigate for the effects of vibration.
111	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	How much CO ₂ and other "Greenhouse Gases" will be generated by the construction work?	This will be assessed specifically as part of the Stage 3 assessment.
112	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Will the roads be tree lined to reduce noise to the properties?	Noise modelling will be undertaken as part of the Stage 3 work. This will identify requirements for noise mitigation.
113	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Have the roads that connect to the A4019 such as the Boddington Lane and Stoke Orchard Road been considered?	A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.
114	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	It seems the studies were done post-COVID-19 when there were back-ups on the motorway. Many people now work from home and employers seem to be adopting these changes Due to COVID-19, people are working from home	We are following the current guidance provided by the Department for Transport (DfT) and Highways England in assessing the scheme. The guidance includes their view on COVID-19 and the long-terms effects of Brexit.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			more which employers seem to be adopting. As a result, traffic delays are no longer an issue - has this been considered?	
115	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has the impact of the greater road capacity on trip generation / attraction and diversion on roads in the surrounding area been considered as the widening of the A4019 coupled with J10 improvements will bring about a situation similar to Braess' Paradox, resulting in diversions through Stoke Orchard or Tredington?	A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.
116	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why was the impact that additional traffic will have on the junction by the Old Spot pub and the Old Gloucester Road not considered?	Initial traffic modelling has indicated that there would not be a significant increase in traffic on the A4019 between Coombe Hill and M5 Junction 10 due to the scheme. As a result, it has been determined that dualling of this section of the A4019 is not required. Any adverse effect on traffic to the junction near the Gloucester Old Spot, where the Stoke Orchard to Piffs Elm Road meets the A4019, will be looked into in further detail as scheme progresses and any issues will be addressed to avoid rat-running on any minor roads.
117	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why has traffic using the Junction 10 and the Old Gloucester Road to access the planned Cyber Park not been considered in your assessments?	The exact connection to the Cyber Park development site will be considered separately during planning application of this development. Current arrangements present a representative view of the scheme which is subject to changes in the future.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
118	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Has the impact of traffic relating to the Horse Racing and access to the proposed Elms Park development been considered?	The impact of the Elms Park Development has been considered in the traffic analysis, although the exact details of the development scheme is subject to planning application. Planning for special events like Horse racing is outside the current scope of works.
119	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	Why immediately commit resources to the A4019 widening when the impact of the new link road on the volume of traffic travelling into Cheltenham has yet to be tested and progress on the Cyber Park and associated development is way ahead of the proposals for North West Cheltenham?	We need to plan and design for the future to ensure local residents don't face unwanted delays and congestion. Schemes like this takes years to build and we are using the standard best practices and guidance to ensure the traffic forecast for the schemes are robust.
120	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q15	What will the impact be on the junction by Aldi and Sainsbury's?	The extent of current scheme doesn't cover this junction, but the A4019/Hayden Road junction is likely to get upgraded when the Elms Park Development is constructed. This is reflected in the traffic modelling work undertaken to date.
121	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Will the bus stop at the east end of the layby on the A4019 be kept?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
122	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can the speed limit be reduced on the A4019?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
123	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a traffic-controlled junction be provided at Homecroft Drive along with a controlled pedestrian crossing?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
124	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Why are the bus stop located far away from junctions? How will people cross to them?	This will be considered in the next stage of the scheme (the preliminary design stage).
125	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Will Traffic Advisory Leaflet 2/94 "Entry treatments" be followed?	Entry treatments and gateways to delineate roads of different character will be considered as part of the next stage of design.
126	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can uninterrupted, segregated cycle lanes along the A4019 be provided?	The suggestion that uninterrupted, segregated cycle lanes should be provided along the A4019 will be taken into consideration in the next stage of design.
127	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can light operated crossings for pedestrians and cyclists be installed near Uckington and Kingstbridge?	Facilities for WCH are currently planned for the Uckington Junction.
128	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can the cycle and pedestrian lanes go all the way to Sainsbury's junction, connecting to local cycle ways and footpaths?	This section of the A4019 is part of the Elm Park Development proposals, so is therefore out of the scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
129	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a path on the south side of the A4019 not be provided?	The suggestion that a cycle path should be provided on the south side of the A4019 will be taken into consideration in the next stage of design.
130	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a crossing opposite the layby on the south side of the A4019 be provided?	The suggestion that a crossing opposite the layby should be provided on the south side of the A4019 will be taken into consideration in the next stage of design. This may be provided as an uncontrolled crossing (no traffic signals) due to level of demand by WCH and proximity of other traffic signals.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
131	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a light controlled crossing across the A4019 between the two arms of Hayden Road be provided? This would enable a safe crossing between the Retail Park and the housing estates.	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
132	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can separate cycle lanes / pavements / bridle ways be provided along the A4019?	The suggestion that provision for all users should be provided along the A4019 will be taken into consideration in the next stage of design.
133	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a dedicated cycle/pedestrian/horse rider crossing on the M5 alongside the junction be provided?	We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users. The proposed cycle lane would commence at the west side of the M5 (at the scheme extent) and then continue east to connect with facilities being introduced as part of the proposed Elm Park Development.
134	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Why does the proposed cycle lane along the A4019 stop at the link road?	We are investigating various options to provide a safe route across the motorway junction for all users. The proposed cycle lane would commence at the west side of the M5 (at the scheme extent) and then continue east to connect with facilities being introduced as part of the proposed Elm Park Development.
135	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a pedestrian controlled crossing be provided at the Moat Lane/The Green junction to allow walkers to continue using the Cheltenham Circular Footpath?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are currently planned for the Uckington Junction.
136	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Why is the proposed cycle track towards North Cheltenham not compliant with current LTN 1/20 in its	We will be following the guidance given in LTN 1/20 as well as relevant design standards and other guidance.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			crossing of the Green, where a changed priority, and a narrower road corner radius would be recommended?	
137	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Why were there no pedestrian / cycle facilities proposed on the A4019 west of the junction leading up to Coombe Hill?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities on the A4019 west of the junction leading up to Coombe Hill is out of scope for this scheme.
138	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Why are there no facilities for cyclists crossing the A4019 at Piffs Elm / Gloucester Old Spot?	The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to unlock development sites in north-west and west Cheltenham, therefore, provision of wider cycle facilities on the A4019 west of the junction leading up to Coombe Hill is out of scope for this scheme.
139	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Other than at the new roundabout and the proposed traffic signal junction at Uckington, there are no indications of how pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders will be able to cross the A4019 once it's duelled? How will they cross safely?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are investigating various options to provide safe crossing points on the A4019.
140	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can horse riders be included on the proposed 4-metre-wide cycleway along the A4019? [BHS]	The suggestion that provision for all users should be provided along the A4019 will be taken into consideration in the next stage of design.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
141	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can a cycle track leading from the B4634 or Hayden Road junctions to The Green (turn off for Elmstone Hardwicke) be provided?	This section of the A4019 is part of the Elm Park Development proposals, so is therefore out of the scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
142	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can the cycle track be extended beyond the roundabout to Withybridge Lane and to The Gloucester Old Spot Pub (Stoke Lane) and Staverton turn?	We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the link road and across the motorway. However, funding for the scheme is for unlocking the development sites to the east of M5 Junction 10 and therefore wider active travel improvements may not be possible under this scheme.
143	Scheme Element 3: A4109 widening	Q14	Can pedestrians, horse riders / cyclists be segregated from lorries?	Segregated facilities on the northern side of the A4019 are currently proposed as part of the scheme.
144	General	Q15	Can road-runoff be intercepted before it enters the brooks and River Chelt?	Yes, runoff from the carriageway and footways will be collected into drainage ponds, and in a minority of locations (such as Coombe Hill) into existing road drainage systems.
145	General	Q15	Why is the scope of the traffic assessment so narrow (i.e. why does it not include surrounding villages)?	A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.
146	General	Q14	Are you working with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust to incorporate adaptations (e.g. hedgehog crossings) and to educate people about local wildlife?	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust were contacted before the options consultation commenced; this provided information about the proposals and the ways the Trust could have their say. The Trust were also sent a reminder halfway through the consultation period. We will continue to engage with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust in the future.
147	General	Q14	Will pedestrian and cycle facilities be designed to	We will be following the guidance given in LTN 1/20 as well as relevant design standards and other guidance.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			comply with the provisions of LTN 1/20?	
148	General	Q14	What design standards will be used to ensure safety of all users (pedestrians; cyclists; motorcyclists; cars; vans; heavy farm machinery and lorries)?	We are following the guidance given in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and other relevant standards and guidance, such as Traffic Signs Manual and Local Transport Notes; this also includes a requirement for an independent road safety audit
149	General	Q14	Can secure bike parking in Cheltenham be provided?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
150	General	Q14	Can a cycle and pedestrian facilities not be provided in local villages where traffic will increase as a result of the scheme?	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in JCS rather than addressing wider traffic issues. An assessment will be carried out to identify any traffic increases on local roads as a result of M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme and suitable mitigation will provided in line with current guidance.
151	General	Q15	Will the changes to the A4019 and Coombe Hill be completed before improvements are made to 10?	Subject to programme confirmation, the A38 Coombe Hill Junction improvements are likely to be delivered before the improvements are made to M5 Junction 10, which should help to address local safety concerns.
152	General	Q4	Why does the Options Consultation brochure say <i>“all options are anticipated to provide better connectivity for existing and new users of all transport modes in the area”</i> when this is the opposite of the truth for cyclists?	Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian facilities are an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the A4019, link road and across the motorway to improve connectivity. We will be following the guidance given in LTN 1/20 as well as relevant design standards and other guidance.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
153	General	Q4	Why can't money from this scheme needs to be spent on the city centre ring road?	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in JCS rather than addressing wider traffic issues.
154	General	Q15	Why can't the £200 million be spend on better things, like COVID-19 or local cycle provision?	The purpose of the scheme is to unlock development sites set out in the JCS; as a result, the funding from Homes England has been ringfenced so cannot be spend on other things such as the county's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.
155	General	Q15	Why is green belt land being allowed to be built on for a dual carriageway, the proposal of a new roundabout and road?	The land where the link road to west Cheltenham and the A4019 widening is proposed was removed from the Green Belt in 2017 after the adoption of the Joint Core Strategy.
156	General	Q4	Have the plans for Junction 9 been considered in the options presented?	Other relevant major projects in Gloucestershire, such as the proposals for M5 Junction 9, were considered during the development of the options presented at options consultation.
157	General	Q4	Has any consideration been given to combining the schemes for J9 and J10 with the link road being extended to meet the upgraded A46 Ashchurch bypass?	This is out of scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.
158	General	Q4	Does building roads not just general more traffic?	The proposed improvements will facilitate the delivery of housing and economic development sites allocated or safeguarded in the JCS rather than to improve current levels of congestion.
159	General	Q15	Can Gloucestershire County Council change their policy to make traffic flow a priority rather than	Maintaining a functioning highway network is the foundation for an integrated transport system. All transport modes in some way interact with the highway network. Therefore, providing infrastructure and facilities for more sustainable modes, such as cycling and public transport, is fundamental to the delivery of Gloucestershire's Local Transport Plan (2015-2041) objectives.

ID	Scheme element	Question	Matters raised	Response
			trying to make people cycle and use public transport?	
160	General	Q15	Why are you asking people to comment on the proposals when these comments will not be considered nor make a difference?	All submitted responses were analysed to understand individual views and opinions on the proposals to inform the preferred route announcement and preliminary design.
161	General	Q14	Why were the proposals presented in long, complex documents? These were difficult to understand	To ensure that the public were well informed about the proposals, we needed to create a balance between providing enough information and keeping documents concise. That's why the consultation brochure contained a summary of key information, and additional, detailed technical information were also made available in Technical Appraisal Reports (TARs). This is standard practice for options consultation.
162	General	Q14	Why were the maps not more user friendly?	As well as providing drawings of the proposed scheme options in the consultation brochure, drawings were also available for the public to view on the scheme's consultation website. We will endeavour to provide larger-scale drawings at statutory consultation.

G.2. Matters raised: General public written responses (non statutory consultation survey)

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
Councillor at Cheltenham Borough Council	<p>Can a separate south access and exit, either north or south of the existing north only access and exit be provided?</p> <p>Why has the Park and Ride that was part of the Transport Plan for the JCS not been included?</p> <p>With the urban extension for the JCS at West Cheltenham currently on hold at the request of Highways England and Homes England, the pressure on the requirement for housing in Cheltenham and Tewkesbury, cannot be addressed until Junction 10 is complete, bearing in mind that under the JCS, an evidence led requirement for housing and employment land, the North West Extension should be completed by 2031, bearing in mind we are nearly in 2021 there is not a single firm proposal to build anything at all. West Cheltenham, Cyber Park and housing associated with it, now looks, in my opinion, easier to bring forward than the North-West urban extension.</p> <p>The improvements to the Coombe Hill Junction, I believe are being put in place for further development in the future.</p>	<p>Please be assured that a range of alternative design solutions have been considered over the course of a lengthy optioneering and appraisal process, including relocating the junction to the South or North amongst other potential solutions, which concluded that constructing adjacent to the existing was the best option in terms of buildability, cost and environmental.</p> <p>In order to provide a more integrated transport network by enabling opportunities to switch to more sustainable transport modes around Cheltenham, an expansion of, and improvements to the Arle Court Transport Hub (formally known as the Arle Court Park & Ride) are being proposed separately to the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme. The improvements to the existing P&R site have a focus on sustainable transport and providing high quality alternatives to car use. A separate Park & Ride is also being proposed as part of the Elm Park Development.</p> <p>Your email notes that the West Cheltenham application is in hold. This is not the case. The work on Golden Valley development, is very much making progress, the council is currently progressing the actions it needs to take in respect of agreeing a preferred developer, alongside this, engagement is taking place in respect of the planning approach and an application is expected next year. This application will need to demonstrate the capacity delivered through the WCTIS scheme, which as you will be aware funding was agreed to facilitate the opening up of the cyber central element of the Golden Valley Development. There is a direct relationship with the delivery of the J10 M5 through the west Cheltenham link road. Any future application will need to articulate the relationship with J10 and the phasing of development in the context of that programme.</p>
Councillor at Cheltenham Borough Council	<p>Has the option for building a new junction and closing the current one been dismissed?</p> <p>What is being done to mitigate the levels of traffic on the A4013, Princess Elizabeth Way?</p> <p>Are resident's opinions actually being considered?</p>	<p>In respect of North-West Cheltenham, you are correct in that there is continuing work in regards to transport. My understanding is that this is progressing and understanding is needed in terms of the programme of M5 J10. I discussed this quite recently with Craig Hemphill who is arranging a meeting with GCC so we can better understand next steps from a transport perspective. The outline application does not include a Park and Ride, this was removed some time ago in response to comments from GCC Highways. However, until we are clearer on</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
		<p>the transport modelling, I cannot confirm the current position on this.</p> <p>The JCS transport strategy set out the strategic context for the delivery of all the JCS growth up to 2031, Highways England were fully engaged in the preparation of this, the strategy was agreed as part of the JCS examination.</p> <p>We will be able to understand how best to minimise impact to traffic on the local network during the construction phase once we have a preferred option (to be announced Spring 2021) and to help achieve this we are looking to employ a buildability adviser in the new year. This person will look at how best to sequence the works to avoid any prolonged closure of the junction in line with the preferred option. As we move through the key stages of the project, I will ensure that we are maintaining contact with yourselves to better understand the local constraints and how we can minimise disruption.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Why has information about land take not been published?</p> <p>How will residents and service vehicles access properties if the improvements go ahead?</p> <p>Why is so much widening required on the A4019 for pedestrians and cyclists?</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to the local resident health with regard to environmental impacts such as increased light pollution and noise?</p>	<p>We are still in the early phase of the scheme development, which to date has focused on producing and sharing our concept designs for the main elements of the scheme. Any land acquisition will follow government guidelines that seek to ensure reasonable compensation is paid for any land acquired or any blight on the property.</p> <p>We recognise access to properties is an important issue and will be examining in greater detail as we develop our preliminary design.</p> <p>We only have one route corridor for the A4019, the existing road, to provide a dual carriageway between Junction 10 and Gallagher Retail Park. Our initial design, as shown on the consultation plans, shows widening to the north of the existing road but we need to consider options of widening to the south as we develop our preliminary design. Widening to the north or south requires us to acquire land and we therefore need to balance the various design and access requirements against the land required. The proposals for the segregated footway and cycleway are yet to be confirmed. Whilst we recognise the space segregated facilities require, this scheme could provide enhanced facilities that could be expanded in the future.</p> <p>As part of the planning process, we will be carrying out various environmental</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
		assessments, including impacts on noise and air quality. Where possible, measure would be provided to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.
Member of the public	<p>How has the PEAO concluded that some of the scheme's options will be 'Minor Beneficial' for air quality and 'Slight Beneficial' for noise and vibration?</p> <p>Why was monitoring of air quality only positioned 5km south-west of Junction 10 and not in residential areas, such as Withybridge Gardens?</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to the additional light pollution caused by the new junction?</p> <p>Has the impact of local residents lives and health been fully considered?</p> <p>What will happen to the residents and their properties should option 2 or 2A proceed and demolition of property is required?</p>	<p>With regards to air quality, an assessment of air quality impacts of the Scheme is yet to be made, with the work done to date focussing only on potential comparisons between the design options. The EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment), to be undertaken within the next phase of the design, will include detailed air quality assessment of the chosen Scheme Option. It will assess and report conditions at individual receptor locations and at a full scheme level. This will include modelling the change in pollutant concentrations at specific residences in the vicinity of M5J10, at Withybridge Gardens and along the A4019, for the with and without the Scheme scenarios. The assessment will also consider the impact at other locations within the wider Cheltenham area, including those within the designated AQMA.</p> <p>With regards to noise, the 'slight beneficial' conclusion that is reported in the TAR addresses the Scheme (Option 2/2A/2B) as a whole. The conclusion was made from a high-level appraisal of the option to relocate to the North, the variations of Option 2 (adjacent) and to relocate to the South. Whilst the work undertaken to date noted that there are a number of receptors where noise levels would increase, the assessment has not yet gone into detail of where those impacts were. Furthermore refined assessment will be undertaken during the next stage of design, and will highlight areas where there are increases, and decreases, in noise levels. This information will be reported as part of the Environmental Statement, which will form part of the planning application.</p> <p>Regarding monitoring, there is Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) and Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC) monitoring in the vicinity of the M5J10 roundabout, including on the A4019 and Withybridge Gardens. In addition, a project specific air quality monitoring survey has been conducted to supplement existing data, including locations on the A4019, east and west of M5J10, and at Withybridge Gardens. These will be used to verify the modelled outputs in line with DEFRA assessment guidelines.</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
		<p>As part of the planning process, we will be carrying out various environmental assessments, including impacts on noise and air quality. Where possible, measure would be provided to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.</p> <p>We are still in the early phase of the scheme development, which to date has focused on producing and sharing our concept designs for the main elements of the scheme. Any land acquisition will follow government guidelines that seek to ensure reasonable compensation is paid for any land acquired or any blight on the property.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Will the major developments be protected from flood risks?</p> <p>Why is there not a 'Park and Ride' option immediately after the M5 exit to prevent bottleneck of traffic further down Tewkesbury Road?</p> <p>Why is this project allowed to be built on Green Belt land?</p> <p>Was the house bought by the Council on Moat Lane a predetermined part of this scheme as a place to locate the new traffic lights?</p> <p>If race days are a particular peak in Cheltenham traffic, why should millions be spent on upgrading Junction 10 as opposed to using Junction 9 more intelligently and a park and ride?</p> <p>Is the project actually vital?</p> <p>Are people the priority in the scheme or is it the roads?</p> <p>Why should local residents be faced with longer</p>	<p>[Joint response sent]</p> <p>With regards to your statement around the need for the scheme, this scheme has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to unlock housing and economic development proposed for the West and North West of Cheltenham. This development was set out in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) the planning framework, adopted by Cheltenham Borough, Tewkesbury Borough and Gloucester City Councils in 2017.</p> <p>When producing the JCS, the extent of the Green Belt was reviewed and amended to include new housing sites 'North West Cheltenham' and 'West Cheltenham'. The JCS has also identified 'safeguarded land' adjacent to both sites that has also been removed from the Green Belt for the longer term development needs beyond the current plan period. These areas of land therefore provide the primary opportunity for helping meet future growth requirements for Cheltenham. All of this proposed development needs to be supported by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>With regards to your concerns about NPPF compliance, the proposed options for this scheme are being carefully assessed against the need to serve these developments and a range of environmental, social and policy constraints. These assessments will be considered as part of an application for planning permission. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) notes that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and 'Very special circumstances' will not allow for development in the Green Belt unless the potential harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
	<p>journey times due to the detours they will have to take to cross the new dual carriageway?</p> <p>Has the financial effect on the properties near the dual carriageway been identified?</p> <p>Has the effect on biodiversity been fully considered?</p>	<p>NPPF do however go on to note that certain forms of development can be deemed appropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Local transport infrastructure is not considered inappropriate if it can be demonstrated that it preserves its openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.</p> <p>Any planning application we make will need to demonstrate that our scheme is suitable for its location, including within the Green Belt. Evidence supporting these benefits will be set out clearly in any future planning application and will also be made available to the public during our statutory consultation, planned for late 2021.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Why is traffic not being directed to the north of Cheltenham, the racecourse and Bishops Cleeve from Junction 9?</p> <p>Where is the mention of a Park and Ride on the Tewkesbury Road?</p> <p>Is it necessary to demolish homes and cause current homeowners to take detours to leave their homes to build the new carriageway?</p> <p>What is being done to protect residents from noise, pollution, disruption and reduced property value?</p> <p>How will this scheme be a efficient use of money?</p>	<p>Regarding biodiversity, environmental and heritage concerns, we are still in the early phase of the scheme development. The positioning and type of infrastructure has yet to be confirmed and we will use public feedback to aid the scheme development. We have carried out a range of initial environmental and ecology assessments and these will also continue as the design develops. To support our assessments, we have and are continuing to collect a wide range of data on various aspects, including current air quality, noise, drainage, heritage and biodiversity.</p> <p>We can also confirm that our initial assessments have already identified the Scheduled Monument and the six listed buildings. As we develop our preliminary design, we will continue to assess the potential direct physical impacts, as well as potential indirect impacts, to the significance of these heritage assets. We can then determine the appropriate mitigation required.</p> <p>Regards to traffic and local journey concerns, initial traffic modelling has allowed us to gain an initial understanding of the predicted changes to traffic as a result of the new the new housing and economic development sites. Journeys on the A4019 are set to increase as a result of the planned JCS development and therefore we need to ensure there is sufficient highway capacity to accommodate this increase. Greater use of M5 Junction 9 would not address the increase in traffic.</p> <p>We are aware of access issues created by widening of the A4019 and are investigating options to mitigate any additional journey times for those residents</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
		<p>and business that currently have direct accesses onto the A4019. We will be liaising with those residents and businesses directly affected as we develop our proposals.</p> <p>Regards to the Park and Ride, provision of a park and ride to mitigate traffic increases is currently not part of our scheme because it is part of the proposed Elm Park Development; this development is currently seeking planning permission to build new homes to the north of the A4019 between Gallagher Retail Park and Uckington. To avoid providing conflicting information with the Elm Park Development, we are currently not showing any proposals past the fire station because the Elm Park Development includes proposals to dual the A4019 between Gallagher Retail Park and the Fire Station. However, we will be working closely with the Elms Park Development team to ensure that there is continuity and consistency along the A4019 to Gallagher Retail Park.</p> <p>Regarding flooding concerns, we are carrying out modelling to understand the current flood risk. The flood modelling is derived using UK guidelines from the Environment Agency and based on recorded data, which includes data from both July 2007 and December 2008 events flood events. However, your observations on the July 2007 event would further assist with validating the flood model; we would welcome any photographic evidence and any other detail you have, such as where that water came from and how deep it got.</p> <p>By understanding the existing flood risk, it will allow us to forecast the future flood risk, including increases due to climate change. This flood modelling information will inform how we develop our preliminary design so that impact of the scheme is minimised and that suitable mitigation is provided, such as providing safe alternatives areas of land that can flood. This will be reviewed and agreed by the Environment Agency and an independent team within Gloucestershire County Council, who also act as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>
Save the Countryside	Can an upgrade of the Stoke Road / Main Road corridor as a link from the M5 Junction 10 to Bishops Cleeve corridor via Swindon Parish be provided? the scheme should include:	This scheme has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to unlock housing and economic development proposed for the West and North West of Cheltenham. Our funding from Homes England is to allow this scheme to progress and therefore unlock the housing and economic development.

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
	<p>A Park and Ride close to the junction, accessed from the hub, onto the land already designated as Safeguarded for Development.</p> <p>A continuous dedicated and segregated cycle path from the West Cheltenham Cyber Park, along the new link road, to the proposed cycle path north of the A4019, allowing pedestrian and cyclist direct access between these two major developments.</p> <p>Continuation of the cycle path across Junction 10 to Coombs Hill (defined in the JCS as a service village) providing access to:</p> <p>Tewkesbury (via the A38), Stoke Orchard and Bishops Cleeve via Stoke Road, Twigworth & Norton via the A38 (that include significant new housing developments).</p> <p>Road improvements to enable a safe cycling route along Stoke Road to Bishop Cleeve.</p> <p>Retention / amendment of local footpaths and bridleways.</p> <p>The local area includes several bridleways and footpaths that cross the A4019 at various locations. These are very well frequented by local residents and walkers / horse riders from the wider community.</p> <p>We would like to understand the project team's rationale for establishing a new corridor through the green belt land for the proposed Western link road as opposed to upgrading the existing parallel road from Witherbridge Lane.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, we are not in a position to consider major improvements for traffic on the wider local road network.</p> <p>Concerns about increased traffic at the local road network, is an issue that has been raised by several stakeholders and members of the public. We are currently undertaking further traffic modelling as part of the next phase of scheme development. These results will allow us to review impacts on the local road network and then determine potential mitigation. Your comments will be useful when we carry out our review of the local road network.</p> <p>Providing a Park and Ride or transport hub off the A4019 is outside the scope of the M5 J10 Improvements Scheme as one is currently included as part of the Elm Park Development.</p> <p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the A4019, link road and across the motorway. We are looking into wider improvements to provide an integrated network for non motorised users and mitigate traffic increases on the local road network, but this is limited by the budget made available from Homes England.</p> <p>The main purpose of the Western Relief Road (link road) is to provide connectivity between the West Cheltenham Development (Cyber Park) and Junction 10 of the M5 motorway. This is to mitigate forecasted increases in traffic at Junction 11 of the M5 motorway, which is already suffering with capacity issues.</p> <p>We only have one route corridor for the A4019, the existing road, to provide a dual carriageway between Junction 10 and Gallagher Retail Park. Our initial design, as shown on the consultation plans, shows widening to the north of the existing road but we need to consider options of widening to the south as we develop our preliminary design. Widening to the north or south requires us to acquire land and we therefore need to balance the various design and access requirements against the land required.</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
	<p>Can alterations to the road can be done to the south side where the Council already owns the fields rather than on the north side at Uckington with great impact on the lives of residents and their properties?</p>	
<p>Member of the public</p>	<p>Why has Cheltenham's wider transport issued not been addressed by the scheme? How will people be able to access North West Cheltenham (Elms Park) if there is an accident on the motorway as there is no alternative? Can existing WCH paths be enhanced under the scheme? Has the impact of local residents' lives and health been fully considered?</p>	<p>This scheme has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to unlock housing and economic development proposed for the West and North West of Cheltenham. Our funding from Homes England is to allow this scheme to progress and therefore unlock the housing and economic development. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to consider major improvements for traffic on the wider local road network.</p> <p>In the event that M5 Junction 10 was closed, the diversion would be signed at Junction 11 and Junction 9 respectively, with the Junction 11 diversion using the A40 and the Junction 9 diversion using the A435.</p> <p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the A4019, link road and across the motorway. We are looking into wider improvements to provide an integrated network for non motorised users and mitigate traffic increases on the local road network, but this is limited by the budget made available from Homes England.</p> <p>As part of the planning process, we will be carrying out various environmental assessments, including impacts on noise and air quality. Where possible, measure would be provided to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.</p>
<p>Member of the public</p>	<p>Why was Elms park development not included in the scheme maps? Will there be access to a detailed plan of A4019 widening, detailing traffic lights, resident access, bus stops and lighting? How much will the proposed scheme increase exhaust pollution and noise pollution? Are there any</p>	<p>Details about the proposed Elm Park Development were not shown in the public consultation materials in order to avoid confusion with the live (at the time of writing) planning application for Elm Park. We are keen to work closely with all developers to ensure our proposals fully reflect any interface or phasing considerations.</p> <p>We are still in the early phase of the scheme development, which to date has focused on producing and sharing our concept designs for the main elements of</p>

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
	plans to reduce the pollution and noise caused by the scheme?	<p>the scheme. Further detail about element designs will be made available during statutory consultation (late 2021).</p> <p>As part of the planning process, we will be carrying out various environmental assessments, including impacts on noise and air quality. Where possible, measure would be provided to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Why are the additional CPO and demolition costs of 2 and 2B not featured in the Technical Appraisal when compared against 2A?</p> <p>What integration is taking place to ensure that already upgraded roads in Cheltenham, such as the B4634, are connected?</p> <p>Without having an outer-ring road, how does this scheme help the expansion of Cheltenham?</p> <p>How does this scheme fit in with GCC Highways' plan for a long-term, integrated network of distributor roads?</p>	<p>Though the three Options may appear to be virtually identical, the impacts with regards to properties within the vicinity of the junction vary greatly and as such we feel it is important to get the opinion of the public via the non statutory consultation. It helps inform our decision by allowing us to better understand the true costs associated with the possible requirement to acquire Withybridge Gardens, on the basis that we cannot simply assume that all landowners would rather stay or sell their property. On the contrary, we believe the consultation to be an integral part of the process and far more than just a box ticking exercise. We are ultimately looking to avoid the CPO process by negotiating the acquisition of any land required for the scheme and are in dialogue with each of the landowners already to assist the process, though of course there is always a risk that this will be unachievable and that we will have to utilise the CPO process.</p> <p>Our proposals outline that the proposed link road will connect to the B4634.</p> <p>An outer-ring road is not being considered as the scheme will deliver the highways infrastructure to enable the development allocated through the adopted JCS.</p> <p>Maintaining a functioning highway network is the foundation for an integrated transport system. All transport modes in some way interact with the highway network. Therefore, providing a safe and reliable highway network is fundamental to the delivery of Gloucestershire's Local Transport Plan (2015-2041) objectives.</p>
Gloucestershire Orchard Trust	Will the layby alteration on the A4019 intrude on the adjacent land?	The layby is not currently shown in our concept design as we need to consider the safety implications of having a layby close to the roundabout. We will be reviewing the provision of the layby, including potential alternative locations, in the next stage of the design development.

Individual or organisation	Matters raised	Response
	Will the Orchard Site and its regional apple varieties be protected from the development?	We are unlikely to directly affect the orchard; our proposals are for the A4019 to be widened on the northern side (away from the orchard). However, we are investigating access options for the orchard and properties immediately to the east of the orchard. These access options should not directly affect the orchard, but we may need to use some land between the orchard and the A4019. We will keep you informed if our proposals for the A4019 change and also on the development of the access options.

G.3. Matters raised: Tier 1 stakeholders (non statutory consultation)

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
Bishop's Cleeve Parish Council	Supportive, no J10 option preference	How will the junction of Stoke Road with the A4019 be managed as this does not appear to have been addressed by the details you have published so far?	<p>A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads, including Stoke Road. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021, where there will be the opportunity to provide further comment.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Bishop's Cleeve Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.</p>
Bloor / Persimmons (NW Chelt Strategic Allocation)	Supportive, no J10 option preference	<p>Will the development access roundabout provide sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast traffic flows?</p> <p>Will the 'stub access' to the safeguarded land, to provide a road to the boundary with Bloor Homes' land be reviewed?</p> <p>Will a second access to the safeguarded land, from Tewkesbury Road to the east of the new roundabout, be provided?</p> <p>Will a segregated cycle route on the new link road to create a route between the safeguarded land and west of Cheltenham, and a new crossing on the A4019 be provided?</p> <p>Will a footway between M5 Junction 10 and the development access roundabout, to replicate the existing provision, be provided?</p>	<p>We will carry out further detailed assessment for the proposed roundabout on the A4019 and the northern connector to the safeguarded land as we develop the design for the scheme. We are happy to continue to meet with your representatives to talk through specific access arrangements as part of this ongoing design development.</p> <p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the A4019, link road and across the motorway.</p> <p>Details about the proposed Elm Park Development were not shown in the public consultation materials in order to avoid confusion with the live (at the time of writing) planning application for Elm Park. We are keen to work closely with all developers to ensure our proposals fully reflect any interface or phasing considerations.</p> <p>We will be following the guidance given in LTN 1/20 as well as relevant design standards and other guidance.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Will the tie-in of the A4019 widening scheme with the proposed Elms Park Development be reviewed?</p> <p>Will the cycle route on the northern side of A4019 be compliance with LTN 1/20 guidance?</p>	
Boddington Parish Council	Neutral, no J10 option preference	Will cycling and walking facilities be provided in the area local to M5 Junction 10?	<p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities across the motorway and adjacent to the A4019, and link road.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Boddington Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.</p>
Cheltenham Borough Council	Supportive, no J10 option preference	Will social media be widely used to ensure there is a representative demographic engaged in the consultation?	<p>Yes, social media, alongside traditional media, was widely used to publicise the scheme's options consultation. Based on the number of consultation responses received, this mixed approach to publicising the event was considered successful, and we hope to also use this approach during the upcoming statutory consultation (planned for late 2021).</p> <p>To ensure that a representative demographic engaged in the consultation, targeted communications were sent to groups to encourage them to have their say. There was room for improvement in targeting some social groups; as a result, we will endeavour to engage with these groups earlier (before statutory consultation commences).</p>
Elmstone Hardwicke Parish Council	Mixed, preference for option 2A	<p>Why were drawings of the proposed scheme options only provided in the consultation brochure? These were too small to read.</p> <p>Why were detailed drawings for Coombe Hill and the A4019 provided in the brochure, but none provided for Junction 10?</p>	<p>As well as providing drawings of the proposed scheme options in the consultation brochure, drawings were also available for the public to view on the scheme's consultation website. We will endeavour to provide larger-scale drawings at statutory consultation.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Will the scheme be designed so as to minimise flooding potential in the Hardwicke area, on agricultural land and The Green?</p> <p>Will a new, complete, and efficient drainage system be put into place at Coombe Hill, specifically the area behind the Garage, up to, and including The Bellows?</p> <p>Why is the road not being made dual carriageway from Combe Hill to Cheltenham?</p> <p>Why has no attention been given to possible alterations/improvements to the junction near the Gloucester Old Spot where the Stoke Orchard to Piffs Elm Road meets the A4019?</p> <p>Why has improvements to the Piffs Elm to Stoke Orchard Road not been included in the proposals?</p> <p>Regarding the junction with the A4019 at the Gloucester Old Spot, why has a left-hand turn lane onto the A4019 not been included as part of the proposals? The grass verge is wide enough.</p> <p>Regarding the junction with the A4019 at the Gloucester Old Spot, can the angle of the entrance when turning from Coombe Hill be improved to avoid left hand turning traffic from the A4019 to stop vehicles, especially lorries, encroaching onto the other lane?</p> <p>Have measures such as lower speed limits and weight limits on local roads been investigated?</p>	<p>Detailed drawings for Junction 10 will be provided once the preferred route has been announced.</p> <p>Flood modelling is being undertaken to allow us to assess the impact of the scheme and allow us to determine any mitigation required. We have started liaison with the Environment Agency and other key stakeholders to help us ensure the proposed mitigation is appropriate. The results of this flood modelling and proposed mitigation will be made available at public consultation in late 2021.</p> <p>We are working with the Council's Local Highways Manager on various topics; these include understanding if there are any other local highway issues that could be addressed as part of our works, potential works required to mitigate construction of our scheme and co-ordinating other local road improvements during the construction of our scheme.</p> <p>Initial traffic modelling has indicated that there would not be a significant increase in traffic on the A4019 between Coombe Hill and M5 Junction 10 due to the scheme. As a result, it has been determined that dualling of this section of the A4019 is not required.</p> <p>Any adverse effect on traffic to the junction near the Gloucester Old Spot, where the Stoke Orchard to Piffs Elm Road meets the A4019, will be looked into in further detail as scheme progresses and any issues will be addressed to avoid rat-running on any minor roads, including Stoke Road. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021, where there will be the opportunity to provide further comment.</p> <p>Speed and weight limit enforcement is managed by the Gloucestershire County Council Road Safety and Camera Enforcement Teams so is outside the scope of the scheme, however, appropriate limits will be considered for all proposed</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Why have the proposals not taken into account the impact of increased traffic on local roads once the new junction is opened?</p> <p>What will be done to mitigate the impact of traffic on local roads when roads are closed during scheme construction?</p>	<p>roads and interfaces with existing roads during the next stage of design.</p> <p>A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.</p> <p>Measures to mitigate the impact of traffic on local roads during scheme construction will be considered in the next stage of design.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Elmstone Hardwick Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.</p>
Environment Agency	Mixed, slight preference for option 2	<p>Has consideration been given to how the proposals will mitigate and adapt to climate change across a range of factors?</p> <p>One of the scheme objectives is to “Provide a more integrated transport network by providing opportunities to switch to more sustainable transport modes within and to west, north-west and central Cheltenham.” This objective relates to climate change (i.e. sustainable transport modes) but why is the link to climate change not stated nor made more prominent here?</p> <p>Will compensatory habitats (to address significant residual adverse effects), new habitat creation and enhancements, and net gain be embedded into the scheme from an early stage for all proposed options?</p> <p>Will an assessment of and commitment to how to integrate habitat compensation and enhancement be made for all proposed options?</p>	<p>Drainage, hydrology, ecology and flood risk mitigation and adaption measures will be developed taking into account climate changes. We will also be looking at resource use (particularly materials) to ensure that a sustainable approach is taken with regards to regional sources of these materials. Consideration will also be made of the use of construction materials that utilise recycled materials where possible. The project is not expected to require water during operation. Measures will be taken at Stage 3 to identify opportunities to improve local water resources. With regard to fluvial flood risk, we are undertaking flood modelling for the 3 options (2, 2A and 2B). It is also our aspiration that any contractors appointed will responsibly source the construction materials required for the scheme.</p> <p>The Council understands that residents and organisations are concerned about climate change, and we are too; that’s why we declared a climate emergency in May 2019 and committed to becoming net zero by 2030. We are committed to providing a more integrated transport network by providing opportunities</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Environment Agency mapping of wetland potential highlights the potential for a variety of wetland habitat options. Will opportunities to de-culvert existing sections of culverted watercourse and naturalise modified watercourses be considered as well as other measures to improve habitat quality and connectivity, and functionality?</p> <p>Will additional surveys to assess baseline conditions take into account potential and historic habitats and species as well as current status?</p> <p>Will an acknowledgement that the options have the potential to preclude or jeopardise ecological improvement measures under the Water Framework Directive (WFD), Habitats Regulations, and other drivers be provided?</p> <p>Why has the summary of operational assessment of impacts on geomorphology been assessed as 'neutral to minor beneficial' following mitigation (therefore not resulting in any significant residual effects for all proposed options in the operational stage)? This does not adequately reflect the adverse impacts that all options will have on the geomorphological functioning of watercourses.</p> <p>Will proposals for draining the Scheme, to control water flow, water levels in adjacent and nearby habitats, control flood risk and avoid groundwater pollution be innovative and holistic, as well as following best practice?</p>	<p>to switch to more sustainable transport modes within and to west, north-west and central Cheltenham. To enable this, new and improved facilities for sustainable modes (WCH) will be delivered under the proposed scheme which will encourage those that can to leave their car at home, reducing congestion and improving air quality in Gloucester, Cheltenham and the wider north west Cheltenham area. While we do not have a specific scheme objective linking to this, we are committed to minimising the impact of the scheme on the environment, as well as ensuring that all elements of the scheme are resilient to the effects of the changing climate. We have dedicated experts supporting us with these ambitions.</p> <p>The selection of small footprint to minimise the impermeable area created and reducing impacts on existing habitats has been part of the optioneering process from the start of the project, and was a key component in the shortlisting of the current three options, over a new motorway junction and the creation of more offline infrastructure.</p> <p>Enhancement opportunities to provide a net gain in biodiversity are being reviewed as part of the Stage 3 work.</p> <p>The identification of compensatory flood storage areas will be made alongside ecological assessment. Enhancements to improve habitat quality are being reviewed as part of Stage 3. However, we do not have opportunities within the M5 J10 scheme to de-culvert existing culverted watercourses. No changes are planned to modify existing watercourses adversely, through changes to banks or alignments for example.</p> <p>Current WFD and HRA improvement measures will be considered as part of the development of the environmental design.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Will drainage and SuDS solutions such as drainage basins be designed to blend into and enhance the existing landscape?</p> <p>Will optimum drainage systems be identified before decisions on land acquisition are made as we advocate the acquisition of additional land to achieve a better scheme in landscape, visual and ecological terms and integration with other mitigation and net gain measures?</p> <p>Will historic uses (of the scheme area) that could give rise to contamination be established?</p> <p>Will oil interceptors and penstocks on road drainage outlets to surface water/groundwater be provided? We wish to be consulted / involved on measures to prevent pollution of watercourses regarding / during the construction phase.</p> <p>Will spill response plans be put in place, and tested?</p>	<p>Current WFD and HRA improvement measures will be considered as part of the development of the environmental design.</p> <p>The summary of operational assessment of impacts on geomorphology will be reviewed further at Stage 3.</p> <p>The environmental design recognises that the watercourses within the project area are part of the River Severn catchment. Current WFD and HRA improvement measures will be considered as part of the development of the environmental design, and the Environment team will seek details on these measures from the Environment Agency. The current design should not present any barriers to the movement of migratory fish and eels through the project area. The design of the bridge over the River Chelt will be clear of the water and will not result in changes to the watercourse (alignment or cross-section).</p> <p>Measures to enhance biodiversity are being considered as part of the Stage 3 work. These are expected to utilise aspects of the drainage and flood management design of the project.</p> <p>Measures to enhance biodiversity are being considered as part of the Stage 3 work. These are expected to utilise aspects of the drainage and flood management design of the project.</p> <p>Known historic contamination sources have been reviewed as part of the Stage 2 work, including the Colmans Farm site located north of the Junction 10.</p> <p>The design developed at Stage 3 will cover the points raised regarding water quality and pollution prevention.</p>
GCHQ	Supportive, no J10 option preference	N/A	We acknowledge GCHQ's response to the consultation, which did not raise any points that require follow-up / a response. We

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
			will continue to liaise closely with GCHQ through the development of the preliminary designs.
GFirst LEP	Supportive, slight preference for option 2A	<p>Is there sufficient queuing capacity from the A4019 at Coombe Hill?</p> <p>How will full cycling connectivity be maintained if cyclists will not be encouraged over the new M5 J10 junction?</p> <p>Why is there no pedestrian/cycling provision on the West Cheltenham link road? Could a cycling route via Boddington from the West and utilisation of the new link road as the route from the East connect with Highways England upgrade between Gloucester and Cheltenham?</p>	<p>Initial traffic modelling that has been undertaken shows that there will be sufficient queueing capacity at Junction 10 for the future forecast year (2041) with the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme in place. Further traffic assessment work will be undertaken and any potential issues with queueing capacity will be addressed. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021, where there will be the opportunity to provide further comment.</p> <p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities across the motorway and adjacent to the A4019, and link road.</p> <p>We are looking into wider improvements to provide an integrated network for non motorised users and mitigate traffic increases on the local road network, but this is limited by the budget made available from Homes England.</p>
Gloucestershire County Council (Ecology)	Mixed, slight preference for option 2	<p>Will an extended Habitats Regulations Assessment be completed to include nearby Local Wildlife Sites as part of the Ecological Impact Assessment for the final preferred suite of options?</p> <p>Has early consultation with Natural England been undertaken?</p> <p>Will a minimum biodiversity net gain of 10% be sought?</p> <p>Will the existing M5 entry and exit sections that will become redundant be broken up and re-purposed for gradual colonisation by wild plants and a new habitat for</p>	<p>We will endeavour to follow the GCC Biodiversity and Highways Guidance where possible.</p> <p>An interim Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has already been produced which assessed five scheme options. It will be updated once the preferred route is announced, when bird survey data will also be incorporated. It currently concludes no Likely Significant Effects and we do not anticipate that this will change.</p> <p>The study areas for designated sites are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 km from the Scheme for identification of European Sites where bats are one of the qualifying features; • 2 km from the Scheme (extended to any distance where there

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>biodiversity?</p> <p>Regarding Option 3 for the A38/A4019 Junction Improvements at Coombe Hill, will street lighting be assessed for impacts on bats?</p>	<p>is a direct hydrological connection) for identification of all other statutory designated nature conservation sites, including European Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 km from the Scheme for identification of non statutory designated nature conservation sites (e.g. Local Wildlife Sites). <p>Natural England have been sent a Consultation Document which outlines the ecological survey work undertaken to-date, the results and conclusions drawn so far. They have also been sent the interim HRA.</p> <p>Regarding biodiversity opportunities, the scheme is working towards a minimum BNG of 10%. We will reach out to BNG experts for support on this, including 3D landscaping. The initial step will be to understand the baseline biodiversity value of the Scheme. We can then determine whether it will be possible/how will it be possible to achieve this within the Scheme boundary, and if not, the amount of off-site habitat that will be required. Impacts to all of ecological receptors are being considered for each junction option. A tri-part approach to BNG would be possible. However, as the Environment Bill (which sets out the requirements for BNG) is not yet in place, there is no legal mechanism to manage such an approach. But, establishing an agreement with a third party, such as a Local Wildlife Trust, would be a potential approach to finding suitable locations off-site to enable the required BNG threshold to be achieved.</p> <p>Opportunities for biodiversity along the segregated footway/cycleway are being investigated and were discussed at the design meeting on 19/12/20. Opportunities for some sort of underpass are also being discussed, to improve permeability for species across this road.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
			<p>For the improvements at Coombe Hill, discussions have been had with a lighting team and further dialogue will be undertaken to ensure minimal/no impact on bats. For the A4019 widening, discussions are underway regarding lighting; although lighting will be needed along the A4019 discussions around best practice in terms of lighting design to minimise impacts on bats, are underway.</p> <p>Overall, we agree that the District Level Licensing (DLL) approach would be appropriate and Naturespace have already been contacted.</p>
Gloucestershire County Council (Flooding)	Mixed, no J10 option preference	Will surface water drainage be designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753, 2015?	Yes, the surface water drainage design will be in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.
Gloucestershire County Council Development Management Team including (Waste and Minerals)	Mixed, no J10 option preference	<p>Will an appropriately detailed Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) be completed?</p> <p>Will the use of secondary and recycled aggregates be given prominence and afforded careful consideration during the requisite planning approval process?</p>	<p>We will endeavour to follow national and local guidance for preparing and submitting a planning application. In line with guidance from Highways England, we would state whether the proposed scheme elements go through a mineral safeguarding area, however, we would not propose to undertake a Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) as identified by Gloucestershire County Council (Waste and Minerals). Our planned utilities searches will include assessment of interfaces with existing infrastructure, including interface with the Hayden sewage treatment works. This is likely to involve consultation with Severn Trent.</p> <p>Waste minimisation will be included as part of the Materials and Waste chapter of the scheme's ES chapter; liaison between the Environment and Design teams about the possibility of reusing excavated materials on-site will also occur. We will address resource efficiency as part of the Materials and Waste chapter of the scheme's Environmental Statement, in line with Highway England's guidance on including minimum levels of recycled content in the project.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
Highways England	Supportive, preference for option 2	<p>Planned developments such as the HIF housing and Cheltenham Garden Town – HE raised the scenario that planned capacity of the new junction may be exceeded by the levels of usage following the completion of planned developments. Highways England would look to see the development of Option 2 during preliminary design to provide a junction with capacity to accommodate the growth identified for the surrounding area</p> <p>Separate traffic model runs of options 2, 2A and 2B have not been provided, so in the performance of the junction and its impact on the M5 motorway mainline there is no means to distinguish between them. At a strategic policy level, they are very similar and so the qualitative impacts and potential of each of them would again be of substantial importance when considering the support of any particular option.</p> <p>Geometric departures from standard - if any departures from standard were to be identified in preliminary design, this could impact the performance of the proposal and may subsequently cause Highways England to review its support for the preferred option from that set out in this response.</p> <p>Detailed assessment of individual variations in the present value of benefits calculations for each of these options would support a more considered view on the preferred route from a value perspective. This is</p>	<p>Our modelling has been based on the known sites A, B, C and D (as per the housing and development associated with the HIF funded infrastructure) and this also aligns with committed and planned development associated with the wider Joint Core Strategy which sets out planned growth until 2031, along with areas of safeguarded land for the future growth, subject to adoption through the Joint Core Strategy Review. Sites A, B, C and D comprise the strategic allocations of North West Cheltenham and West Cheltenham and safeguarded land at the same 2 locations. The West Cheltenham allocation and safeguarded land also has Garden Community status. Therefore it is our view that all of the planned growth in the area has been tested in the modelling that was presented during the public consultation. We will continue to liaise with HE via the traffic modelling products which will come forward during PCF3.</p> <p>We note your concerns regarding future growth and as you know both GCC and HE are working closely with the JCS authorities as they develop the JCS Review. Any additional growth identified within that plan will require a mitigation strategy on top of infrastructure already being planned such as the J10 scheme. That said, it is worth making the point that elements of future proofing will be identified and considered for inclusion in the J10 design, enabling potential future improvement works to come forward either as part of the JCS Review mitigation or arising from other long term needs of the strategic road network.</p> <p>From a traffic modelling/network performance perspective, all the three options are quite similar, and thus the differences with regards to impact on benefits is likely to be minimal compared to the overall value of the monetary benefits. Therefore, it would have added only negligible value to model all the three options, taking into account the majority of the</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>because the existing data only supports an analysis based on the cost differential.</p> <p>Buildability risk of all the presented options is something for GCC to consider during the ongoing PCF stage 3 preliminary design work.</p>	<p>benefits are derived from Land Value Uplift. We note that from an operational perspective, these variants will flag minor differences when run through an operational model. However, we believe that any differences will still be marginal and irrespective of which option is taken forward, the issues will remain the same and would be addressed in Stage 3.</p> <p>Work to date shows that no Departures from Standard are envisaged on the SRN. Looking forward, it is our intention to discuss any emerging design issues that may impact this, with Highway England at the earliest possible opportunity.</p> <p>We do not anticipate there would be any significant changes to the scheme benefits between variations of Option 2, on this basis, we did not undertake further modelling. The majority of the benefits are derived from land value uplift which remains the same for all the options, unlike any traditional highway scheme where TUBA user benefits is a major differentiator.</p> <p>Agreed. We have recently engaged a constructability advisor to feedback on the preliminary design and we are considering the option of ECI to facilitate a collaborative approach to procurement.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Highways England and will consider concerns raised about the wider network during the development of the preliminary designs.</p>
Historic England	Mixed, no J10 option preference	Will desk-based assessments, geophysics, geo-archaeological work undertaken alongside or as well as ground investigations, trial trenching and setting assessments be undertaken?	We have undertaken desk top assessments to date to identify designated and non designated assets within the study area around the scheme. The heritage assets identified from these studies include those listed in your response. The heritage assessment will be continued into Stage 3 of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme, with work undertaken to assess the significance and settings of the known heritage assets, as well

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
			<p>as to further characterise as-yet unknown archaeology. Stage 3 assessments will also consider potential impacts of the scheme to the historic environment, as direct impacts and effects on the setting of the heritage assets present. A geophysical assessment along the line of the link road component of the Scheme has recently been undertaken, and we will follow this up with targeted trial trenching works as part of an assessment and mitigation strategy agreed with Gloucestershire County Council's Heritage Service as well as consultation with Historic England regarding the potential for nationally significant archaeological remains. Thank you also for highlighting your specialist to discuss potential impacts to Grade II listed heritage assets. We welcome the opportunity to review the Cultural Heritage chapter of the Environmental Statement with Historic England in advance of its submission.</p>
<p>Leigh Parish Council</p>	<p>Mixed, no J10 option preference</p>	<p>Will the Highways Team do more 'joined up' thinking, upgrading local roads to help with increased traffic, consider postponing/cancelling other nearby roadworks in the area to minimise disruption to commuters and ensure that local media sources put out daily updates to help inform travellers of all disruption in the area?</p> <p>Can a study be conducted at the A38/A4019 Coombe Hill junction to observe the difficulties that lorries cope with when faced with a standing start on this steep gradient?</p> <p>Can all pedestrian access and cycle lanes crossing the various entry/exit slip roads for M5 Junction 10 be made more prominent for safety reasons?</p> <p>Has contact with the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust been made?</p>	<p>We are working with the Council's Local Highways Manager on various topics; these include understanding if there are any other local highway issues that could be addressed as part of our works, potential works required to mitigate construction of our scheme and co-ordinating other local road improvements during the construction of our scheme.</p> <p>A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021, where there will be the opportunity to provide further comment.</p> <p>Initial traffic modelling undertaken showed that with M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme in place, some of the traffic using the local road network between Coombe Hill and Gloucester will switch to using the M5 motorway, whilst there</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Can all safety improvement recommendations relating to the access points to the housing developments and PFS be incorporated into the conditions stipulated in any approved planning permission decisions?</p> <p>No work should be undertaken until full details of surface water/drainage/flood water issues have been outlined and rectified for the protection of local residents and businesses.</p> <p>Will houses and businesses be fully informed of the proposals?</p> <p>Will the proposed cycle lanes connect with new or existing lanes?</p>	<p>will be some additional traffic between Tewkesbury and Coombe Hill. Overall, the traffic reaching the Coombe Hill Junction will be less when the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme is in place. Thus, with some minor alterations to traffic signal timings, the junction should be able to cope with the estimated traffic volumes. A further traffic assessment of the local road network will be undertaken which will allow us to determine if additional mitigation measures will be required. A similar exercise will be undertaken when sufficient details about the construction programme are available. Subject to programme confirmation, the A38 Coombe Hill Junction improvements are likely to be delivered before the improvements are made to M5 Junction 10, which should help to address local safety concerns. We also examined the approach of the A4019 arm of the proposed signal junction during concept development, and it was found that any changes would require significant work to raise the A4019. As a result, we will carry out further review on this.</p> <p>We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy; this will include a review of the location of pedestrian access and cycle lanes. The Road Safety Audit process that will take place during the design stages will consider pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>Yes, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust were contacted before the options consultation commenced; this provided information about the proposals and the ways the Trust could have their say. The Trust were also sent a reminder halfway through the consultation period. We will continue to engage with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust in the future.</p> <p>Flood modelling is being undertaken to allow us to assess the impact of the scheme. This will allow us to determine if any</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
			<p>mitigation will be required. The results of this modelling will be made available at public consultation in late 2021.</p> <p>A leaflet-drop to all residents and business within 500m of the scheme area occurred to ensure they were aware of the scheme's consultation. We also contacted all landowners that may be directly impacted by the scheme to offer them a meeting with the project team. The scheme's consultation was also widely publicised on local media and social media. We will continue to ensure that we communicate updates and information locally.</p> <p>We are looking into wider improvements to provide an integrated network for non motorised users and will take the Parish Council's comments on lighting and Advanced Stop Lines for cyclists into consideration as we develop the designs.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Leigh Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.</p>
Midlands Land Portfolio	Supportive, no J10 option preference	N/A	<p>We acknowledge Midlands Land Portfolio's response to the consultation, which did not raise any points that require follow-up / a response. We will continue to liaise closely with Midlands Land Portfolio through the development of the preliminary designs.</p>
Swindon Parish Council	Mixed, preference for option 2A	<p>Why does the scheme not align with the proposed access to the outlined Elms Park development?</p> <p>Can demonstration of sufficient capacity at the junctions of the A4019 and the Elms Park development (to mitigate the anticipated congestion) be provided?</p> <p>Can the proposed dual carriageway Cyber Park link road connect directly with Junction 10, rather than the proposed arrangement that introduces a new junction on</p>	<p>Details about the proposed Elm Park Development were not shown in the public consultation materials in order to avoid confusion with the live (at the time of writing) planning application for Elm Park. We will be working closely with the developer of Elm Park to ensure continuity and constancy between schemes.</p> <p>The quantum of Elms Park Development (as per the developer's latest plans), were included in the traffic modelling,</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>the A4019?</p> <p>What is the rationale for utilizing a new corridor through the green belt land for the proposed Cyber Park link road as opposed the existing corridor following Withybridge Lane?</p> <p>Can the dual carriageway west of Junction 10 be extended to the junction with Stoke Road / Main Road (adjacent to the Gloucester Old Spot)?</p> <p>Can the junction with Stoke Road / Main Road (adjacent to the Gloucester Old Spot) have traffic light control at peak times, improved visibility, and the bus stop relocated?</p> <p>Can the layby on the southern edge of the A4019 adjacent to the houses on east of Homecroft drive be retained and enhanced (segregated from the new dual carriageway)?</p> <p>Can confirmation be provided that the modelling Scenario Q incorporates the future demand from these potential developments? This modelling should include sensitivity analysis in terms of future potential developments to assist with long term planning of future required improvements.</p> <p>Has the impact of increased traffic on local roads been assessed, and appropriate mitigations developed? The Parish Council would like to be involved in this process.</p> <p>Why has a Park and Ride not been included in the proposed scheme?</p>	<p>thus traffic volume on the A4019 includes trips generated by this development.</p> <p>Two of the major development sites unlocked by the HIF are the Elms Park Development and West Cheltenham, both of which lie at the periphery of the town, so will have a limited impact on the A4019. The proposed scheme includes upgrading the A4019 and a link road, thus any impact on Cheltenham town centre or other local roads is expected to be minimal.</p> <p>A key factor for the determining the current position of the link road is the requirement to minimise the impact on the River Chelt floodplain whilst still providing a route resilient to flooding. Using Withybridge Lane was discounted because elevating it would have greater environmental impacts including greater loss of existing floodplain, hedge banks and trees and the likelihood of more severe direct impacts on the Grade II listed buildings at Millhouse Farm.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to unlock housing and economic development proposed for the West and North West of Cheltenham. Our funding from Homes England is to allow this scheme to progress and therefore unlock the housing and economic development. Unfortunately, this scheme is not in a position to consider major improvements for traffic on the wider local road network.</p> <p>The impact of the link road on the floodplain is a key aspect surrounding its location, particularly as a dual carriageway is proposed. We are carrying out further work to confirm the position of the link road.</p> <p>Initial traffic modelling has indicated that there would not be a significant increase in traffic on the A4019 between Coombe Hill and M5 Junction 10 due to the scheme. As a result, it has</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Can a dedicated and segregated cycle path from the West Cheltenham Cyber Park, along the new link road, to the proposed cycle path north of the A4019 be provided to allow pedestrian and cyclists direct access between these two major developments?</p> <p>Can the cycle path across Junction 10 to Coombe Hill be continued to provide access to Tewkesbury (via the A38), Stoke Orchard and Bishops Cleeve via Stoke Road, Twigworth & Naunton via the A38?</p> <p>Can road improvements to enable a safe cycling route along Stoke Road to Bishops Cleeve be provided?</p> <p>Can a grade separated crossing providing access north / south across the new dual carriageway be provided?</p>	<p>been determined that dualling of this section of the A4019 is not required.</p> <p>The retainment and enhancement of the layby on the southern edge of the A4019 will be considered in the next stage of design.</p> <p>Initial traffic modelling included a trajectory for JCS development (up to 2041). Overall traffic growth also incorporates background traffic growth based on TEMPro and Road Traffic Forecasts. As a result, the 2041 forecasts are considered appropriate for analysis and assessment and is based on the industry standard. We understand that some developments may come up in the future, or that some of the proposed developments may not proceed; any changes to the JCS would be picked up during JCS review. In further traffic modelling, the models will also be stress-tested for the high growth scenario to ensure the scheme is resilient to anticipated uncertainty. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021.</p> <p>A traffic assessment of the local road network is being undertaken to enable us to understand any potential increases in traffic. This will allow us to determine if mitigation measures will be required to help prevent rat-running on any minor roads.</p> <p>A Park & Ride is part of the proposed Elm Park Development and therefore outside scope of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme.</p> <p>We will take the Parish Council's suggestions about facilities for pedestrians, cyclist and equestrians into consideration, however, some suggestions may be outside of what this scheme can provide. A WCHR assessment (our strategy for WCH) is being prepared. The results of this assessment will be made available at public consultation in late 2021.</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
			We will continue to liaise closely with Swindon Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.
Tewkesbury Borough Council	Supportive, no J10 option preference	N/A	We acknowledge Tewkesbury Borough Council's response to the consultation, which did not raise any points that require follow-up / a response. We will continue to liaise closely with Tewkesbury Borough Council through the development of the preliminary designs.
Uckington Parish Council	Broadly supportive	<p>Can a fully integrated cycle path linked to Coombe Hill and also through Tewkesbury?</p> <p>Can the Cyber Park link road spur off directly from the new roundabout at Junction 10, rather than the proposed arrangement that introduces a roundabout and another junction on the A4019?</p> <p>Can the A4019 dual carriageway extend westwards from Junction 10 to the junction with the Stoke Road, adjacent to the Gloucester Old Spot public house? This should be traffic light controlled at peak times.</p> <p>Why has a P&R not been included in the proposals?</p> <p>Can the bus stops along the length of the A4019 have dedicated lay-bys and enclosed bus shelters?</p> <p>Will greater consideration be given to providing a public transport system, the provision of charging points and dedicated and segregated cycle and footpaths between Tewkesbury, the West Cheltenham Cyber Park, Elms Park, the town of Cheltenham and its railway station?</p> <p>The JCS Transport Strategy recommended a Western Relief Road linking Bishops Cleeve to the West of</p>	<p>Active travel is an important element for us to develop during the next phase of the scheme. We are currently developing our wider Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding strategy, which includes providing facilities adjacent to the A4019, link road and across the motorway. We are looking into wider improvements to provide an integrated network for non motorised users and mitigate traffic increases on the local road network, but this is limited by the budget made available from Homes England.</p> <p>Initial traffic modelling assessments show that a new link road and connection to Junction 10 is required to serve the West Cheltenham Cyber Park development. One reason for the new link road is to relieve forecasted congestion at Junction 11; the current improvement works at Junction 11 would not create enough highway capacity. A key factor for the determining the current position of the link road is the requirement to minimise the impact on the River Chelt floodplain. However, this is an area we are examining further as we carry out further traffic modelling and flood modelling for the preliminary phase of the scheme. We are also considering Withybridge Lane as part of this review. We are currently undertaking further traffic modelling as part of the next phase of scheme development. These results will allow us to review impacts on the local road network and then determine potential mitigation, including any</p>

Stakeholder	Sentiment	Matters raised	Response
		<p>Cheltenham. Can this take place in tandem with the M5 Junction 10 Improvement Scheme?</p> <p>Why can't land-take to widen the A4019 be taken from the South side?</p> <p>What will be the impact on the viability of farming and horticulture in the area due to the loss of Grade One Agricultural Land and horticultural land?</p> <p>Can cycle paths run the entire length of the A4019 from Coombe Hill to Cheltenham?</p> <p>Can facilities be put in place to ensure the safety of road users along the following roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stoke Road from the A4019 at Piff's Elm (alongside the Gloucester Old Spot public house) through Hardwicke to Stoke Orchard and Bishops Cleeve. - Boddington Lane from the A4019 through to Staverton. - Elmstone Hardwicke Lane from The Green off the A4019 through to Hardwicke via New Road. <p>There are several existing footpaths that traverse the A4019 at various points; can pedestrian refuge islands at these locations be provided?</p>	<p>potential improvements to the junction by the Gloucester Old Spot Pub and Stoke Road.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as a key infrastructure requirement to unlock housing and economic development proposed for the West and North West of Cheltenham. Our funding from Homes England is ringfenced to allow this scheme to progress and therefore unlock the housing and economic development. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to consider major improvements to the wider local road network.</p> <p>In order to provide a more integrated transport network by enabling opportunities to switch to more sustainable transport modes around Cheltenham, an expansion of, and improvements to the Arle Court Transport Hub (formally known as the Arle Court Park & Ride) are being proposed separately to the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme. The improvements to the existing P&R site have a focus on sustainable transport and providing high quality alternatives to car use. A separate Park & Ride is also being proposed as part of the Elm Park Development.</p> <p>We are still in the early phase of the scheme development, which to date has focused on producing and sharing our concept designs for the main elements of the scheme. Our preliminary design will include many additional details raised by the Parish Council, other stakeholders and member of the public, including active travel measures and public transport details.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise closely with Uckington Parish Council and commit to working directly with the Parish in the future.</p>

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