
M5 JUNCTION 10 IMPROVEMENTS SCHEME

Written Summary of Oral Representation ISH1 on
behalf of St. Modwen and Midlands Land Portfolio
Limited, Land at West Cheltenham

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1. This document is submitted on behalf of St. Modwen and Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd (SM&MLPL) and forms the written summary of the oral statements made by Mr Nick Matthews at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1).
- 1.2. This document also provides some additional information relating to discussions held with the Applicant post ISH1.

1.2 Oral Summary

- 1.3. This document is submitted on behalf of St. Modwen and Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd (SM&MLPL) and forms the written summary of the oral statements made by Mr Nick Matthews at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1).
- 1.4. At ISH1, Mr Matthews on behalf of SM&MLPL questioned how the distribution of deadweight capacity had been allocated amongst four locations shown in Table 6 of the following document, 7.5 Transport Assessment – Appendix L – Traffic Forecasting Report [document reference APP-142].
- 1.5. Following discussion, SM&MLPL understands that the Applicant will be preparing a written response to the Inspectors question in relation to this matter for submission at Deadline 1. At this stage SM&MLPL wishes to reserve their position on this matter and will review the Applicant's submission at Deadline 1 and respond more fully to the ExA at Deadline 2.

1.3 Additional Summary Points

- 1.6. There are two further matters which SM&MLPL wish to briefly comment upon at this stage.
- 1.7. Firstly, SM&MLPL noted in their original Relevant Representation [document reference RR-034] that they did not consider the proposed cost recovery funding mechanism to be a fair and proportionate means of addressing the funding shortfall through developer contributions. SM&MLPL's primary concern was that this mechanism relied exclusively on financial contributions from two strategic allocations in the JCS and thereby excluded the potential for contributions from other developments locally which will also have an impact upon on movements at Junction 10.
- 1.8. In dialogue with Gloucestershire County Council officers immediately following ISH1, Mr Matthews was informed that the mechanism has been reviewed in order to address these concerns. SM&MLPL welcome this in principle and look forward to

SM&MLPL, Land at West Cheltenham – ISH1 ORAL SUBMISSION SUMMARY

further engagement with the Applicant on this matter. At this stage SM&MLPL reserve the right to comment further once they have had the opportunity to review and comment upon the proposed alternative mechanism.

- 1.9. Secondly, SM&MLPL note that the Technical Note (dated 30/01/24) submitted by PJA on behalf of Bloor Homes and Persimmon Homes outlined the outputs from the modelling work which they have undertaken. The modelling included only 1,100 dwellings at West Cheltenham. This very conservative quantum of development upon which the allocation was made reflects the uncertainty at the time of the allocation of the site through the JCS. The further assessment work undertaken to inform the preparation of the Golden Valley Supplementary Planning Document recognised that the allocation has capacity for a considerably larger quantum of development and this has been reflected in the planning applications subsequently submitted by two of the three developers / landowners bringing forward proposals. The output of the PJA modelling does not therefore reflect the latest position with the cumulative sites and underestimates the quantum of development being brought forward at West Cheltenham.