



Edwin Maund
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

AtkinsRéalis
Nova North
11 Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5BY

OUR REFERENCE:
M5J10.JC.D3.CL

YOUR REFERENCE:
TR010063

Date: 30 July 2024

Dear Mr Maund,

Application by Gloucestershire County Council for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme: TR010063

Submission made by the Joint Councils pursuant to Deadline 3 (D3) of the Examination of the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

This letter is written on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council, (GCC), including acting on behalf of GCC in its role as Local Highway Authority, Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) and Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC), together the Joint Councils (20047710). The Joint Councils are the host authorities for the GCC Major Projects Team ('the Applicant') M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme Development Consent Order (DCO) ('the Scheme').

Joint Councils' Response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) First Written Questions (ExQ1)

The ExA published the ExQ1 referenced [PD-010] on 9th July 2024. The Joint Councils identified a number of questions that are directed to them and will submit responses to these questions at D3. The Joint Councils' responses to these questions are set out in a separate document, titled "Joint Councils Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions" (our reference: M5J10.JC.ExQ1). The Joint Councils have also produced plans and tables to provide the ExA with the information requested in Q5.0.15, regarding funding of the Scheme. These will be submitted in three separate documents titled 'Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(i)', 'Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(ii) – Employment Allocation Data' and 'Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(ii) – Residential Allocation Data'.

Joint Councils' comments on the Deadline 2 (D2) submissions made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties

The Joint Councils have reviewed the following submissions made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties at Deadline 2 on 9th July 2024:

- Submissions made by the Applicant:

- 9.34 Landscape Visualisations Viewpoint 1 – Years 1 and 15 [REP2-003]
- 9.35 Landscape Visualisations Viewpoint 2 – Years 1 and 15 [REP2-004]
- 9.36 Landscape Visualisations Viewpoint 3 – Years 1 and 15 [REP2-005]
- 9.37 Landscape Visualisations Viewpoint 4 and 5 – Years 1 and 15 [REP2-006]
- 9.38 Landscape Visualisations Viewpoint 6 – Years 1 and 15 [REP2-007]
- 9.40 Applicant’s Response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-009]
- Submission made by other Interested Parties:
 - Written Representation [REP2-012], submitted by the Environment Agency
 - Comments on Deadline 1 submissions [REP2-014], submitted by National Highways
 - Comments on Deadline 1 submissions [REP2-015], submitted by Gowling WLG (UK) LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited and Persimmon Homes Limited
 - Written Representation [REP2-016], submitted by Savills on behalf of St Modwen and Midlands Land Portfolio Limited

The Joint Councils would like to comment on the following submission items made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties. Further details of the Joint Councils’ comments are set out below.

Documents on Landscape Visualisations Viewpoints [REP2-003, REP2-004, REP2-005, REP2-006 and REP2-007]

The Joint Councils have reviewed the landscape visualisations produced by the Applicant at six different viewpoint locations. These landscape visualisations, which depict the Proposed Development, are requested in the ExA’s Procedural Decision following Issue of Acceptance Decision [PD-005] dated 9 February 2024. The Joint Councils would like to draw attention to a few observations which are highlighted below in the following comments:

1. The visual representations of trees at year 15 appear significantly larger and more mature than one would expect, given that many are depicted as small saplings (under 1 meter) at the outset or as trees less than 2 meters tall. It raises the question of whether there is a documented methodology detailing how these year 15 tree sizes were determined, including annual growth rates, height spread, and trunk size. The projection of most trees reaching heights of 10 metres or more seems overly optimistic, especially for slow-growing species, and does not take into account the limited growth typically observed during the first 2-3 years post-planting. Growth rates are, of course, subject to variation based on environmental conditions, but the visuals seem to represent an ideal scenario. In reality, the trees may not achieve such robust growth. Therefore, it might be more prudent for the visuals to depict a more conservative growth scenario, such as the worst-case or even an average growth rate, to avoid giving a misleading impression. Additionally, it would be beneficial to provide explanations regarding the methodologies used to determine the sizes of trees and vegetation projected at year 15.

2. The acoustic fence is depicted as a standard timber structure in all visual representations. However, it is important to note that the final design has not been established. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) anticipates that all fencing will incorporate greening elements, such as climbing plants, to soften their appearance and lessen their visual impact. This discrepancy between the visuals and the assessment's description is concerning. Particularly, certain images suggest insufficient space for planting to be successful – for example, Viewpoint 06 shows a minimal gap between the kerb and the fence, which is likely to be filled with the concrete foundations necessary for the construction of both the fence and kerbs. To resolve this inconsistency, it is imperative that either the visuals are updated to reflect the greening measures outlined in the LVIA, or the assessment's evaluated impact is revised to align with the current visualisations. Without these changes, the visuals fail to accurately represent the mitigation strategies detailed in the LVIA documentation.
3. In the year 1 visuals, the depicted grass areas present a dense and verdant sward, which does not accurately reflect the expected reality. It is anticipated that the majority of these areas will be sown with diverse meadow mixtures that require several years to fully establish. Consequently, during the first year, it is more probable that one would observe considerable patches of bare soil interspersed with only sporadic green growth. The year one imagery, therefore, does not provide a true representation of the greening process for verges and embankments, potentially setting unrealistic expectations for early development.
4. The street lighting along the A4019 is characterised by columns that are significantly prominent, creating a substantial visual impact, particularly when observed from either direction of the road, as illustrated in Viewpoint 06. The assessment report only cursorily addresses the influence of these columns, which seems insufficient given their pronounced effect on the landscape's character and the visual amenity of the area, as evidenced by the provided visuals. A more thorough evaluation of the lighting columns' impact on the surrounding landscape is warranted to fully understand their effect on the aesthetic and functional quality of the landscape.
5. The hedges depicted in the visuals do not seem to represent the native hedgerows proposed accurately. They are presented as being quite diminutive, even at 15 years of growth, which contradicts the expected development. Furthermore, the image suggests a uniform species, neatly trimmed hedge, which is a departure from the diverse and natural appearance suggested in the landscape proposals. The proposals likely envision a more robust and varied hedgerow that would typically include a mix of native plant species, contributing to local biodiversity and offering a more authentic representation of the natural landscape.

Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-009]

The Joint Councils have reviewed the Applicant's Response to the LIR [REP2-009]. The Joint Councils submitted the LIR [REP1-069] to the ExA at D1 on 18th June 2024. The LIR [REP1-069], together with the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Joint Councils [REP1-034] submitted by the Applicant at D1, reflect the latest position of the Joint Councils on the Scheme.

The Joint Councils broadly agree with the responses made by the Applicant [REP2-009]. Where the Joint Councils have further comments on the Applicant's responses, these are provided in the Appendix of this letter.

Bloor Homes Limited and Persimmon Homes Limited's Comments on Deadline 1 submissions [REP2-015]

The Joint Councils, on behalf of GCC as the Local Highway Authority, are responding to one comment made by Bloor Homes Limited and Persimmon Homes Limited [REP2-015] on the Applicant's Response to their Relevant Representation [REP1-048], regarding alternatives to the Scheme. The Joint Councils response is contained within the Appendix of this letter. To facilitate the ExA in understanding the response made by the Joint Councils, a study on the traffic impact of the West Cheltenham and North-west Cheltenham strategic allocations commissioned by GCC Highways Development Management will be submitted alongside this letter.

The Joint Councils have no specific comments to make in response to the submissions by other Interested Parties at D2.

Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Applicant

The Applicant's SoCG Joint Councils [REP1-034] submitted at D1 on 18th June 2024 reflects the latest position of the SoCG between the Joint Councils and the Applicant. Following on from the SoCG submitted by the Applicant at D1, a meeting has been scheduled between the Applicant and the Joint Councils on 7th August 2024. This meeting seeks to move forward the SoCG by progressing the discussion of the remaining and any new outstanding matters with the Applicant.

The Joint Councils are in the process of agreeing with the Applicant for them to submit a revised SoCG at D4 on 3rd September 2024. The Joint Councils would like to reiterate their position in support of the Scheme in principle and will continue the discussions with the Applicant during the Examination to work towards agreement wherever possible.

Documents submitted by the Joint Councils at D3

In summary, please find below a list of documents which form the Joint Councils submission for D3 of the Examination of the Scheme:

- Joint Councils' response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions – document reference M5J10.JC.ExQ1; prepared by AtkinsRéalis on behalf of the Joint Councils, dated 30th July 2024.
- Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(i).
- Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(ii) – Commercial Allocation Data.
- Joint Councils Response to ExQ1 Q5.0.15(ii) – Residential Allocation Data.
- West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment – prepared by AtkinsRéalis on behalf of GCC, dated 16th May 2024.

This Covering Letter for the Submission, which includes the Joint Councils' comments on the D2 submissions made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get in contact via the M5 J10 Joint Councils project team: M5J10JointCouncils@atkinsrealis.com

Yours sincerely,

Lewis Oliver

Lewis Oliver

Associate Planner for and on behalf of The Joint Councils

APPENDIX

Appendix: Joint Councils comments on the Deadline 2 (D2) submissions made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties

Table 1 – Joint Councils' comments on the Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-009]

LIR ref.	Topic	LIR Extract (verbatim)	Applicant Response at D2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at D3
3.1.8	Air Quality	The Joint Councils welcome the assessment that the Scheme will deliver a decrease in annual mean NO ₂ concentrations as a result of the improved connectivity between the Strategic Road Network and the local transport network in west and north-west Cheltenham. The methodology applied in examining particulate matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) concentrations determines that as PM concentrations in the base year do not exceed objectives for these pollutants, concentrations are unlikely to exceed objectives in future years also. No specific commentary is provided in the ES on the potential impact of the Scheme on achieving recently legislated concentration targets for PM _{2.5} .	The AQ assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB. Estimated PM _{2.5} concentrations have been provided for the 2019 base year as shown in Table 2.3 of Appendix 5.1 of the ES (APP-081). The Applicant notes that targets for PM _{2.5} are defined in the Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations SI 2023 No.96 as an annual mean concentration of 10 µg/m ³ to be met by 2040, and a 35% reduction in population exposure by 2040 (as compared to a 3-year baseline period 2016-2018). Defra's Air Quality Strategy for England (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-airquality-strategy-for-england) section 5 identifies that having set the targets, further consideration is required to determine how the targets will be implemented and taken account of within decision-making. .	Response accepted. Assessment of air quality effects associated with the Scheme in accordance with DMRB methodology is appropriate, and was agreed prior to legislation of PM _{2.5} targets. The Joint Councils also accept that these are targets for PM _{2.5} concentrations, rather than objectives.
3.1.9	Air Quality	The Joint Councils note that there are approximately 646 human health receptors within 200 m that are at risk of temporary elevated dust deposition and soiling during construction.	Potential impacts from dust during construction of the Scheme will be mitigated through the measures described in the 1st iteration of the Air Quality Management Plan (AS-034). With the implementation of these construction dust mitigation measures, and any additional measures as will be detailed in the 2nd iteration of the Air Quality Management Plan, it is likely that there will be no significant effects for air quality during the construction stage.	Agreed. In addition, Section B.4.7 of the AQMP (Annex B4 to the EMP, 1st iteration) sets out how daily and weekly inspections will appraise the effectiveness of mitigation measures applied for the control of dust emissions, providing a mechanism for identification of further corrective actions if required.
3.1.11	Air Quality	The Joint Councils welcome the dust mitigation measures outlined within the chapter and that these will be included within contract documentation and further developed following the 2nd iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) once construction methodologies have further developed. The 2nd iteration is requested to be submitted to the Joint Councils, as statutory consultees, for comment and approval prior to commencement of works.	As detailed in item AQ1 of the REAC (REP1-030), the EMP (2nd iteration) will be submitted to and approved by the county planning authority following consultation with the relevant local planning authority and strategic highway authorities to the extent that it relates to matters relevant to their functions.	Agreed. Submission of the EMP (2nd iteration) and annexes (including the AQMP at Annex B4) is required by Requirement 3 to the draft DCO and is welcomed.
3.1.12	Air Quality	Schedule 2 Requirement 3 of the dDCO (TR010063/APP/3.1) requires three iterations of the EMP to be prepared. The EMP will need to set out mitigation potentially required for the air quality effects arising from construction if monitoring identifies increased particulate matter and dust.	As detailed in item AQ1 of the REAC (REP1-030), Scheme specific mitigation measures to control dust during construction would be specified within the 2nd Iteration EMP prior to commencement of the Scheme. The Applicant considers that monitoring for particulate matter and dust during construction is	The EMP (1st iteration) Annex B4 (Air Quality Management Plan) describes at Section B.4.7 the daily and weekly inspections that will be undertaken and recorded for site activities. These visual inspections are the minimum requirement to monitor and appraise the effectiveness of mitigation measures in controlling dust emissions and to identify the need for any further corrective actions, or indeed quantitative monitoring.

LIR ref.	Topic	LIR Extract (verbatim)	Applicant Response at D2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at D3
			not necessary due to the mitigation measures proposed and secured via the 2nd Iteration EMP.	It is recommended that a standard proforma is developed for recording these inspections in a consistent manner. Visual inspection logs should be made available to the local authority upon request.
3.2.6	Noise and Vibration	Noise impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme will significantly affect residential properties and non-residential receptors, particularly those close to the A4019 East of the M5 as well as properties close to the Link Road and any new access roads to individual properties. Construction works would be temporary, with noise control measures set out in the EMP. A detailed construction programme is not yet available and as such the Applicant has committed to revisiting the potential need to implement noise insulation or temporary rehousing measures at the Detailed Design stage, when the detailed construction programme and piling methods are available. The Joint Councils are aware that current assessments show that two properties would exceed the threshold for noise insulation during the day, one additional property would exceed the threshold during the evening, five properties plus the properties at River Leys that are 10 m from the works would exceed the threshold in the night-time. In addition, there are six properties exceeding the threshold for temporary rehousing.	Noise impacts during the construction stage will be managed through the 2nd iteration of the Noise and Vibration Management Plan. This will be produced by the Principal Contractor in advance of construction, and submitted for approval by the county planning authority, following consultation with the relevant planning authority and strategic highway authority to the extent that it relates to matters relevant to its functions. The 1st iteration of the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (AS-033) (section B.3.6) sets out that the Principal Contractor will undertake an appraisal for noise insulation or temporary housing six to nine months prior to starting the construction phase of the works or at such time appropriate to the scale and nature of the works. With regards to the exceedances referenced by the Joint Councils, the Applicant notes that where noise levels are predicted to exceed the threshold for a moderate and major impact at a property, this would not automatically lead to a significant effect, as both the duration of the works and the noise levels over that duration must be taken into account. This is in accordance with the methodology in DMRB LA 111 'Noise and Vibration' 2020, section 3.19.	Yes, we agree that when the Applicant undertakes the appraisal for the requirements of noise insulation and temporary rehousing both the noise levels and duration shall be considered as specified in DMRB LA 111 'Noise and Vibration' 2020.
3.3.13	Biodiversity	A Biodiversity Net Gain assessment report (TR010063/APP/6.15) concludes the project has the potential to achieve a net gain in excess of 10 % for habitats units (11.59%), hedgerow units (15.96%) and river and streams (34.19%) and ditches (23.38%). The Joint Councils welcome that an outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) was requested by the Examining Authority as part of the s51 advice. The Joint Councils have reviewed the LEMP (1st iteration) ((TR010063/APP/9.5). The Joint Councils welcome the information regarding objectives, management and monitoring outlined within the LEMP and consider the description of objectives, targets, management and monitoring for habitats thorough. However, the objectives for habitat creation are not just to compensate for the loss of habitats to the Scheme, but to mitigate or compensate for the loss of habitats used by protected species. The Joint	The Applicant notes the Joint Councils statement in support of the LEMP (AS-034). Regarding the final point, the Applicant will ensure that the comments are shared with the EC1 contractor and addressed in the 2nd Iteration of the environmental management plans. This is in accordance with the approach agreed in the Statement of Common Ground (REP1-034, matter reference number 19.1).	Joint Council's comments will be added in writing in response to ExA first written questions. It is understood these will be incorporated into the next iteration of the LEMP.

LIR ref.	Topic	LIR Extract (verbatim)	Applicant Response at D2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at D3
		Councils would like to see that the outline description of monitoring, considers associated objectives relating to habitat function, such as provision of suitable connected habitat for protected and priority species and landscape screening.		
3.4.7	Road drainage and the water environment	The principal concerns for the impacts on the water environment are associated with how the Applicant has responded to consultee comments and the lack of water quality data.	The Applicant's surface water quality assessment is robust and has followed the Design Manual for Road and Bridges (DMRB) Standard LA 113 Road Drainage and the Water Environment. As documented in Appendix 8.3 (Surface Water Quality Assessment) of the ES (APP-111) baseline water quality data have been used to help assess the risk to surface water quality. Water quality data are also provided in the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Compliance Assessment (REP1-026), and a summary of WFD overall status is provided in the baseline section of the Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter of the Environmental Statement (REP1-014). This is the level of water quality data needed to assign an importance to a watercourse, as set out in the DMRB Standard LA 113 methodology.	Agreed during discipline discussions that annexes contain sufficient water quality data and that exclusion from the main ES chapter was to allow the chapter to remain concise.
3.5.8	Landscape and visual impacts	The Scheme is situated within the Cheltenham and Gloucester Greenbelt. The construction activities, loss of vegetation, and expansion of infrastructure are anticipated to significantly alter the landscape character. Residents in the vicinity are likely to experience adverse effects on visual amenity both during the construction phase and upon completion.	As set out in the Written Summary of ISH1 (REP1-046) (it is considered that the general character of the area will not substantially change and the sense of openness of the Green Belt will be retained.	The Joint Councils have largely concurred with the applicant's response, acknowledging that, following the implementation and establishment of mitigation measures, there is an expectation that the character and openness of the green belt will not undergo significant alteration. Once these measures have taken effect and achieved their intended purpose, it is anticipated that the green belt will maintain its essential qualities and spatial openness.
3.5.9	Landscape and visual impacts	To summarise, the construction phase and immediate aftermath are expected to yield significant but temporary disruptions. However, with the gradual implementation of proposed landscape mitigation measures, it is envisaged that the Scheme could eventually yield overall beneficial effects on the landscape character, particularly by the 15th year.	As detailed in para 9.16.6 of Chapter 9 (Landscape and Visual) (REP1-016), as an overall summary it is considered that, although significant adverse effects may be experienced during construction and initially upon completion, once the designed in mitigation had established and matured, the Scheme would not have any long-term significant adverse effects on landscape character or visual amenity, and in some cases may provide beneficial effects.	The Joint Councils agree with the applicant's assertion that, following the implementation and maturation of the proposed mitigation strategies, it is anticipated that there will be no substantial enduring impact on the landscape's character and the visual amenity.
3.5.10	Landscape and visual impacts	The Joint Councils did not agree with assessment conclusions of the visual receptors at Barn Farm, Informal Travellers Site and at the properties on the south side of A4019 east of West Cheltenham Fire Station mainly due to the introduction of a barrier. The Joint Councils requested further explanation as to how these conclusions were reached. On all occasions these matters were agreed during a meeting between technical specialists from the Joint Councils and the Applicant and it is now understood that the assessment assumes that residents will	Item LV6 of the REAC (REP1-030) confirms that consultation will be undertaken with the LPA and directly affected receptors on options for the final design of the noise barriers. Regarding the Joint Councils assessment of the impacts on visual receptors at Barn Farm, Informal Travellers Site and at the properties on the south side of A4019 east of West Cheltenham Fire Station, the Applicant agrees with the Joint Councils comment that this point has now been agreed. This is detailed in item 9.5 of the SoCG (REP1-034).	The Joint Councils can confirm that the applicant's response in regards to this matter is correct and would note it is essential that the final design of the fence is agreed with all parties involved as the treatment provides an important part of the intended mitigation in the area.

LIR ref.	Topic	LIR Extract (verbatim)	Applicant Response at D2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at D3
		have input into the design of the barrier. There is room for climbing plants to create an interesting/attractive screen at year 1. The Joint Councils agree with these matters subject to detailed design and commitments made in the REAC.		
3.5.11	Landscape and visual impacts	The Joint Councils support the mitigation outlined for the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. The Joint Councils note that the management measures within the REAC and ES chapter are not yet included within the EMP (1st iteration) (TR010063/APP/7.3). The Joint Councils note the inclusion of these measures in the LEMP (1st iteration) (TR010063/APP/9.5).	The LEMP 1st iteration (AS-035) is Annex B.5 of the EMP 1st iteration (AS-025), and therefore the Applicant's view is that all measures included in the AS-035 (LEMP 1st iteration) are inherently part of the AS-025 (EMP 1st iteration).	The Joint Councils understand and accept the applicants response in regard to this matter.
3.8.11	Materials and waste	The Joint Councils note that the 1st iteration of the EMP (TR010063/APP/7.3), MMP (TR010063/APP/9.1) and Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) (TR010063/APP/9.9) have been produced. The Joint Councils welcome the review of the 2nd iterations once available.	As detailed in item MS1 of the REAC (REP1-030) the EMP 2nd iteration will include 2nd iterations of the MMP and SWMP.	Noted, we look forward to receiving them for review in due course.
3.9.24	Population and human health	It is noted that the underpass will not be lit during dusk and dawn to allow the movement of bats. From an ecological perspective, this is recommended though it does pose a safety risk to pedestrians and equestrian users which the Joint Councils welcome further information on.	The Applicant has provided further information to the Joint Councils on this matter through the Statement of Common Ground process. The Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-043) provides relevant additional information in response to the Joint Councils' Relevant Representation (RR-039). In response to point 39.19 on page 171 (REP1-043) the Applicant states that: <i>'The underpass has been designed with dual function; however, the passage of pedestrians and equestrians is expected to be principally recreational, while bats are a nocturnal species. It is anticipated that recreational users of the underpass would typically favour daytime movement. There are alternatives for the movement of people and equestrians who may wish to cross the A4019 at grade – there will be signalised pedestrian crossings as part of the A4019/Link Road junction as well as an informal opportunity for equestrians to cross between The Green and Moat Lane at Uckington using the signalised junction proposed in this location. In balancing the needs to be met here, the ecological mitigation is a primary driver; and the pedestrian and equestrian movement is a compatible benefit in terms of recreational connectivity. The design parameters reflect this. The population and human health assessment provides mitigation measures that seek to address human health effects – this includes ensuring that user groups are well informed about the characteristics and benefits of the Scheme once operational, and this aspect of the design would logically be included within such communications.'</i>	It is stated that the underpass has been designed with "dual function" yet during darkness/ night time, the underpass is not suitable to users as priority is for bats and if 'co-used' results in conflict and safety issues for users. It is stated that alternative access/ crossing points are available nearby but how would users: 1) know that the underpass is not suitable for use at night?, and 2) know what alternatives are nearby, and are these alternative options safe? All of this would need to be communicated to potential users well in advance of the underpass and Scheme becoming operational

LIR ref.	Topic	LIR Extract (verbatim)	Applicant Response at D2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at D3
3.9.26	Population and human health	To reduce effects on the retail parks and local businesses, the Joint Councils welcome the close liaison between the Public Liaison Officer and affected businesses to ensure effective traffic management and potential agreement / relocation for the loss of one local business is implemented.	With regard to the potential relocation of the local business the Applicant continues to engage with the business owner with the aim of finding an appropriate solution.	Liaison with affected businesses and specific engagement with the owner of the local business that may need to be located is welcomed. This would need to be followed through to a successful resolution

Table 2 – Joint Councils’ comments on Bloor Homes Limited and Persimmon Homes Limited’s Comments on Deadline 1 submissions [REP2-015]

Relevant Representation Theme	Bloor Homes Limited and Persimmon Homes Limited Response at Deadline 2 (verbatim)	Joint Councils Response at Deadline 3
Alternatives to the Scheme	<p>As indicated above, the Interested Parties do not agree with the Applicant's assertions that A4 is dependent development or that the Scheme is required to enable full build out of the JCS allocations.</p> <p>The Applicant seeks to separate out its functions as promoter of the Scheme and the county highway authority (HA) but, at the same time, seeks to rely on its functions as HA to, firstly, link the justify its position that the Scheme is needed to unlock Allocated Site A4 and, to secondly, secure the funding required to deliver the Scheme. It follows however that if the Applicant is unable to speak for or control over the HA then how can the Applicant provide any certainty over the HA's position or ability to secure funding. The Interested Parties have made representations to the HA and National Highways challenging the proposed Grampian condition, and the requirement for any financial contribution remains in dispute (note the HA's consultation response RR-006 Appendix 4 is not agreed and in any event is silent on the quantum of any financial contribution).</p> <p>It should be noted also that the proposed Grampian condition (of 1,000 units referred to in RR-006 Appendix 4) related to the interim south-bound off-slip signalisation which was based on modelling provided for the Swindon Farm planning application (reference 20/00759/FUL). Subsequent modelling undertaken by the Interested Parties has shown that signalisation will accommodate all of the JCS growth, additional West of Cheltenham growth and all of North West Cheltenham with betterment to current conditions.</p> <p>As regards the Safeguarded Land, the Applicant is asked to clarify its comments and direct the Interested Parties to the relevant application documents which set out the consideration given to the impacts of route alignments on sterilising the Safeguarded Land in its options appraisal.</p>	<p>The National Highways Grampian is currently under review and may result in a raising of their develop limits pending implementation of J.10 south slips in connection with anticipated main line queuing at M5 J.10 south bound off-slip and M5 J.11 south bound off-slip and Elmbridge Court on the A40. However, that is only a very small part of the picture, harm arising from growth on the local road network in the absence of the re-direction of traffic to the south facing slips is much more severe. The County Council as highway authority has commissioned a separate piece of work, titled “West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment” and submitted alongside this covering letter, using their new multi-modal SATURN model. This re-test the assumptions of a 1700 deadweight on the local road network and will be the basis for testing a congestion, noise, air quality and safety in accordance with INF1 of the JCS. That modelling re-affirms the local road 1700 unit limit.</p>