

TR010063 M5 junction 10 Improvements.  
Landowner Responses to the Applicants Responses  
(APP 9.39 Rep1-072). From ref.no: 20047638

Para.72.1

- 1) Land & Planning facts: The site is no longer within the Green Belt following a recommendation by Inspector Elizabeth Ord and adopted by the JCS Councils.
- 2) Field GR364928 is encompassed within the Allocated Site Boundary and next to a larger field that has a planning application made upon it (TBC 22/01107/OUT).
- 3) The Golden Valley Development SPD clearly illustrates a large area of water in the form of a Lake on the various schematic drawings. The lake is in its self 'Development' within the meaning of the Planning Act.
- 4) As there is no Equalisation Agreement with other landowners within the West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation, the lake is NOT viable as there is no natural water supply on the site. The site is available for development under policy A7.
- 5) The SPD has various Schematic drawings illustrating development, but as the applications made by St. Modwen & Cheltenham BC show they have not strictly complied with the SPD.
- 6) For the applicant to base their assumptions on various schematic drawings shows a lack of understanding of landownership and planning issues surrounding field GR364928 and the Allocation as a whole.
- 7) I drew the applicant's attention to the issue of further development of my field from our first meeting and subsequently informed them of the 'Material Considerations' referred to in NPPF paragraph 47 of section 4 'Determining Applications' that they needed to consider.
- 8) My site can be easily linked to any footpath and cycling provision for the whole Allocation and particularly those illustrated around the signalled junction.
- 9) It is relevant to note that Tewkesbury BC do not presently have the required Housing Land Supply as set out in the NPPF. The applicant should not be closing off Allocated development opportunities with a CPO.

Para.72.2

Drainage: There are presently 2no. drainage pipes under B4634 (be they smaller than proposed), but I still question that the 3no. proposed will be enough bearing in mind all the houses, offices and thousands of people being accommodated on the Allocation.

Plus the general run off from buildings, hard landscaping and the increased discharge from Hayden Sewage Treatment Works.

I do not want to have flooding on my land due to lack of drainage capacity under the B4634.

Para.72.3

Signalised crossroads: The applicant refers to traffic modelling and queuing, but I am not aware of the data being in the public domain or discussion at the Inquiry.

A reason has still not been given as to why there cannot be a central turning lane designed to accommodate right hand turning in and out of my site.

There is an established agricultural access which is going to be very dangerous to use without proper highway provision.