

# M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

**Applicant Response to Interested Parties D3  
submission**

**TR010063 - APP 9.67**

Rules 8 (k)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9  
September 2024

# Infrastructure Planning Planning Act 2008

## The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

---

#### Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 submissions

---

<b>Rule Number:</b>	Rule 8 (k)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010063
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010063/APP/9.67
<b>Author:</b>	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme Project Team

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	September 2024	Deadline 4

# Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	4
2. REP3-066 Joint Councils	5
3. REP3-071 Environment Agency	12
4. REP3-077 Gowling WLG (UK) LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes and Persimmon Homes Limited	13
5. REP3-080 Neil Hadley	14

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This document (TR010063/APP9.67) provides the Applicant's response to submissions made by Interested Parties at Deadline 3 namely:
- REP3-066 Joint Councils
  - REP3-071 Environment Agency
  - REP3-077 Gowling WLG (UK) LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes and Persimmon Homes Limited
  - REP3-080 Neil Hadley
- 1.1.2. Where issues raised within the IP's response have been dealt with previously by the Applicant within one of the application or other examination documents, a cross reference to that response or document is provided to avoid unnecessary duplication. The information provided in this document should, therefore, be read in conjunction with the material to which cross references are provided.
- 1.1.3. In order to assist the Examining Authority, the Applicant has not provided comments on every point made by Interested Parties, including for example statements which are matters of fact and those which it is unnecessary for the Applicant to respond to. However, and for the avoidance of doubt, where the Applicant has chosen not to comment on matters contained in the response, this should not be taken to be an indication that the Applicant agrees with the point or comment raised or opinion expressed.

## 2. REP3-066 Joint Councils

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
<b>Joint Council's comments on the Deadline 2 (D2) submissions made by the Applicant and other Interested Parties</b>		
066-04	<p>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.</p> <p>Documents on Landscape Visualisations Viewpoints [REP2-003, REP2-004, REP2-005, REP2-006 and REP2-007]</p> <p>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:</p>	See responses in relation to the visualisations under 006-05 to 006-09 below.
066-05	<p>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</p>	<p>The visualisations have been produced in order to provide an indication of the form and scale of the proposed engineering works in the context of the existing landscape and townscape. To this end, they have focussed on earthworks and structures and the extent of lost vegetation, with an indication of the soft landscape proposals, based on the DF3 design.</p> <p>Bearing this in mind, the visualisations provide a good indication of how the Scheme can be expected to look. It is not possible to predict exactly how the Scheme will look at year 15 in terms of soft landscape. Plant growth is dependent on factors such as species, spacing, quality of planting and management, soil conditions, shelter</p>

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>and microclimate. The 3D visualisations production team has used a generic 3D model to ensure that they are representing vegetation at assumed heights. For Year 1, heights of 0.6m – 0.8m have been used. For Year 15, heights of 5m –11m have been used (See section 9.15 of ES Chapter 9 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment), paragraph 9.15.8)[REP1-016]. The model trees do not show the variety of species proposed and are wider in trunk girth than is likely for year 15 but do provide a good indication of how the proposed planting would provide filtered screening.</p> <p>In developing the visuals, focus was placed on the accuracy of the existing vegetation lost and the proposed built elements. Reworking the visualisations to refine how the planting could look at Year 15 would not add to the understanding of how the Scheme will sit in the landscape over the years. The Year 1 visualisations provide a ‘worst case’ that can be extrapolated over the years. The Year 15 visualisations, are fit for purpose in providing an understanding of how the earthworks, bridges and other built elements will appear in the landscape. The visualisations also indicate how the proposed planting elements will provide visual screening or filtering of the built elements.</p>
066-06	<p>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</p>	<p>The acoustic barrier shown in the visualisation represents a ‘worst-case’ scenario. This is because the manufacturer and exact specification will be decided at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Entry LV6 of the REAC secures the Applicant’s commitment to consult with the local planning authorities and directly affected receptors on options for the final design of noise barriers so that they provide visual amenity and/or biodiversity values as well as noise abatement. In addition, DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 14(1) requires noise mitigation proposals to have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation</p>

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>with the relevant planning authority and county planning authority prior to construction. Requirement 14(2)(a) states written details must reflect mitigation measures included in Chapter 6 (noise and vibration) of the ES and Noise and Vibration Management Plan approved as part of the EMP (2nd iteration). The Applicant therefore considers that regardless of the worst case scenario presenting in the visualisations, that there are sufficient controls in the dDCO to ensure sufficient consultation and engagement with relevant parties on the detailed design of these features.</p>
066-07	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the limitations of the current visualisations provided, however, the changes proposed are not considered to add particular value. The visual qualities of the grass verges are not essential to aid understanding of how the Scheme will sit in the landscape and therefore the Applicant does not agree with the request to produce a more detailed sward representation.</p>
066-08	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Applicant has used generic 3D models of street lighting for a road scheme of this type. At this stage in the design the Applicant would note that there is not a manufacturer's model specified. Therefore, the spacing and height of columns is assumed to be essential for this type of road and the LVIA confirms that the columns would be intrusive elements (para 9.11.15 of the ES Chapter 9 (LVIA) [REP1-016]. The Applicant's assessment is that the effect on the landscape is not considered substantial.</p>
066-09	<p>The hedges depicted in the visuals do not seem to represent the native hedgerows proposed accurately. They are presented as being quite</p>	<p>As per the methodology detailed in para 9.15.8 of the ES Chapter 9 (LVIA) [REP1-016], the Applicant has used a height of 0.6-0.8m for</p>



Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Year 1 hedges and 1.2m for Year 15 hedges. It is acknowledged that the hedges could be considerably taller than this, however, it is anticipated that the hedgerows are likely to be maintained to a 1.2 or 1.5m height, as they are currently.</p> <p>Although the hedges shown in the Year 15 visualisations are presented as neat and uniform, the Applicant does not consider this to affect the function of the visualisations to aid in the understanding of how the Scheme will sit in the landscape.</p> <p>The hedges are proposed to be species rich, and underplanted with wildflower grass as appropriate, thereby providing enhanced biodiversity and visual interest.</p>
066-10	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No response needed. See responses below to Joint Council's responses on the Applicant REP2-009.</p>
066-014	<p><b>LIR Ref 3.1.12 Air Quality</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of the EMP Annex B4 (Air Quality Management Plan) will be updated by the Applicant's Principal Contractor to confirm the measures which will be employed to monitor and control dust emissions. Daily visual inspections and weekly inspections carried out before use by the trained and competent operator and recorded in accordance with the Principal Contractor's certified BMS system. These inspections are required to comply with POWER Regulations 1998, as well as to mitigate dust and noise generation.</p>



Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
	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.	The Principal Contractor will implement all best practicable means to minimise the creation of dust at source, these will be dependent on the specific activity and prevailing weather conditions.
066-022	<p><b>LIR Ref 3.8.11 Materials and waste</b></p> <p>Noted, we look forward to receiving them for review in due course.</p>	The Applicant confirms the Joint Councils will be consulted on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration EMP (MMP and SWMP) when produced and as secured through requirement 3 of the dDCO. .
066-023	<p><b>LIR Ref 3.9.24 Population and human health</b></p> <p>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</p>	<p>The design of the Withybridge underpass as 'dual function' refers to its use by bats as a route to cross under the A4019 at nighttime, and an access route for walkers and equestrians during the daytime.</p> <p>With regards to question (1) from the Joint Councils, the Applicant is reviewing the proposed lighting of the underpass by pedestrians and equestrians at night.</p> <p>With regards to question (2), the Applicant will, as part of detailed design, review appropriate wayfinding signage. Alternative access and crossing facilities would be available for pedestrians and cyclists at the proposed A4019/West Cheltenham Link Road signalised junction with proposed connections to Withybridge Lane to the south and the proposed access track and bridleway AUC 1 to the north.</p> <p>As detailed in items PHH3 and PHH4 of the REAC [REP3-031] continued engagement with walking, cycling and horse-riding groups throughout the detailed design and construction phases would assist with all user groups' understanding and familiarity of the scheme proposals.</p>
066-024	<p><b>LIR Ref 3.9.26 Population and human health</b></p> <p>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</p>	There is no guarantee of a successful resolution, but the Applicant aims through its previously stated engagement that such a resolution will be achieved.

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
066-25	<p>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.</p> <p>The Joint Councils have no specific comments to make in response to the submissions by other Interested Parties at D2.</p>	Please see the Applicant's response to 066-026 below.
066-026	<p><b>Alternatives to the Scheme</b></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>	<p>The new multi-modal strategic model used for the West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment has not been used by the Applicant for the assessment of the Scheme. The outputs of the traffic modelling used for the assessment of the Scheme cannot be directly compared with the outputs from the new multi-modal strategic model, since some of the underlying assumptions for the new model will inevitably vary from those on which the traffic modelling for the Scheme are based, such as differences in near certain or more than likely developments included in uncertainty log and different forecast years. Nonetheless, the new SATURN model used for the West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment, by GCC as County Highway Authority, supports the need for the Scheme, since it demonstrates that with all the JCS developments (excluding safeguarded sites), there would be widespread congestion issues across almost all of the junctions analysed and that this level of development cannot be accommodated in the absence of major scheme intervention.</p>

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response
066-027	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Further meetings have been held with the Joint Councils in August to discuss matters outstanding. An updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is submitted at Deadline 4 (TR010063/APP/8.2 Rev 2) which sets out the latest position on matters between the Applicant and the Joint Councils.</p>
066-029	<p>Joint Councils' response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions – document reference M5J10.JC.ExQ1: prepared by AtkinsRealis on behalf of the Joint Councils, dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 2024.</p>	<p>Please see TR010063/APP/9.66 for response by Applicant to Joint Councils response to WQ1 submitted at D4.</p>
066-033	<p>West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment – prepared by AtkinsRealis on behalf of GCC, dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 2024.</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant's response to 066-026 above.</p>

### 3. REP3-071 Environment Agency

Response Reference	Issue	Applicants Response made at D3 – APP 9.44
12.1	<p>We have some concerns over access to a river gauging station during the works at Uckington.</p> <p>If I refer you to Sheet 13 of 16 (TR010063-000742-TR010063_2.2_Land_Plans), we would normally use the A4019, Moat Lane and then a track to access our asset (please see EAAssetUckingtonPlan.pdf), however it looks as if the works will prevent this access.</p> <p>We are not accessing this asset frequently, however, therefore if we could be provided with the dates of work, then our team believe we would be able to work around this.</p>	<p>Please note that the Applicant has received and responded to this issue previously.</p> <p>The Environment Agency raised this issue first in relevant representation ref. REP2-012, to which the Applicant responded in ref. REP3-044.</p> <p>A copy of the response provided in REP3-044 is provided below:</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the site at Uckington is not currently a working Environment Agency river gauge but a concrete trapezoidal channel that was once intended as a new gauge for the River Chelt.</p> <p>The proposed Scheme will not prevent access to this site on the River Chelt. The Applicant is not undertaking any works on Moat Lane in the vicinity of the Environment Agency’s access point.</p> <p>The only issue on access are the works planned to the A4019 and the junction of the A4019 and Moat Lane at Uckington which will require temporary traffic management measures. However, access to Moat Lane will be maintained not least due to the need to ensure access to residential properties along Moat Lane is secured. Access to residential community and business premises is secured within the Traffic Management Plan which is in turn secured via requirement 3 of dDCO.</p>

## 4. REP3-077 Gowling WLG (UK) LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes and Persimmon Homes Limited

Response Reference	Issue	Applicant Response
<b>Response Reference 52.1 Traffic Impacts of Elms Park</b>		
077-01	<p>The position of the Interested Parties is that the effects of the development at North West Cheltenham (Elms Park) can be sufficiently mitigated on the national and local highway network through provision of local highway mitigation, avoiding any conflict with NPPF paragraph 115. This is evidenced through the planning application submissions to the Local Planning Authorities.</p>	<p>Strategic traffic modelling undertaken as the evidence base for the adopted JCS, for the HIF Outline Business Case for the Scheme, for the assessment of the Scheme subject to this DCO and, most recently, for the West of Cheltenham and Elms Park Development GC3M Assessment have all demonstrated that cumulatively the JCS developments cannot be accommodated in full in the absence of the M5 Junction 10 scheme.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for the Applicant, in the context of this DCO, to review and comment on traffic modelling undertaken to support individual planning applications. Nonetheless, the Applicant notes that the conclusions drawn by the Interested Party that <i>“that the effects of the development at North West Cheltenham (Elms Park) can be sufficiently mitigated on the national and local highway network through provision of local highway mitigation, avoiding any conflict with NPPF paragraph 115”</i> are inconsistent with and contradictory to the conclusions drawn from all the aforementioned strategic traffic modelling.</p>

## 5. REP3-080 Neil Hadley

Response Reference	Relevant Representation Issue	Applicant Response
<b>Para 72.1</b>		
080-5	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.	It is for the relevant Local Planning Authority to consider the acceptability of the individual planning applications when considered against the relevant planning policy documents that are a material consideration of the determination process.
080-6	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.	As outlined in Section 1 of the Golden Valley SPD the document seeks to provide guidance on how the outcomes associated with Policy A7 of the JCS are expected to be delivered. As such it is the Applicant's position that, as a single allocation, with multiple landowners, the guidance provided by the SPD is a material consideration in the planning policy context that informs the Scheme design.
080-7	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.	Whilst the Applicant understands that Mr Hadley may wish to seek the further development of his land at some point in the future the Applicant has been consistent in its approach to other potential future developments that do not have a formal planning status. This is to provide equivalent access arrangements to ensure no detriment to the current use of the land, something that the Applicant believes they have achieved. Whilst Mr Hadley's land is part of the wider Strategic Allocation A7 of the JCS, for which access is provided for by the Scheme, it does not have a formal planning status for development in its own right. As such the Applicant does not consider this a material planning consideration in the context of paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Response Reference	Relevant Representation Issue	Applicant Response
080-8	My site can be easily linked to any footpath and cycling provision for the whole Allocation and particularly those illustrated around the signalled junction.	<p>The Scheme proposes a connection between FP AB026 in the north west corner of field No. GR412610 and the walking and cycling provisions included at the proposed B4634/West Cheltenham Link Road signalled junction. The proposed connection to FP AB026 is immediately adjacent to field No. GR364928 so it is possible that a future connection to this facility could be achieved should Mr Hadley's land be developed in the future. In providing cycling and footpath links to the Strategic Allocation A7, the Applicant has provided the opportunity for further future connections.</p>
080-9	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.	<p>The Scheme provides a point of access into the Strategic Allocation A7, in accordance with the Golden Valley SPD. The Applicant considers that this is an appropriate level of access and provision to unlock the Golden Valley site and to facilitate its development.</p> <p>The minimum amount of land has been included to provide the realignment and widening of the B4634 to the south. This will allow for the provision of a shared use path along the northern verge and gradual widening to provide a right turn lane at the proposed signalled junction.</p> <p>Plot 16/9a is required for part of the realigned of the B4634 carriageway, verge and supporting earthwork embankment (all part of Work No 6). It also includes unlined ditches (also part of Work No 6) at the toe of embankments to intercept embankment runoff and land drainage. The ditches have a base width of 1m, depth of 1m, with 1 in 3 side slopes, an earthwork offset of 2m and maintenance access. Space is also required for the proposed ditches to connect to the proposed replacement culverts (Work No 6a and 6b) which will be under the B4634. A replacement private means of access is provided as Work No. 6c.</p>



Response Reference	Relevant Representation Issue	Applicant Response
		<p>Within the proposed B4634 verge, the following utility diversions are proposed through Plot 16/9a; diversion of telecommunications cables (Works No 8, 12 and 34) and diversion of an electricity cable (Work No 26).</p> <p>Plot 16/9b is required for construction working space for Work Nos 6, 6a, 6b and 6c, all described above.</p> <p>The Applicant has also sought to provide an overlay of Sheet 16 of the General Arrangement Drawings (TR010063/2.9 Rev 2), submitted at Deadline 4, that show the two land parcels in question within the context of the Scheme to aid in the consideration of its impacts and proposed use.</p>
<b>Para 72.2</b>		
080-10	<p>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.</p> <p>I do not want to have flooding on my land due to lack of drainage capacity under the B4634.</p>	<p>A similar question was asked by Mr Hadley in REP1-072 and responded to by the Applicant in REP2-008.</p> <p>The design and associated impacts of the West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation are not a matter for this Scheme, but a consideration of any planning applications associated with the development of that Strategic Allocation Site. The existing Development and Flood risk policy, set through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its Flood Risk and Coastal Change Guidance) is in place to ensure those upstream developments have no adverse impacts on flood risk elsewhere. This is further enhanced through the Tewkesbury Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document on Flood and Water Management.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that there are 2no. existing watercourse crossing on the B4634: one by the proposed Link Road and the</p>

Response Reference	Relevant Representation Issue	Applicant Response
		<p>other to the west near the 'House in the Tree'. These are both included in the flood modelling undertaken. The flood modelling assessed the impacts of the flood risk to and from the Scheme at the southern end of the Link Road, including the new junction spur to the proposed West Cheltenham Development Area, and the changes to the B4634. The assessment of these impacts are presented in a technical note (AS-049).</p> <p>The assessment undertaken concluded that the Scheme with the mitigation described (replacing the existing 850 mm × 400 mm box culvert under the B4634 with 3nr 2100 mm × 800 mm box culverts) will be appropriate in terms of all applicable surface water flood risks and effects being acceptable. This is on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The hydraulic modelling indicates only minor, or no, adverse, impact on peak flood levels downstream of the Old Gloucester Road in conveying any displaced water, which will not cause any significant disbenefit (in fact a small reduction in flood level is predicted) upstream of the B4634, and in fact reduces the duration of flooding. This is the primary reason why flood compensation is required immediately downstream; and</li> <li>- the dDCO includes for flood compensation immediately downstream of the B4634, and the wider M5 J10 Improvement Works includes additional volume within its compensatory storage wetland near the motorway junction to provide an overall increase in flood storage in the catchment.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the upstream developments are bound by existing planning policy. The Scheme will marginally reduce flood risk to the land immediately upstream of the B4634, not increase it.</p>

Response Reference	Relevant Representation Issue	Applicant Response
<b>Para 7.2.3</b>		
080-11	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is an established agricultural access which is going to be very dangerous to use without proper highway provision.</p>	<p>The outputs of the traffic modelling undertaken for the assessment of the Scheme are reported in the Transport Assessment (AS-029), with the impacts of the Scheme on traffic queues specifically presented in Appendix F.</p> <p>Please refer to the Applicant's response 28.7 to the Relevant Representations (REP1-043) regarding the Interested Party second two points concerning vehicular access.</p> <p>For ease, the response provided by the Applicant is provided again below:</p> <p>Currently, there is no right turn lane for the existing field access and therefore the Scheme does not change the current arrangement. However, it remains that it is the Applicant's position that access will be improved, especially as the B4634 is being widened in this location (it will be 10.1m wide compared to the existing 6.1m wide). This is therefore an improvement over the current situation. Additionally, a bell mouth access with radii of 6m and an access track of 3.6m wide would be provided along with a gate set back 15.8m from the carriageway. This would allow suitably sized vehicles to pull in and stop off the road when turning in and out of the site compared to the existing situation where the gate is set back approximately 2m from the carriageway with no space for vehicles to stop off road. The signalised junction should create gaps in traffic flow that would aid agricultural vehicles when turning in and out of the site. The proposals therefore offer an improvement over the existing situation in terms of both safety and the ease of access when turning right in and out of the site.</p>

# AtkinsRéalis

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

Tel: +44 (0) 8000 514 514