



## Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3): Flood Risk, Traffic and Transport, Funding and Environmental Matters

Application by Gloucestershire County Council for an Order granting Development Consent for the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme (TR010068).

Actions arising from the ISH3 held on the 13 August 2024.

| Action | Description   | Action By     | Deadline (D) |
|--------|---|---------------|--------------|
| 1      | Confirm a signposting document in respect of the exception test and sequential test.  | Applicant     | D4           |
| 2      | Scour assessment – views to be set out  | EA            | D4           |
| 3      | EA seeking an adjustment to GS4 in the REAC   | EA            | D4           |
| 4      | Technical Note on reservoir to be provided.   | Applicant     | D4           |
| 5      | EA to advise on position in respect of practicalities moving forward for ensuring the reservoir complies with the Act and is delivered through the dDCO | EA            | D4           |
| 6      | Plots to be referenced in written submission for land affected by increased depth of flooding   | Applicant     | D4           |
| 7      | Copy of confirmation from GCC that disapplication of drainage legislation has been agreed   | Applicant/GCC | D4           |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |  |                            |            |
|----|--|----------------------------|------------|
| 8  | <b>Consideration of the legal powers that arise from a DCO and whether these can be imposed upon National Highways</b>             | <b>Applicant and NH</b>    | <b>D4</b>  |
| 9  | <b>Advise on the averages used for assessing journey times and any consequences</b>  | <b>NH/ Applicant</b>       | <b>D4.</b> |
| 10 | <b>NH to provide detail on what they see as the TAG compliance or non-compliance</b>   | <b>NH.</b>                 | <b>D4</b>  |
| 11 | <b>Clarification for access arrangements to farm land north of the A4019 with widths of current accesses</b>                       | <b>Applicant and Bloor</b> | <b>D4</b>  |
| 12 | <b>Accident data to be investigated with regard to farm accesses and farm machinery.</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b>  |
| 13 | <b>Land plan overlain with the scheme to understand the relationship between ownership and future highway boundary</b>             | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b>  |
| 14 | <b>Sensitivity testing to be investigated, and timing of when and whether it could be done and when it could be reviewed by NH</b> | <b>Applicant/NH</b>        | <b>D4</b>  |
| 15 | <b>Q15.0.3 consideration of route choice for all</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b>  |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |   |                         |           |
|----|---|-------------------------|-----------|
|    | <b>vehicles affected by slip road closures during construction</b>  |                         |           |
| 16 | <b>Revisit safety report in line with revised DMRB Standard CD122</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 17 | <b>Plan to be provided to show location of departures from standard identified in the Safety Report</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 18 | <b>Re DFS.10. Tapering of 1:35 safety issue explanation, rather than land availability/cost</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 19 | <b>Re DFS. 11, 12, 13, regarding B4634 explanation of departure with shortening of visibility and TRO for reducing speed limit and where secured in the DCO</b> | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 20 | <b>Departure consideration relative to changed prevailing road conditions (layout and volumes of traffic) in light of proposed scheme</b>                       | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 21 | <b>Applicant to come back on Safety Audit issue (gg119 compliance) – 5.46 from SoCG</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 22 | <b>NH to share and Applicant to respond to scheme cost</b>  | <b>Applicant<br/>NH</b> | <b>D4</b> |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |  |                            |           |
|----|--|----------------------------|-----------|
|    | <b>calculations including allowances for risk, BNG, carbon reductions and VAT etc</b>  |                            |           |
| 23 | <b>NH to provide response to applicant's side funding proposal (which excludes bond)</b>   | <b>NH</b>                  | <b>D4</b> |
| 24 | <b>Applicant to provide an explanation of how they have taken into consideration the potential for delays to commencement in respect of the assessment of the cost of the scheme</b> | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b> |
| 25 | <b>Consider whether St Modwen suggestion of a Requirement could be a mechanism to allow funding matter to be progressed.</b>   | <b>Applicant/NH/JC/IPs</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 26 | <b>Applicant to prepare and submit note on sustainability, pulling together areas of the ES to sign post compliance with 10 design principles (carbon, active travel etc).</b>       | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b> |
| 27 | <b>Applicant to provide a summary of key changes to scheme that have arisen as a result of consultation process.</b>   | <b>Applicant</b>           | <b>D4</b> |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |   |                  |           |
|----|---|------------------|-----------|
| 28 | <b>Applicant to confirm if controls re. quality of design going forward (PCF etc) relate to the whole scheme or SRN elements?</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 29 | <b>JC to provide position statement re. adequacy of scheme design and what needs to be resolved at detailed design stage (and if that is secured via the dDCO).</b>   | <b>JC</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 30 | <b>Applicant to explain why an external or independent review process (design panel) has not been undertaken (this would be a NH requirement whereby land is required as per PCF process). Consideration of whether there would be benefit in undertaking a review at this stage?</b> | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 31 | <b>NH to signpost specific PCF / design panel review requirement.</b>   | <b>NH</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 32 | <b>Applicant to identify any differences between PCF process that has been followed and design panel process.</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 33 | <b>JC to review and confirm if provisions regarding reviews / consultations /</b>   | <b>JC</b>        | <b>D4</b> |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |   |                  |           |
|----|---|------------------|-----------|
|    | <b>approvals with respect to environmental barriers as secured via the REAC / DCO are acceptable.</b>   |                  |           |
| 34 | <b>Applicant to explain their conclusions re. landscape effects given the visualisations in respect of effect on:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Local Landscape Areas,</b></li><li>• <b>The beneficial effects for Barn Farm and</b></li><li>• <b>Moderate adverse effects on Sheldon Cottages</b></li></ul> | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 35 | <b>Applicant to provide information regarding which landscape visualisations were considered and why they were discounted.</b>  | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 36 | <b>Applicant to signpost assumptions and growth rates regarding trees (in year 15 visualisations etc)</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 37 | <b>Re Hedgerow impacts. Do the DCO changes and powers alter the findings of the landscape assessment?</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 38 | <b>Re. Heritage Assets. Applicant to confirm timescales, length of September geophysical surveys (including any</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |



# The Planning Inspectorate

|    |  |                  |           |
|----|--|------------------|-----------|
|    | <b>likely subsequent evaluation trenching) including reporting of findings.</b>  |                  |           |
| 39 | <b>Re. Noise any updates regarding delivery of mitigations at Stoke Orchard / Stoke Road</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 40 | <b>Noise. How will PC deal with surveys and delivery of mitigations as per rehousing / glazing etc. Additional information to bridge gap between EMP and 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of EMP and how mitigation would be delivered in practice</b> | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 41 | <b>Now included in Action 40.</b>  | <b>-</b>         | <b>-</b>  |
| 42 | <b>Position regarding noise impacts and mitigation at Elms Cottage.</b>  | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 43 | <b>Applicant to confirm if Natural England are expecting any further info regarding construction as per NE SoCG Item 10.1.</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |
| 44 | <b>EA to confirm if Requirements 8 and 11 are now drafted acceptability given provisions in the REAC etc</b>   | <b>EA</b>        | <b>D4</b> |
| 45 | <b>Applicant to check consistency re REAC and DCO items.</b>   | <b>Applicant</b> | <b>D4</b> |