

M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme

Statement of Common Ground
National Highways (Tracked)
TR010063 – APP 8.3

Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 8

July November 2024

Infrastructure Planning Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

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

8.3 Statement of Common Ground National Highways (Tracked version)

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010063
Application Document Reference	TR010063/APP/8.3
Author:	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme Project Team

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	October 2023	DCO Application
Rev 1	June 2024	For Deadline 1 submission
Rev 2	July 2024	For Deadline 3 submission
Rev 3	September 2024	For Deadline 4 submission
<u>Rev 4</u>	<u>November 2024</u>	<u>Final for Deadline 10 submission</u>

Contents

Chapter	Page
1.2. Purpose of this Document	<u>67</u>
1.3. Structure Statement of Common Ground	<u>67</u>
1.4. Status of SoCG	7
2.1. The Role of Gloucestershire County Council	8
2.2. The Role of National Highways	8
2.3. Summary of consultation	8
4.1. Principal matters outstanding	<u>2260</u>
Tables	
Table 2-1 - Consultation with National Highways	9
Table 3-1 - Matters agreed between the Applicant and National Highways	12
Table 4-1 - Matters outstanding between the Applicant and National Highways	<u>2361</u>

Glossary

Term	Meaning / Definition
(The) Act	The Planning Act 2008 (as amended)
<u>Asset Data Management Manual (ADMM)</u>	<u>This provides the requirements for creating, managing or using data on behalf of National Highways. It captures the requirements of asset data management; a data dictionary outlining the structure and rules for individual assets and attributes and contains the asset reference catalogue which is a tool used to help identify and record specific assets.</u>
(The) Applicant	Gloucestershire County Council (Strategic Development team) applying for the DCO
<u>Baseline Execution Index (BEI)</u>	<u>Baseline Execution Index - performance calculations</u>
Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	Biodiversity Net Gain delivers measurable improvements for Biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development
<u>CI32 – Principal Contractor Clause 32 submission</u>	<u>This term refers to the revised programme of works which the Principal Contractor submits for Client acceptance, typically on a monthly basis, as per the NEC contract requirements of Clause 32. Clause 32 submissions are based on the original Clause 31 programme submission as per NEC requirements. It is industry practice to reference individual clauses numbers in the NEC contracts, rather than the clause title. For example, "Clause 32 Revising the Programme" is known as Clause 32 or CI32.</u>
Carter Jonas (CJ)	Land referencing consultant working on behalf of the Applicant
Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC)	CBC is the local planning authority for Cheltenham Borough, and is a statutory consultee for the scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(b) of the Act
<u>CPI -</u>	<u>Cost Performance Index - earned value metrics</u>
Development Consent Order (DCO)	The consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) given by the relevant Secretary of State on the recommendation of the Planning Inspectorate under the Planning Act 2008 (as amended).
<u>Early Contractor Involvement (ECI)</u>	<u>This is a term defined in the New Engineering Contract (NEC) suite of contracts. ECI is a type of construction contract where the Principal Contractor is engaged at an early state in a project to offer input into the design phase. It is on contrast to the design-bid-build model where the contractor is only brought onboard at the end of the design phase. The model allows the contractor to have input into the design and suggest value engineering changes which can result in time and cost savings.</u>
Environment Agency (EA)	A non-departmental public body with responsibilities relating to the protection and enhancement of the environment in England.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A process of evaluating the likely environmental impacts of a proposed development, including inter-related socioeconomic, cultural and human health impacts, both beneficial and adverse.
Environmental Statement (ES)	Reports the findings of the EIA, including at least the information reasonably required to assess the likely significant environmental effects of the development.
<u>EPSL</u>	<u>EPS Licence – European Protected Species Licence.</u>

Term	Meaning / Definition
Examining Authority (ExA)	The person(s) appointed by the Secretary of State (SoS) to assess the DCO application and make a recommendation to the SoS.
Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)	An assessment of the likelihood of flooding in a particular area so that development needs, and mitigation measures can be considered.
Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)	Gloucestershire County Council. It is therefore a statutory consultee for the Scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(c) of the Planning Act 2008 ("the Act"). GCC is the local highway authority in Gloucestershire and is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) for Gloucestershire. GCC also has statutory duties in relation to drainage, flood risk, and heritage assets and archaeology.
<u>Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP)</u>	<u>3rd iteration Environmental Management Plan (EMP) which related to the post-construction stage of the scheme</u>
Historic England	Publicly funded body that champions and protects England's historic places, also known as the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England.
Host Authority	The local authority, within which the Scheme would be situated, In this case, Cheltenham Borough Council, Gloucestershire County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council.
<u>LEI</u>	<u>Lookahead Execution Index performance calculations</u>
Local Planning Authority (LPA)	The county council, metropolitan, or district council, which has statutory responsibilities within its administrative areas.
Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP)	A project of a type and scale defined under the Planning Act 2008 and by Order of the Secretary of State (SoS) relating to energy, transport, water, wastewater and waste generally. These projects require a single development consent, which includes consents under different regimes, such as planning permission, listed building consent and scheduled monument consent.
Natural England (NE)	Executive non-departmental public body responsible for the natural environment.
Planning Inspectorate (PINS)	The Government Agency responsible for operating the planning process for NSIPs. The Planning Inspectorate is responsible for examining DCO applications and making recommendations to the relevant SoS, who will make the decision on whether to grant or to refuse development consent. The SoS for Transport takes the decision on applications for highway NSIPs.
Preferred Route Announcement	Designation of a proposed option as a 'preferred route' by the Department for Transport and provides a form of planning protection from development of land in the vicinity of the M5 Junction 10 improvement scheme
<u>SPI</u>	<u>Schedule Performance Index - earned value metrics</u>
Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)	Prepared in accordance with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, to inform, explain and communicate how the consultation will be undertaken.
(the) Scheme	The proposed M5 Junction 10 improvements development which is the subject of a DCO application.

Term	Meaning / Definition
Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC)	Tewkesbury Borough Council is the local planning authority for Tewkesbury Borough and a statutory consultee for the Scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(b) of the Act.
Water Framework directive	The Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) which established a framework for European Community action in the field of water policy.

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the application for the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme (“the Scheme”) made by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 1.1.2. If made, the DCO would grant consent for the construction of improvement works to M5 Junction 10, consisting of a new all-movements junction; the widening of the A4019 east of the junction to the Gallagher Retail Park Junction; and a new link road from the A4019 to the B4634. A small section of the A4019 will also be widened to the west of the proposed junction.

1.2. Purpose of this Document

- 1.2.1. This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between GCC (the Applicant) and National Highways in relation to the M5 J10 improvement Scheme (‘the Scheme’).
- 1.2.2. The document identifies the following between the parties:
- Matters which have been agreed; and
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed)
- 1.2.3. The matters which are referenced in this document are that which are considered to be of material difference. Other lesser matters, such as those that concern amendments to supporting documents, have been reported on in the Consultation Report or addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. This SoCG ~~is being~~ has been progressed alongside responses ~~to the Relevant Representation~~ made by National Highways (~~RR-026~~) during the examination as well as side agreements.
- ~~1.2.4. The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the Examination stage.~~

1.3. Structure Statement of Common Ground

- ~~1.3.1. The SoCG has been updated to reflect the position of both parties at Deadline 3 on 30 July 2024. Since the 1st iteration of the SoCG was submitted with the DCO application in December 2023, a number of meetings have been held to discuss the initial issues in the SoCG and subsequent comments made in the Highways England Relevant Representation made to the Planning Inspectorate on 22nd March 2024. Therefore, historical discussions in Section 5 have been superseded / updated to reflect the comments made in the Relevant Representation and discussions in meetings.~~
- ~~1.3.2.~~ 1.3.1. The structure of the SoCG has deviated from that proposed in the ~~1st iteration SoCG.~~ Therefore, the 2nd iteration final version of the SoCG has been structured on a topic based approach which as such, removes Section 3 of the 1st iteration SoCG. The issues discussed in this SoCG are grouped by topic as follows:
- Draft DCO articles, schedules, Protected Provisions
 - Environmental Statement (including carbon reporting)
 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) and Environmental Management Plans
 - Transport (including modelling)
 - Land Plans, Book of Reference, Statement of Reasons
 - Funding
 - Construction

- Operation and maintenance
- Project Control Framework and Governance

~~1.3.3. Previous Sections 4 and 5 (now Section 3 and 4) are a record of matters agreed and matters outstanding following discussions on the issues raised during the relevant representation process and following the structure set out above. The previous Table 5.1 in Section 5 is now included as an appendix to this SoCG showing historical issues discussed between parties. All issues are included in either Section 3 or 4 to record whether the matter is agreed between parties or the matter remains outstanding.~~

1.4. Status of SoCG

- ~~1.4.1. This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of both parties at the Deadline 3 on 30 July 2024, 10 on 28 November 2024. This is the final version of the SoCG between parties.~~
- ~~1.4.2. It is acknowledged that the views and opinions of both parties may change over time and as such this SoCG will continue to evolve as the Examination.~~

2. Consultation

2.1. The Role of Gloucestershire County Council

- 2.1.1. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) is the Highway Authority for Gloucestershire, and the Applicant for the M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme will be promoted and delivered by GCC with support from National Highways and Homes England.
- 2.1.2. The Strategic Road Network (SRN) comprises the M5 J10 junction and is managed by National Highways. The A4019 is managed by Gloucestershire County Council as the local highway authority.

Gloucestershire County Council as Statutory Consultee

- 2.1.3. The Scheme is situated wholly within the boundaries of GCC. It is therefore a statutory consultee for the Scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(c) of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).
- 2.1.4. GCC is the local highway authority in Gloucestershire and is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) for Gloucestershire. GCC also has statutory duties in relation to drainage and flood risk, and heritage assets and archaeology.
- 2.1.5. GCC also has statutory duties relating to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and therefore will consider provision for walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH) within the Scheme.

2.2. The Role of National Highways

- 2.2.1. The application includes improvements to the Strategic Road Network (“SRN”) controlled by National Highways as well as improvements to the local road network managed by GCC’s Highways Authority. Therefore, National Highways have been a collaborator on aspects of the Scheme related to the SRN as these elements will be handed over to the National Highways Operations Directorate upon scheme completion. National Highways also perform a separate role as a prescribed consultee under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. This SoCG contains record of engagement with, and matters raised by National Highways in their role as a prescribed consultee rather than their role as collaborator on the Scheme.
- 2.2.2. GCC has been in consultation with National Highways during the development of the scheme’s design, including the optioneering process, non-statutory and statutory consultation in February 2022, further targeted consultation in June 2023 and S42 and S56 consultations. Consultation has continued throughout preliminary design, pre-application stage, post DCO acceptance stage, Pre-examination including Relevant Representation received by Highways England (APP-147) and into the Examination through a series of meetings. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the Scheme.
- 2.2.3. During statutory and non-statutory consultations, National Highways is a statutory consultee for the Scheme, as defined under section 42(1)(b) and section 43(c) of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).
- 2.2.4. A section 278 agreement (or s278) is a section of the Highways Act 1980 that allows developers to enter into a legal agreement with the local authority to make permanent alterations or improvements to a public highway, as part of a planning approval.

2.3. Summary of consultation

- 2.3.1. The engagement outlined in Table 2-1 - covers consultation with National Highways and engagement which pertains to matters raised in this SoCG. Other exchanges, such as requests for information or clarification points are not detailed below but are available on request.

~~2.3.2. The Applicant and National Highways have been actively engaging and this sentiment is echoed in the National Highways D2 submission (REP2-014).~~

~~2.3.3. National Highways and the Applicant continue to seek to resolve issues raised in the PADSS and in this SoCG with the Applicant and National Highways will provide an update to the PADSS (and SoCG) at Deadline 3.~~

2.3.2. The consultation with National Highways to date is set in Table 2-1 - .

Table 2-1 - Consultation with National Highways

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters Discussed
10/06/2021	Email	National Highways	Update on intended date for preferred route announcement
16/06/2021	Email	National Highways	Update on intended date for preferred route announcement
07/12/2021	Email	National Highways	Sharing of stakeholder pack
10/12/2021	Email	National Highways	Issuing of public consultation documents
10/02/2021	Email	National Highways	Receipt of National Highways representation to statutory consultation
12/05/2021	Email	National Highways	Response provided to National Highways' feedback to statutory consultation
09/01/2022	Email	Atkins, National Highways Environment	Email sent requesting a meeting with National Highways to discuss the SoCG.
07/07/2022	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, GCC project team, Atkins planning team	Meeting held to update National Highways on the progress of the Scheme and to agree their approach to undertaking the SoCG. At this stage National Highways indicated that the initial SoCG draft should be shared with them at the point of receiving the draft DCO.
06/2021 to 10/2023	Meeting series - Virtual	National Highways, GCC project team, Atkins project team	Regular weekly progress meetings to provide updates on progress and discuss key design changes or issues.
06/2021 to 10/2023	Meeting series - Virtual	National Highways, GCC project team, Atkins project team	Fortnightly meetings to discuss key issues.
06/2021 to 10/2023	Meeting series - Virtual	National Highways, GCC project team, GCC management	Six weekly programme board meetings to provide project board (NH member) with progress updates and for project board to make key project decisions

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters Discussed
		team, Atkins project team	
03/08/2023	Meeting Virtual	National Highways	Meeting to discuss matter reference 19.1 about National Highways requirements around Carbon Management Plan and reporting.
06/2021 to 10/2023	Emails	National Highways	Relevant PCF products issued initially for review and then for approval following updates to address NH comments
01/2024 to date	Meeting series virtual	National Highways, GCC PM,	Weekly meetings. Items discussed include governance, key matters and project management.
05/03/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, GCC PM, AtkinsRéalis Project Team, Burges Salmon	SoCG Working Group held to discuss NH comments on the dDCO in the comments tracker spreadsheet.
06/03/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, GCC PM, AtkinsRéalis Project Team (including Project Management and Planning team)	SoCG Working Group held to discuss the data-modelling that to be shared with NH, and to inform NH of when information is likely to be available.
08/03/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, GCC PM, AtkinsRéalis project team (including Project Management, Environment and Planning)	SoCG Working Group to discuss environmental matters raised by NH in the draft SoCG.
12/03/2024 – to date	Meeting series Virtual	National Highways, GCC, AtkinsRéalis PM	Fortnightly SoCG catch up meetings (SoCG working group).
29/04/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, Burges Salmon, GCC, Carter Jonas, AtkinsRéalis PM	Discussion on land acquisition.
09/05/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, GCC, AtkinsRéalis PM, AtkinsRéalis Planning and Traffic Modelling	To discuss National Highways review of traffic models issued on 26 March including Paramics modelling. Further meeting to be held following AtkinsRéalis review of National Highways Technical Note on modelling.

Date	Method	Parties concerned	Matters Discussed
13/05/2024	Meeting Virtual	National Highways, Burges Salmon, GCC, Carter Jonas, AtkinsRéalis PM	Lands workshop to discuss high level principles to acquiring land through Compulsory Acquisition. Further actions agreed to be discussed at further meeting to be arranged.
03/07/2024	Meeting virtual	National Highways, GCC, Atkins Réalis	To discuss National Highways comments on the Saturn modelling.
10/07/2024	Meeting virtual	GCC and NH Legal meeting	To discuss National Highways concerns relating to the DCO, articles, schedules and protective provisions.

3. Matters Agreed

3.1.1. Table 3-1 shows those matters which have been agreed, including the topic, the issue and position and the date and method by which it was agreed. ~~There is also a reference to the National Highways Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) (REP1-059) where the Applicant considers matters have been agreed in the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1, but due to deadline cross overs, some matters in the PADSS are now considered resolved.~~

Table 3-1 - Matters agreed between the Applicant and National Highways

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
1. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)				
<u>1.1 Requirements</u>	<u>National Highways have concerns regarding requirements 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 and request that any discharge of requirements is for the SoS throughout the entire suite of DCO documentation.</u>	<u>Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 21).</u>	<u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>1.2 Limits of Deviation</u>	<u>National Highways have concerns regarding limits of deviation and request that GCC confirm that the design and any implications of implementing, for example a full 2m downward LoD in respect of NH assets and adjacent to them has been considered. NH also wish to seek further clarity regarding the assessment of horizontal LoD within the limits of the order.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 25 (5)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>1.3 Schedule 2 Requirements</u>	<u>National Highways request that any assets to be handed over to</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>24</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<u>National Highways upon scheme completion are clearly subject to the agreement of National Highways to ensure that the asset is acceptable to National Highways, including but not limited to fencing, landscaping, drainage and noise mitigation.</u>	<u>the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 31 (2)).</u>		
<u>1.4 Article 14</u>	<u>National Highways request that the wording, inventory and associated plans in relation to adoption of the assets are subject to the agreement of National Highways.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 28 (5)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>1.5 Article 17</u>	<u>National Highways request that the wording in relation to access roads inside the order limits excludes motorways and slip roads</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 25 (4)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>18</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>1.6 Temporary Possession</u>	<u>National Highways require confirmation that all land rights necessary to access all (current and proposed) Strategic Road Network assets affected by the project have been included in the DCO/land requirements.</u>	<u>Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 11).</u>	<u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>1.7 Article 2</u>	<u>National Highways are concerned that 'pre-construction mitigation works' referred to within the definition of 'commence' in Article 2 are not defined.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 25 (3)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>1.8 Requirement 3</u>	<u>National Highways notes that Requirement 3(2)(e) does not clearly set out appropriate working hours on Sundays. National Highways further requests that Requirement 3(4) require consultation with National Highways on the proposed EMP 3rd Iteration. National Highways requests (as noted above) that this requirement is discharged by the SoS.</u>	<u>Working hours resolved via amends to draft DCO at Deadline 2.</u>	<u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u>	<u>20, 21</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>1.9 Requirement 6</u>	<p><u>National Highways requests the wording in relation to the liability of replacing trees and shrubs within 5 years of planting is clarified to make this the responsibility of Gloucestershire County Council, and that this is included in the aftercare package between Gloucestershire County Council and the Principal Contractor.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways also requests that the aftercare package agreement between Gloucestershire County Council and the Principal Contractor is provided for National Highways oversight to ensure that the agreement is in accordance with National Highways operational requirements, e.g. the use of Species Rich Grasses and the application of MPI-85.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways request that the aftercare package is to be agreed with National Highways to ensure that the package is maintainable by National Highways and reflects the existing landscaping packages already in place on the Strategic Road Network.</u></p>	<p><u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 31 (2)).</u></p>	<p><u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u></p>	<p><u>24</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>1.10 Requirement 14</u>	<u>National Highways request clarity in relation to noise mitigation measures that will be handed over to NH for operation and maintenance are subject to agreement with National Highways throughout detailed design and handover.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 28 (5)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>1.11 Article 11</u>	<u>National Highways request that this Article is drafted to ensure that the power in relation to street works cannot be exercised over the Strategic Road Network without consent from National Highways.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 35).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>1.12 Article 25</u>	<u>National Highways request a review of the interaction with NH lands to confirm re-rerouting of PRoWs in both the temporary and permanent case.</u>	<u>Expressed by NH not to be a DCO drafting concern. Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 11).</u>	<u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>1.13 Freehold of subsoil</u>	<u>National Highways request that all interests within the Strategic Road Network in relation to the freehold of subsoil, including that on unregistered highway</u>	<u>The revised PPs as submitted at D5 resolve this issue given the provisions in relation to design and construction.</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>11</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<u>land, is transferred to National Highways.</u>			
4.241.14 Status of SoCG	National Highways note that the Statement of Common Ground as submitted by the Applicant in the December 2023 application is historic and not reflective of the current working position with Gloucestershire County Council. National Highways would like to note they will work with the Applicant to update this as necessary throughout the Development Consent Order process.	Noted and why this SoCG has been re-structured. This updated SoCG provides an up to date position between National Highways and GCC and will continue to be updated to keep the ExA informed of the latest position between parties.	Agreed for SoCG submission at Deadline 3.	N/A
2. Environment Statement including carbon reporting				
2.1 Carbon Reporting	National Highways request GCC consultation in respect to carbon reporting for the construction period since this will be the responsibility with Gloucester County Council.	Noted and agreed.	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	29 (Medium)
2.2 Land Management	National Highways requests confirmation of any changes to land management and/or the short list of development included in the cumulative assessments over the last 2-4 years is provided by Gloucestershire County Council. National Highways also requests further information in relation to the justification of the	The request from NH clarified as to be regarding the details of the RFFPs (reasonably foreseeable future projects) and their assessment within the Environmental Statement (ES). The list of RFFPs was last updated in August 2023 and the current ES has been assessed against this list. This is presented in Chapter 15	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	approach to the assessment and why this hasn't been updated reporting to reference a more up to date baseline.	(Cumulative Effects Assessment) of the ES, as submitted to PINS.		
2.3 Mitigation	National Highways requests further information from Gloucestershire County Council is provided in relation to references in the Environmental Statement where other projects provide mitigation to the expected impacts of the M5 J10 scheme (e.g., noise impacts and air quality) and request that these associated developments are referenced in the do-min scenario for the Environmental Impact Assessment if they are works to be carried out in advance.	The associated developments referred to were Coombe Hill Junction Improvements, and Arle Court Park and Ride. Chapter 1 of the ES (Section 1.1) describes how these two schemes have been managed, and that they are not included as part of the ES for the M5 J10 Improvements Scheme (as set out in the Transport Assessment APP-138).	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	N/A
2.4 Flood Assessments	National Highways requests information regarding any agreements within the Environmental Assessment on the approach to modelling the Flood Risk Assessment. In particular, further evidence is requested in relation to advice given by the Environmental Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities on the climate change allowances used and whether these represent a precautionary position (the FRA	Climate change allowances are assigned based on vulnerability of the receptors. A categorisation of essential infrastructure means a climate change allowance of 53% applies. Early discussions with the Environment Agency around the Link Road suggested that this may not be categorised as essential infrastructure. If it is not essential infrastructure, then a lower allowance for climate	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	seems to suggest the EA advised they could use a lower % for climate change allowance for the link road compared to the upper central allowance used (53%).	change could be assigned. The FRA indicates this, but then assessed flood risk with a single climate change allowance (the higher 53% figure) on a precautionary basis. The assessment undertaken is described in Appendix 8.1 (Flood Risk Assessment).		
2.5 Noise	National Highways requests that further information is provided by Gloucestershire County Council in relation to any agreements with National Highways on any indicated night closures.	The Applicant agrees to this.	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	N/A
2.6 Noise barriers	National Highways request confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council that M5 J10 has been represented in the baseline scenario in relation the Noise Policy Statement for England with specific reference to noise barriers as it appears that the compliance has been modelled upon a separate project completed in advance of proposed development.	The assessment undertaken for M5 J10 assumes that Arle Court and Coombe Hill schemes will be completed in advance of the construction of M5 J10 (as set out in the Transport Assessment APP-138).	Agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024	N/A
2.7 Biodiversity net gain	National Highways request that the biodiversity net gain unit loss/gain related to the Strategic Road Network is	The BNG assessment undertaken is for the Scheme as a whole. There is no	Principles agreed at SoCG working group 08/03/2024. Level of detail remains to be resolved (PADSS point	30 (Medium)

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p>clarified by Gloucestershire County Council. National Highways also request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm and agree any maintenance obligations which are reliant on National Highways due to being the guardian of the Strategic Road Network which may support a project wider BNG position.</p>	<p>separate calculation for the SRN. The BNG Scores reported in the DCO are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terrestrial habitats +11.59% - Hedgerows +15.96% - Rivers and Streams +34.19% - Ditches +23.38% <p>The BNG assessment (and subsequent reporting) are based on the Scheme's landscaping and planting design. These have been developed in line with NH's requirements (for the SRN areas), and GCC's planting and maintenance of road verges requirements for the non-SRN elements. These details are presented in the LEMP (Annex B5 of the EMP 1st iteration). All management and maintenance requirements will be agreed with NH.</p>	<p>30 as captured in 2.2 of Matters Outstanding)</p>	
<p>2.42.8 Carbon Management Plan</p>	<p>National Highways request visibility and agreement of the carbon management reporting for the project to ensure the promotion of lower whole life carbon choices, including</p>	<p>The carbon reporting in the ES uses the NH carbon tool. All reporting is Scheme wide and there is no separation for the Strategic Road Network</p>	<p>Agreed 23/07/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 3 <u>on 30 July 2024</u></p>	<p>29 (medium)</p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	visibility and agreement of construction carbon datasets, operation and maintenance datasets and road user emissions.	<p>aspects. Further work is to be taken up by ECI contactor.</p> <p>It was discussed in the SoCG meeting on the 8/3/24 that the way data is recorded within NH is under review and there is an obligation for NH to understand SRN impacts. The NH team were reviewing the requirements internally for future reporting.</p> <p>Copy of the Carbon Management Plan (Annex B16 of the EMP 1st iteration) to be shared with NH.</p> <p>23/07 NH confirms visibility of the Applicants, NH PCF compliant, CMP product for future stages is sufficient, including TAG compliant reporting of Operational carbon and DRMB compliant reporting assessment and use of the NH carbon tool.</p>		
<p><u>2.1 Environmental Statement (item 30 from PADSS)</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request clarification on the approach taken to Biodiversity Net Gain in respect to the Strategic Road Network.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways require clarity from the Applicant in respect of any National Highways maintenance obligations on the SRN</u></p>	<p><u>Resolved - control via the REAC and EMP.</u></p> <p><u>The location and preliminary design of these habitats is shown on the Environmental Masterplan (Application document TR010063/APP/2.13). - Implemented through the detailed design. - Details of</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024</u></p>	<p><u>30</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<u>including how these align to the REAC.</u>	<u>how the habitat creation measures will be implemented, managed, and monitored will be within the EMP (2nd iteration). Completion, approval and implementation of the 2nd iteration EMP, is secured by DCO Schedule 2, Requirement 3(1) and 3(3).</u>		
<u>3. Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments</u>				
3.1 para 1.2.1	National Highways require that the wording needs to cover the Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ) around retained tree areas.	Agreed, request to change the wording in the REAC.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission <u>on 18 June 2024</u>	27 (High) N/A
3.2 G1	National Highways require that the 3rd iteration EMP (Handover EMP) must be developed and completed 'in draft' by the end of construction and planting on site. The final version is required for handover at the end of the establishment / aftercare period. For end of construction the 3rd iteration EMP must be issued to National Highways and acknowledged by this team as an acceptable draft. The 3rd iteration EMP must comprise the draft handover report and draft handover plans.	The Applicant is in agreement with National Highways request.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission <u>on 18 June 2024.</u>	21 (High)

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p>These are required to enable a joint inspection at the completion of planting and will trigger the start of the establishment / aftercare period if the condition of landscape planting is agreed to be acceptable by National Highways. The HEMP plans must be readable when printed at A3 size.</p> <p>Approval of the 3rd iteration EMP, all versions (draft at the end of construction, interim drafts during the establishment period, and the final version at handover), will require acceptance by National Highways.</p>			
3.3 reference B5	National Highways require that the EMP and REAC recognise national biosecurity issues, not just those identified within the curtilage of the Scheme.	Agreed, and this can be carried through to the EMP at the 2 nd iteration .	SoCG Deadline 1 submission <u>on 18 June 2024.</u>	N/A
3.4 reference B6	National Highways require that the Applicant provide the Arboricultural Impact Assessment for National Highways review and reference.	This is a DCO Application document APP-116 (Part 1) and APP-117 (Part 2)).	SoCG Deadline 1 submission <u>on 18 June 2024</u>	N/A
3.5 reference B9	National Highways requested that the text regarding 'shrubs with trees' is updated as this is no longer recognised by ADMM.	The Applicant considers this is a reference to the text in the REAC and a key on the Environmental Masterplan.	Agreed for SoCG submission at Deadline 3 <u>on 30 July 2024.</u>	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		Agreed that this will be carried through in the detailed design.		
<u>3.6 reference B13</u>	<u>National Highways require further information regarding the replacement planting of 10 years, i.e. is this an EPS licence requirement stipulated by Natural England and is this applicable to all planting or only specific mitigation locations.</u>	<u>PPs are still being discussed with National Highways with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-003) which reflect discussions to date and which the Applicant considers addresses this issue (PP 31 (2)).</u>	<u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u>	<u>24</u>
3.7	National Highways require that any of the construction-related undertakings of actions and commitments are to the responsibility of the Applicant. National Highways require that any operational commitments in relation to the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments are to the agreement of National Highways.	On the basis that these are commitments then they will be for the Applicant to deliver under the contract (through detailed design, where applicable, initially and then in the construction phase).	SoCG Deadline 1 submission <u>on 18 June 2024</u>	21 (High)
<u>4. Land Plans, Book of Reference, Statement of Reasons</u>				
Currently no matters agreed <u>4.1 Land acquisition</u>	<u>National Highways request a review with the Applicant of the National Highways land interests and all lands associated with the</u>	<u>The Applicant understands that the approach to acquisition of NH's land is now agreed with NH. The dDCO</u>	<u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u>	<u>11, 26</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>construction, planned handover, operation and maintenance to ensure that the proposed land and its DCO status facilitates the foregoing.</u></p>	<p><u>has been amended to address concerns.</u> <u>Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 11).</u></p>		
<p><u>4.2 Land Access – Easements</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways require easements over the private land side of any fencing for future maintenance/ replacement min 5mts width required.</u> <u>National Highways require easements over the private land for any outfalls, ditches and or buried pipelines that are to remain in NH ownership for future maintenance/ replacement min 5mts width required each side of the apparatus.</u> <u>National Highways require easements over private land to any land locked plots for future maintenance min 10mts required.</u> <u>National Highways require easements over private land to any Culverts not deemed structures for future maintenance min 10mts required .</u> <u>National Highways require easements over private land to any structures for future</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that all land and rights necessary to access all SRN assets (current and proposed) affected by the scheme have been included in the Book of Reference. Suitable easements can be included so far as necessary as part of the PPs should agreement not be reached with NH in the side agreement.</u> <u>Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 9).</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u></p>	<p><u>9</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>maintenance min 10mts required</u></p> <p><u>National Highways require easements for access and the rights for future maintenance in relation to all assets to be adopted by National Highways for operation and maintenance.</u></p>			
<u>4.3 Statement of Reasons</u>	<p><u>National Highway request further details of the breakdown of works as they do not follow the structure of Schedule 1 of the DCO.</u></p>	<p><u>High level principles agreed by NH at Legal Meeting held 10 July. Plot by plot review has been shared with National Highways.</u></p> <p><u>5. TransportThe Applicant understands that this is no longer an issue. Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (including traffic modelling PADSS items 9 &11).</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u></p>	<u>26</u>
<u>4.4 Streets, Right of Way and Access Plans – sheet 5 of 16</u>	<p><u>Omission of a viewport to show stopping up on sheet 5 of 16 of Street, Right of Way and Access Plans.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways requests that an insert to the drawings is added to show the stopping up of the old N/B on slip road under the junction overbridge.</u></p>	<p><u>Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 32).</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways PADSS submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October 2024 (REP5-038).</u></p>	<u>32</u>
<u>4.5 Diminution of property values</u>	<p><u>Part 1 compensation claims for diminution of property values caused by physical factors</u></p>	<p><u>Protective provisions are still being discussed with NH with the aim of an agreed form</u></p>	<p><u>Revised PPs submitted at Deadline 5 on 1st October (REP5-003).</u></p>	<u>12</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>(Inclusion of Part 1 claims)</u>	arising from new works – liability to remain with Applicant - National Highways requires confirmation that any Part 1 claims for compensation will remain the responsibility of the Applicant to settle and that the Applicant will retain all liability for compensation payments arising out of CA after the SRN Assets are transferred to National Highways.	being submitted to the ExA. Notwithstanding those discussions, a revised set of PPs were submitted at deadline (D5) which reflect discussions to date and which GCC consider address all the issues raised in relation to the PPs.		
<u>4.1 Land Parcel 5/2n (new item from PADSS)</u>	National Highways request that parcel 5/2n, which appears to leave the redundant length of the old northbound on slip road loop in situ, including carriageway and retained vegetation, with the maintenance track pushed to west of works, is redesigned so that the maintenance track is designed adjacent to scheme earthworks and that the redundant length of the slip and existing vegetation is removed/integrated into the scheme. The land and works plans will require amendment.	This issue will be resolved by changes to the land and works plans as required (linked to Change Application 2).	Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024	<u>7</u>
<u>5 Transport (including modelling)</u>				

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<p>5.7.5.1 Transport Assessment Chapter 4: Scheme Proposals, Para 4.2.4</p>	<p>National Highways requests that the location of the access to farmland is confirmed by Gloucestershire County Council.</p>	<p>General Arrangement Plans for the Scheme, that show the locations of access to farmland, have been submitted with the DCO application (APP-014 and APP-015). The access to farmland referred to in the scheme description of TA is the existing farm track that is currently accessed off the A4019 where the M5 southbound off-slip merges with the A4019 eastbound, which is an inherently unsafe location for an access. The Scheme amends this access so that it is incorporated into the signal-controlled junction of the A4019 with the West Cheltenham Link Road. See Sheet 12 of the General Arrangement Plans (APP-015)</p>	<p>Agreed 24/07/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline <u>30 July 2024</u></p>	<p>3 (Medium)</p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<p>Funding</p> <p><u>5.2 Transport Assessment</u></p>	<p>National Highways are unable to support the scheme without full visibility of the transport modelling in order to confirm the findings of the transport assessment. National Highways require the full modelling package including but not limited to future year modelling, slip road design, travel time variances, capacity, modelled queues, model calibration, construction scenarios, signal modelling, local road/SRN interactions, model validation, development assumptions.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling first shared with NH Spatial Planning on 03/2024.</p> <p>Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24.</p> <p>Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24.</p> <p>Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24.</p>	<p>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</p>	<p><u>1, 2 & 4</u></p>
<p>Currently no matters agreed</p> <p><u>5.3 Transport Assessment Chapter 1.2.4 (Scheme background)</u></p>	<p>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information regarding the dependencies between the developments at Coombe Hill and Arle Court Park and Ride development in respect to M5 Junction 10.</p> <p>National Highways have concerns regarding the Coombe Hill development should this not occur and the impacts of this on the cumulative assessments as submitted in the draft</p>	<p>Appendix A of the Traffic Forecasting Report (APP-142) contains the Uncertainty Log that lists proposed developments in the model area and categorises the likelihood of them being implemented in accordance with TAG. The Uncertainty Log indicates which proposed developments are included in the traffic modelling for the Core scenario for each of the forecast years of assessment.</p> <p>Coombe Hill is referred to as Land at A38/A4019 Jct in the</p>	<p>Agreed following discussions with National Highways.. 01/10/2024.</p>	<p><u>1</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>Development Consent Order application.</u></p>	<p><u>Uncertainty Log and is included in the Core scenario (100% complete by 2027). Arle Court Park and Ride development is referred to as Christ College Arle Road, Cheltenham Gloucestershire, GL51 8LE in the Uncertainty Log and is included in the Core scenario (100% complete by 2027). A list of proposed developments that are dependent on the implementation of the M5 junction 10 Improvement Scheme is provided in Table 6 of the Traffic Forecasting Report.</u></p> <p><u>Neither the Coombe Hill or the Arle Court Park and Ride developments are dependent on the M5 junction 10 Improvement Scheme being implemented.</u></p>		

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<p>Construction</p> <p><u>5.4 Transport Assessment Chapter 2: Planning Policy</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm how the scheme of works are compliant with 01/22 circular and Planning for the Future (2023) documentation.</u></p>	<p><u>Chapter 2 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) provides a review of the national, regional and local transport related policy relevant to the Scheme. Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/22- Strategic Road Network the delivery of sustainable development and National Highways' (NH) Planning for the Future - A guide to working with National Highways on planning matters (2023) are not referenced in either the Transport Assessment or the Planning Statement (APP-135). This is because both the DfT and NH documents explain how NH will engage with the planning system.</u></p> <p><u>7- GCC has engaged with NH throughout the evolution and development of the Scheme in accordance with these documents."</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways.. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>5</u></p>
<p><u>5.5 Transport Assessment Chapter 3: Baseline conditions</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requested that Gloucestershire County Council update the Personal Injury Analysis in relation to the nature of serious and fatal accidents on the SRN. This will allow National Highways to</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant has updated the Transport Assessment to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Include reference to relevant policy and guidance that has been updated since the original TA was prepared.</u> 	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways.. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>5</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>understand what current major PIAs are known and understand if further analysis is required to mitigate issues for any areas of concern in relation to the proposed design for the Strategic Road Network.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Report on the outcomes of updated operational (Paramics) traffic modelling that has been undertaken to address refinements to the model as suggested by National Highways.</u> • <u>Reference to latest recorded personal injury accidents, reflecting data that has subsequently become available since the original TA was prepared.</u> • <u>Provide additional and more detailed information on the impacts of the Scheme on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</u> • <u>Provide information on forecast construction traffic generation for both vehicles delivering materials and equipment and the workforce.</u> 		
<p><u>5.6 Transport Assessment Chapter 5: Traffic Modelling, Section 5.11</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the difference between the strategic and operational model to understand the differences and potential impacts between Saturn and Paramics matrices to ensure where there are alternative</u></p>	<p><u>Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) describes the approach to the traffic modelling. The Appendices to the Transport Assessment provide more detailed information on the traffic modelling, specifically Appendix J - Transport Model</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>routes to the M5, that traffic assignment is similar in both models.</u></p>	<p><u>Package (APP-140), Appendix K – Traffic Data Package Report (APP-141) and Appendix L – Traffic Forecasting Report (APP-142).</u></p> <p><u>Figure 8 in the Transport Assessment shows the geographical coverage of the Strategic Traffic Model (Gloucestershire Countywide Traffic Model (GCTM)). Figure 9 in the Transport Assessment shows the geographical coverage of the Operational (PARAMICS) Traffic Model.</u></p> <p><u>Outputs from the demand matrices of a cordoned section of the Strategic Model, corresponding to the area of covered by the Operational Traffic Model, have been used to provide the inputs to the traffic demand matrices for the Operational Traffic Model.</u></p> <p><u>The road network covered by the Operational Traffic Model offers no alternative routes for traffic using the M5 and offers virtually no practical alternatives routes for traffic using the rest of the road network within the modelled area. Consequently, the routing, or assignment, of traffic in the Operational Traffic</u></p>		

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>Model is consistent with that for the Strategic Traffic Model.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.7 Transport Assessment Chapter 6: Scheme Assessment Methodology, Section 6.4.1</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requests that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the sample size of seeded runs is appropriate to the variability of the future year model and if any of the model runs appear to be a significant outlier from the others.</u></p>	<p><u>Section 6 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) confirms that the Operational Traffic Model has been run for all the modelled scenarios with 10 different random seeds (sample size of seeded runs) to account for the daily variability of the traffic arrival patterns and network operation.</u></p> <p><u>Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling is based on 15 seed runs per scenario.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>4</u></p>
<p><u>5.8 Transport Assessment Chapter 7: Scheme Assessment, Section 7.2</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requested that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the interpretation of the traffic flow</u></p>	<p><u>The flow difference plots in Appendix B of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) provide peak hour traffic flow</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>differences identified for the Strategic Road Network.</u></p>	<p><u>differences for the model impact area covering two comparisons of scenarios, namely with the Scheme, but without Dependent Development compared with the do-minimum (Scenarios S vs P) and with both the Scheme and Dependent Development compared to the do-minimum (Scenarios R vs P) for both the opening (2027) and horizon (2042) years. The results shown in the difference plots are generally as expected. In Scenarios S v P comparison, that shows the impact of the Scheme in isolation, there is re-routing of some of the existing traffic which take advantage of the proposed south-facing slip roads at junction 10, which results in some increases in traffic flows along the M5 between junctions 10 and 11. The Scenarios R v P comparison, that shows the impact of both the Scheme and Dependent Development in combination, shows a notable amount of extra traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed Dependent Development in addition to</u></p>		

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>the rerouted traffic due to the proposed south-facing slip roads, particularly on the M5 between junctions 10 and 11 and on the A4019.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.9 Transport Assessment Chapter 7: Scheme Assessment, Table 9</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the location(s) that are causing the travel time increase on Route 3 WB (A4019 E to M5 N) for the 'with scheme' scenario 2027 AM peak.</u></p>	<p><u>Most of the additional delay for this journey time route during the AM peak is due to the introduction of several new signal-controlled junctions along the A4019 as part of the proposed Scheme. These signal-controlled junctions are necessary to provide access for the Dependent Developments and control the resultant additional development generated traffic.</u></p> <p><u>Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increase for Route 3.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>4</u></p>
<p><u>5.10 Transport Assessment Chapter 7.</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requested that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>4</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>Scheme Assessment, Table 10</u>	<u>location(s) that are causing the travel time increase on Route 3 WB (A4019 E to M5 N) for the 'with scheme' scenario 2027 PM peak as there is insufficient information to ascertain if this impact relates to the A4019 or the M5.</u>	<u>provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>		
<u>5.11 Transport Assessment Chapter 8 Table 15</u>	<u>National Highways requested that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the 33% increase in total network travel time (hours) and a 7% increase in the average journey time for the 2024 AM peak as this suggests the scheme has a detrimental impact in some locations.</u>	<u>The additional total network travel time is due to a combination of the extra traffic generated by the Dependent Developments and the introduction of additional signal-controlled junctions along the A4019 as part of the Scheme.</u> <u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>4 & 5</u>
<u>5.12 Transport Assessment Chapter 8: Cumulative Assessment, Figure 20</u>	<u>National Highways requested that the assessment of the where the predicted journey time increase of up to 10 minutes may occur along the M5 NB route is provided.</u>	<u>Figure 20 in the Transport Assessment (APP-138) shows the variance in northbound journey times over the 10 seeded runs undertaken for the Operational Traffic Modelling for the AM peak period, covering the whole of Journey Time Route 2 along the M5. The maximum increase in the AM peak journey time over the 10 seeded runs is 10 minutes, but</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>3, 4 & 5</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>the average increase is just over two minutes compared to the Do-minimum Scenario (Scenarios R v P), as presented in Table 19 of the Transport Assessment.</u></p> <p><u>The additional journey time is in the vicinity of the northbound junction 10 diverge and is due to the extra traffic generated by the Dependent Developments.</u></p> <p><u>Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24.</u></p> <p><u>The revised modelling is based on 15 seed runs per scenario. The revised modelling also shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increases.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.13 Transport Assessment Chapter 10: Assessment of Highway Network During Construction</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requested zoomed in V/C plots of M5 J9 and M5 J11 as it is currently impossible to ascertain the predicted impacts at the current scale of the plans.</u></p>	<p><u>There are 15 V/C plots in Appendix M of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) supporting Chapter 10 which details the assessment of highway network during construction. The plots cover the Do-minimum and four different closure scenarios for three modelled time periods.</u></p> <p><u>Gloucester County Council</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1, 5</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>request that NH confirm it requires zoomed out V/C plots for all 15 plots in Appendix M, which will result in 30 new plots. Given the pattern of impact is the same during the three modelled periods, GCC suggest a sample for each of the closure phases and the Do-minimum scenario for one period (AM peak or PM peak) would be sufficient. This will generate six new plots that are likely to provide sufficient information for NH to understand the impacts during construction of the Scheme.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.14 Transport Assessment Chapter 18</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requests confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council to confirm the suitability of flows used in the model validated for a 2017 base year and any comparisons between the 2017-present day (including the impact of COVID flows).</u></p>	<p><u>GCC has undertaken further traffic modelling work to confirm its validity, accounting for the impact of COVID-19 on travel patterns and demand. This is reported in the Transport Supplementary Report (AS-046) which has been shared this with NH. Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>2</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.15 Transport Assessment</u></p>	<p>National Highways request evidence of the calibration of M5 flows as this currently does not appear to show any calibration of flows on the M5 mainline.</p>	<p>Both the Strategic and Operational Traffic Models have been calibrated and validated in full accordance with TAG and pass the relevant TAG traffic modelling calibration and validation acceptance criteria. Calibration and validation of the Strategic Traffic Model is set out in the Chapters 5 and 10 of the Traffic Model Package (APP-140) which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment (APP-138). Baseline traffic flows on the M5 from the Strategic Traffic Model have been calibrated and validated against observed data as shown in Figure 8-1 of the Traffic Model Package. Figures 10-4, 10-5 and 10-6, as well as Table 10-5 of the Traffic Model Package demonstrate that the baseline modelled flows along the M5 north and south of junction 10 all pass the TAG criteria when compared to observed flows.</p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1, 2</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<p><u>5.16 Transport Assessment (same as 5.18)</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request evidence of the queue length calibration of the comparison of modelled and observed queue lengths and confirmation of if this assessment has been undertaken during calibration.</u></p>	<p><u>Both the Strategic and Operational Traffic Models have been calibrated and validated in full accordance with TAG and pass the relevant TAG traffic modelling calibration and validation acceptance criteria. Calibration and validation of the Strategic Traffic Model is set out in the Chapters 5 and 10 of the Traffic Model Package (APP-140) which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment (APP-138). Calibration and validation of the Operational Traffic Model (Local Model Validation Report (LMVR)) is contained in Appendix H of the Traffic Model Package. The calibration and validation of both the Strategic and Operational traffic models have been undertaken using observed traffic flows and journey times and not observed queue lengths. This approach is compliant with TAG Validation Criteria and Guidance, which specifies traffic flow and journey times as the only required criteria. Nonetheless, as stated in Section 18.6 in Appendix H of the Traffic Modelling Package</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1, 2</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<u>“modelled queuing simulated in the base model runs correlates with the AM and PM peak journey time validation exercise”.</u>		
<u>5.17 Transport Assessment</u>	<u>National Highways request further information in relation to the quote "with more notable queuing intermittently present at the signalised junctions and the M5 J10 southbound on slip" as this appears to contradict the validation of journey times on the M5 SB if sufficient delay is present in this part of the model.</u>	<u>Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24. Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increases.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>5.18 Transport Assessment</u>	<u>National Highways requests confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council to confirm the suitability of flows used in the model validated for a 2017 base year and any comparisons between the 2017-present day (including the impact of COVID flows).</u>	<u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1, 2</u>
<u>5.19 Transport Assessment Appendix J:</u>	<u>National Highways request information related to modelled</u>	<u>Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1, 2</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>Transport Model Package, Table 14.2</u>	<u>journey times validated on 60s TAG criteria is provided to identify how significant the difference between modelled and observed journey times is to demonstrate the model is within a reasonable range of the observed.</u>	<u>detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24. National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>		
<u>5.20 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package, Section 16.5</u>	<u>National Highways requests confirmation in relation to the statement of amendments made to the average signal timings during calibration and if these amendments were also made to factors affecting saturation flows before changing the signal timings.</u>	<u>Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>5.21 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package</u>	<u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide confirmation of how the impacts at the adjacent junctions on the M5, practically Junction 11, is assessed to demonstrate that the scheme is not having a severe impact at these junctions.</u>	<u>M5 junction 11 is not included in the Operational Traffic Model. Therefore, the impact of the Scheme on M5 junctions 9 and 11 has been assessed using the Strategic Traffic Model. The impact of the Scheme on M5 junctions 9 and 11, in terms of changes in total traffic throughput and demand to capacity ratios, will be provided to NH.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>		
<u>5.22 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package</u>	<u>National Highways requests full details of what is included/excluded for Appendix J.</u>	<u>The Transport Assessment (APP-138) lists its appendices and their contents. Appendix J is listed as containing the Model Package Report (APP-140) which refers to the Strategic Traffic Model. Appendix J also includes the Operational Traffic Modelling – Local Model Validation Report, which erroneously is not listed in the Transport Assessment contents under Appendix J. National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>5.23 Transport Assessment Appendix K: Traffic Data Package Report</u>	<u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide the comparison information of 2015 and 2017 base years against the present day data for both GCTM and Paramics models.</u>	<u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>5.24 Transport Assessment Appendix K: Traffic Data Package Report, Figure 2.2</u>	<u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information relating to the validation of journey times on the route</u>	<u>The local road through Staverton and Boddington is included in full in the Strategic Traffic Model, but only in part in the Operational</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1, 2</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>through Staverton and Boddington as journey time data does not provide data for validation of the journey times through these locations. Whilst not being a major road, this information is required as could be a key route choice in the Paramics model and should be included in the journey time validation.</u></p>	<p><u>(PARAMICS) Traffic Model. This route is not included in the journey time calibration/validation of either the Strategic or Operational traffic models.</u></p> <p><u>Also refer to Gloucestershire County Council's response to comment 5.19 above.</u></p> <p><u>24/07 – National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>		
<p><u>5.25 Transport Assessment Appendix L: Traffic Forecasting Report</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways requests that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information regarding the assignment of traffic in Saturn and Paramics to understand any differences or potential impacts on the proposed scheme.</u></p>	<p><u>Please refer to GCC's response to 5.8 above.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1, 2, 4</u></p>
<p><u>5.26 Traffic Modelling GC3M Model</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request the review and endorsement of the GC3M model, including any amendments to the model baseline and scenarios, as this has not been undertaken by</u></p>	<p><u>The Gloucestershire Countywide Traffic Model (GCTM) traffic model has been used for the assessment of Scheme, not the GC3M traffic model.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>1</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<u>National Highways to date and, as such, are unable to confirm that the model is acceptable to National Highways.</u>	<u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>		
<u>5.27 Transport Assessment</u>	<u>National Highways notes that the Transport Assessment indicates that increased traffic levels and V/C ratios predicted along the M5 main-line, imply that the motorway will be operating above capacity between Jcns 10-11.</u> <u>National Highways require full visibility of the traffic models to fully assess this concern.</u>	<u>The Applicant has done further interrogation of the model outputs</u> <u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>5.28 Transport Assessment</u>	<u>National Highways request that further information relating to scheme design including length/type of slips (as supported by traffic modelling) and explanation of 'dependant development' is provided by Gloucestershire County Council.</u>	<u>The full details of the scheme design have been provided in Volume 2 of the submission.</u> <u>Details of dependent developments can be found in Appendix L of the TA (Table 6 of Transport Forecasting Package).</u> <u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>5.29 Transport Assessment</u>	<u>National Highways request that that current flows for M5 J10 (using Webtris) are provided for a comparison for J10 forecast flows since traffic survey data provided in the TA is dated</u>	<u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u>	<u>1, 2</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<u>2017 and then growthed to 2023 levels (using the industry standard TEMPRO).</u>			
5.30 Traffic Assessment	National Highways have concerns that there is no construction traffic or construction related employee traffic included in the traffic assessments as this could be a significant addition to the traffic patterns and flows.	<p>The TA includes four closure scenarios during construction in Chapter 10 in accordance with the current TMP. The TMP will be reviewed during the next stage of the scheme when the information on construction related traffic would be available.</p> <p>Estimates of forecast construction traffic and workforce commuting trips were not available when the traffic modelling of the temporary traffic management arrangements was undertaken. Nonetheless, the construction traffic generated by construction of the scheme will most likely represent a very small proportional increase in traffic volumes on the M5 compared to baseline flows and is, therefore, unlikely to materially alter the outputs of the traffic modelling of the temporary traffic management arrangements as reported in the Transport Assessment (APP-138).</p>	Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.	1

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>Section 2.8 of Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (AS-010) provides the following information:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Estimated size of the construction workforce.</u> - <u>Estimated construction vehicle generation.</u> <p><u>Section B.11.2.14 of the Environment Management Plan Annex B11 – Traffic Management Plan (AS-041) provides information on anticipated construction traffic routes.</u></p> <p><u>National Highways have reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and agree this matter.</u></p>		
<u>5.31 Traffic Management</u>	<p><u>National Highways requested that all Traffic Management will be subject to the agreement of National Highways to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Road Network.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant has shared our TM proposals with NH and seek approval/acceptance where they are deemed to impact the SRN only, e.g. any works on the M5, including the slip road closures and diversion routes (but these are in the DCO anyway).</u></p> <p><u>National Highways has responded to ExA Q15.0.1 on this matter. The dDCO has been amended to address this</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed following discussions with National Highways. 01/10/2024.</u></p>	<p><u>N/A</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<u>issue and is agreed with the Applicant.</u>		
<u>5.32 Merge/Diverge/weaving assessments</u>	<u>National Highways requested further information including traffic flows/modelling to understand if the weaving/merge/diverge provision proposed (as required by CD 122), offer sufficient capacity for the predicted increase in traffic levels. Any assessment also needs to include the impact and safety implications of the new junction proposed between 9 and 10.</u>	<u>This matter is resolved following National Highways' review of DFS information issued on 12.11.24. .</u>	<u>Agreed via email 12.11.2024.</u>	<u>1, 3 and 4</u>
<u>5.33 (new item from PADSS)</u>	<u>National Highways requires clarification from the Applicant that a fully GG119 compliant Road Safety Audit (RSA)has been completed for the DCO design.</u> <u>Furthermore, National Highways require confirmation of what stage RSA has been completed. The response letter implies this is a Stage 1/2 but the report is just that of a Stage 1.</u> <u>National Highways would expect the RSA Stage 2 to be completed after detailed design which National Highways would</u>	<u>The RSA 1 & 2 will be completed by the PC through detailed design.</u>	<u>Agreed via email 15.11.2024.</u>	<u>33</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>require consultation for the SRN elements.</u> More specifically this needs to <u>also include a location plan based on the scheme marked up and referenced to understand the impact on the SRN - see clause 5.3 of GG119.</u></p>			
<p><u>5.34 Slip Roads</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provides a GG104 risk assessment in relation to the design of slip roads and associated traffic modelling analysis specific to the slip roads to outline the proposals potential impact to road user and operational safety</u></p>	<p><u>The design of the Scheme has been undertaken in full accordance with guidance and standards contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). Design development of the Scheme has followed the National Highways (NH) Project control Framework (PCF), with all applicable PCF documents having been signed-off from a governance perspective by NH. This is acknowledged by NH in comment reference 8.1 of this Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). A Safety Report for the Scheme has been submitted to, and signed-off by, NH in accordance with the NH PCF process. The Safety Report includes risk assessments in accordance with GG104 of the DMRB. The proposed designs</u></p>	<p><u>1/10 - The revised Protective Provisions contain amendments to address NH's concerns.</u> <u>Considered resolved as included in revised PPs (PP 25(4))</u></p>	<p><u>3, 33</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>for all the M5 junction 10 slip roads require departures from standard. These have been uploaded onto NH's Departure Approval System (DAS) and NH's Safety, Engineering & Standards (SES) have confirmed provisional agreement to the departures.</u></p> <p><u>The design of the Scheme has also been subject to an independent road safety audit (RSA) and an Audit Response has been prepared by the Scheme design team. These have been issued to, and signed-off by, NH (SES) in accordance with the PCF process and will be issued to the Examining Authority (ExA) by 22/03/24.</u></p> <p><u>The M5 junction 10 slip roads are included in both the Strategic and Operational traffic models."</u></p>		
<p><u>5.1 Transport Assessment Chapter 1.1 (Introduction)</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that the study area of impact at the SRN and rationale of J9 and J11 current conditions or impact to the proposals have to the junction.</u></p>	<p><u>Chapter 11 of the latest version of the Transport Assessment (TA) (REP4-021) specifically reports on the impact of the Scheme on the SRN, including M5 junctions 9 and 11, with Appendices N, O & P providing further detailed information. Chapter 10 of the</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024</u></p>	<p><u>4</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		<p><u>TA also includes further information regarding additional traffic generated during construction of the Scheme and its impact.</u></p> <p><u>Additional modelling completed by the Applicant to demonstrate impacts during construction. Also refer to responses to the ExA's Third Written Questions by both National Highways [REP9-017] and the Applicant [REP9-011]</u></p>		
6. Funding				
<u>6.1 Homes England Infrastructure Funding</u>	<u>National Highways request that the Homes England grant for the project is provided for information to confirm any caveats to funding noting this funding represents some, but not all, of the funding streams and may provide a cash surety mechanism noting the shortfall in committed funds.</u>	<u>NH confirm this matter is resolved.</u>	<u>08/11 via NH review of SoCG.</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>6.4 Commuted sum</u>	<u>National Highways seeks a milestone schedule to provide visibility of when the commuted sum figure will be updated and how this aligns to the detailed design programme.</u>	<u>National Highways and the Applicant have reached an agreement in respect to the Commuted Sum.</u>	<u>Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024</u>	<u>34</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
<u>7 Construction</u>				
7.1 Handover	<p>National Highways require Gloucestershire County Council to adhere to National Highways handover process as presented in the Project Control Framework to allow for the scheme to be operated and maintained by the National Highways.</p> <p>National Highways will require documentation including but not limited to as-built drawings, completed PCF product documentation, assets data and quality records.</p>	The Applicant can adhere to this.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A
7.2 Traffic management	National Highways request that all Traffic Management will be subject to the agreement of National Highways to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Road Network.	As it stands, this request is too general. It goes without saying that the Applicant will need to gain approval for all TM on the SRN. The slip roads will be closed for 9 and 15 months (according to the DCO submission) and TM on the A4019 and B4634 during this time will not affect the SRN. The Applicant propose to share our TM proposals with NH and seek approval/acceptance where they are deemed to impact the SRN only, e.g. any works on	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
		the M5, including the slip road closures and diversion routes		
7.3 Technical Assurance	National Highways will require funding for a Works Examiner to inspect and supervise the construction of National Highways assets. Confirmation is sought from GCC.	The Applicant can adhere to this.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A
7.4 Value Engineering	National Highways would like to confirm that any value engineered solutions on the Strategic Road Network in relation to the detailed design throughout construction are agreed with National Highways to ensure that proposed solutions are within the Operations Directorate capacity for management.	The DCO already requires this.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A
7.5 Closures	National Highways requests confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council to confirm the slip road closure strategy as the summary indicates to a closure of the slip roads onto the M5 for a period of 19 months. This is so that any impacts to the Strategic Road Network and Local Road Network are fully assessed and mitigated as far as reasonably practicable.	DF3 TMP has been reviewed and approved as part of the stage 3 PCF process. This included NH alternate routes for M5 closures, both from J9 and J11 which have been adopted by the Project. The TA and ES submitted with the DCO application also assesses the impacts of the slip road closures. As an additional comment, the slip road closures are described in Chapter 2.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
7.6 Programme	<p>National Highways request that a construction programme is provided to National Highways on a monthly basis to align with Principal Contractor CI32 submissions to Gloucestershire County Council to provide oversight of construction activities to the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>National Highways request that a cost loaded construction programme is regularly provided to NH for oversight of project performance (i.e., CPI/SPI/LEI/BEI).</p>	The Applicant can provide a construction programme but not with cost loading. The Applicant does not understand why NH needs oversight of project performance.	This matter is now agreed with National Highways as cost loaded programme not required and metric elements have been agreed elsewhere. <u>16/07/2024</u>	<u>46N/07/20245A</u>
8. Operation and Maintenance				
8.1 Reservoir	National Highways request consultation throughout the detailed design of the reservoir and surrounding assets to ensure that the proposed solutions are within the Operations Directorate capacity for management for assets to be maintained by National Highways.	The Applicant can adhere to this.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	6- (Low)
8.2 Detailed Design	National Highways would like to reconfirm that the proposed development on the Strategic Road Network will need to be designed as per Safety, Engineering and Standards and	The Applicant can adhere to this.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	Operations Directorate requirements to allow for safe and efficient maintenance upon scheme completion.			
8.58.3 Operations Technical Leadership Group	<p>National Highways request confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council that the project will attend the Operations Technical Leadership Group as required to ensure that best practice is applied throughout scheme design.</p> <p>National Highways seeks confirmation from Gloucester County Council that the actions arising from Stage 3 Ops TLG from February 2022 have been fully addressed and the design submitted for the Development Consent Order does not amend any of these findings.</p>	The actions arising from Stage 3 Ops TLG have been considered as part of the Preliminary design development and the design submitted for the Development Consent Order is not considered to not amend any of the findings raised at the Ops TLG meeting. Please refer to the "Stage 3 Ops TLG Actions" Technical Note (GCCM5J10-ATK-GEN-ZZ-TN-CS-000003_C01.pdf), issued to NH in Sept 2022, which provides additional details of work undertaken to address the actions and NH agreements.	SoCG Deadline 1 submission	N/A
8.4 Access	<u>National Highways request that access onto land parcels affected by the development for future maintenance by the Operations Directorate are applied and agreed with National Highways. This includes, but not limited to, easements over the private land for any outfall, ditches and/or</u>	<u>Plot by plot review has been undertaken by National Highways.</u>	<u>01/10 - Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 9).</u>	<u>8</u>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>buried pipelines that are to remain in National Highways ownership with a minimum 5m width required at each side of the apparatus for maintenance, easements over private land to any land locked plots for future maintenance with minimum 10meters width required, easements over private land with any culverts not deemed as structures for future maintenance with minimum 10 meters width required, easements for any drainage or other national highways assts and the rights to carry out future maintenance to these.</u></p>			
<p><u>8.2 Reservoir</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways would require provision for the drainage asset in relation to the reservoir in the commuted sum figure (£TBC)</u></p>	<p><u>This issue will be resolved by the Applicants Change Application 2 submitted and accepted in examination by the ExA.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024</u></p>	<p><u>6</u></p>
<p><u>8.3 Ownership</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways would like it secured in the DCO and supporting documentation that ownership and maintenance of the reservoir lies with GCC and that responsibility of the construction and maintenance of the M5 southbound on slip embankment, up to formation level, lies with Gloucestershire County Council in accordance</u></p>	<p><u>This issue will be resolved by the Applicants Change Application 2 submitted and accepted in examination by the ExA.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed 25/11/2024 for SoCG submission at Deadline 10 on 28 November 2024</u></p>	<p><u>6</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>with the requirements of the Reservoirs Act 1975 of an above ground reservoir. Ownership and maintenance of the M5 southbound on-slip road drainage to be with National Highways.</u></p>			
<p>9. 9. Project Control Framework and Governance</p>				
<p><u>Currently no matters agreed</u> 9.1 PCF</p>	<p><u>National Highways confirms that its role prior to the acceptance of the DCO was to provide support to the Applicant to ensure that the application documentation met the requirements of governance for projects on the SRN at the Preliminary Design at Project Control Framework Stage 3 (PCF 3). National Highways did not review any products that have been de-scoped from the PCF 3 process or any documents that were sent for National Highways information only at PCF 3 stage. National Highways reviews and advice at PCF 3 are intended to ensure that documents are in accordance with governance requirements and include the chapters, headings and topics that should be covered. The PCF 3 review does not provide any level of technical assurance</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways position is that they have endorsed, for the purposes of joint governance, PCF products rather than approved them. Resolved by National Highways in PADSS submitted at D5 (PADSS item 31).</u></p>	<p><u>Deadline 5 submission 01/10/2024</u></p>	<p><u>31</u></p>

Topic	Matter which has been discussed / agreed	Position	Date and Method of Agreement	PADSS Ref
	<p><u>or endorsement of the scheme's viability or design, nor comment on the accuracy or acceptability of any substantive consent, simply that content is there. The PCF 3 process is to ensure that documents meet governance standards only. If it assists the examination process, a full list of which documents that National Highways reviewed at PCF 3 stage can be provided to the Examining Authority, as well as a list of documents that were de-scoped. National Highways confirms that despite reviewing a selection of documentation for PCF 3 stage, there are a number of matters which were not resolved by the Applicant and National Highways can provide the Examining Authority with further information should this be required.</u></p>			

4. Matters Outstanding

4.1. Principal matters outstanding

4.1.1. The principal matters outstanding between Applicant and National Highways are summarised as follows:

- Draft DCO, Articles and Schedules
- ~~Carbon Management Plan~~
- Traffic modelling
- Funding and Collateral warranties
- ~~Landscaping maintenance – EMP reference B13 – National Highways require further information regarding the replacement planting of 10 years~~
- ~~Approach to land rights acquisition (dialogue between National Highways and the Applicant has resulted in an agreed set of principles that are currently being implemented)~~
- Liabilities
- ~~Reservoir and Ownership~~

4.1.2. Table 4.1 shows those matters that are outstanding between the parties, including that matters reference number, and the status and date of the latest position. This table has been updated to include cross reference to the Points of Concern outlined in National Highways Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) submitted by National Highways at Deadline 1 (REP1-059), ~~and at Deadline 3 (REP3-075) and at Deadline 5 (REP5-038).~~

4.1.3. ~~The PADS Tracker submitted by National Highways will be updated by National Highways. The SoCG with National Highways will be updated alongside the PADSS using track changes to show the amendments and updates made in the PADSS. This SoCG should be read in conjunction with the National Highways PADSS (REP1-059) as updated by National Highways during the examination.~~

4.1.4.1.3. An additional column has been added to record ~~further~~final response from National Highways and its current position on at Deadline 310.

Table 4-1 - Matters outstanding between the Applicant and National Highways

Topic	Position/Matter Raised	Applicant Response/Position at D1(18 June)	Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3	NH response /Latest position at D3/D10	PADSS Point of Concern Number/Ref
1. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)					
4.1 Requirements	National Highways have concerns regarding requirements 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 and request that any discharge of requirements is for the SoS throughout the entire suite of DCO documentation.	NH to provide details of process re discharge of requirements when SoS.	Meeting held with DfT on 12 July with GCC and Joint Councils to explore this approach. The position is being considered by GCC and the Joint Councils.	23/07 – The appropriate decision maker for the Requirements is currently an issue in discussion between the Applicant, the Joint Councils and National Highways	13 (High)
4.21.1 Transfer of Benefits	National Highways have concerns regarding the transfer of benefits in article 10 and request that a bespoke provision is included to the effect that where any transfer to a third party would impact the SRN, the strategic highway authority is consulted and SoS consent needed to transfer benefit to NH.	Considering Amendment to Article 10 which require SoS consent to transfer on face of the order to allow for public visibility and transparency.	In ISH2 NH confirmed that a contractual solution would address its concerns. GCC is awaiting NH's written response to the draft side agreement sent 24 May 2024. <u>23/07 - Discussions continued between Applicant and National Highways.</u>	<u>01/10 - The Applicant does not understand the need for a restriction on the transfer of rights to statutory undertakers as specified by and pursuant to the dDCO and consider NH are sufficiently protected. However, NH have suggested covenants as a way of resolving this issue. This is being considered by the Applicant.</u> 23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways. This is being discussed as part of the side agreement	14 (High)
4.3 Limits of Deviation	National Highways have concerns regarding limits of deviation and request that	The Applicant to provide confirmation of assessment of works re	Legal meeting held 10 July. Response awaited	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	15 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	GCC confirm that the design and any implications of implementing, for example a full 2m downward LoD in respect of NH assets and adjacent to them has been considered. NH also wish to seek further clarity regarding the assessment of horizontal LoD within the limits of the order.	LoD. To explore to capture in side agreement that deviations to SRN works will not be carried out without agreement of NH.	from NH to GCC suggested approach.		
4.5 Schedule 2 Requirements	National Highways request that any assets to be handed over to National Highways upon scheme completion are clearly subject to the agreement of National Highways to ensure that the asset is acceptable to National Highways, including but not limited to fencing, landscaping, drainage and noise mitigation.	Side agreement to capture landscaping agreement of wider assets is included in detailed design approval.	Legal meeting held 10 July. Awaiting NH response to draft side agreement.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	24 (High)
4.6 <u>1.2</u> Article 10	National Highways request further information from Gloucestershire County Council regarding the consent to benefit transfer of the order will occur noting that National Highways are	Scope and mechanism to be discussed.	Legal meeting held 10 July. Awaiting NH response to draft side agreement. <u>23/07 - Discussions continue between</u>	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways 01/10 -The Applicant does not understand the need for a restriction on the transfer of rights to statutory undertakers as	14 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>a consultee as per the requirements.</p> <p>National Highways further requests clarification by Gloucestershire County Council on the proposal mechanism to agree assets to be handed over to National Highways upon scheme completion to ensure that these are within the operational capacity of National Highways South West Operations Directorate.</p>		<p><u>Applicant and National Highways</u></p>	<p><u>specified by and pursuant to the dDCO and consider NH are sufficiently protected. However, NH have suggested covenants as a way of resolving this issue. This is being discussed as part of the side agreement.</u></p>	
<p>4.71.3 Article 13</p>	<p>National Highways request that the effect of article 13 is detailed by Gloucestershire County Council in relation to assets intended to be handed over to National Highways.</p> <p>National Highways request that paragraph 7 should apply to the strategic highway authority as well as the undertaker.</p>	<p>To be explored and included in side agreement in terms of clarification on what highways assets are to be handed over to NH. Amending article also possible should this impact other consultees.</p> <p>Second point - article point likely to be amended but with drafting points in side agreement to protect GCC liabilities in relation to work activities.</p>	<p>Legal meeting held 10 July. Amendment proposed in draft side agreement issued to NH on 24 May. Awaiting NH response.23/07 - <u>Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that Article 13 (together with Article 14) identifies the assets which NH will be taking on. The PPs also protect NH though the certification process.</u></p> <p><u>Under Art 13 construction, alterations and diversions to the M5, as a trunk road, must be completed to NH's reasonable satisfaction. NH must maintain those alterations including any culverts or structures laid under it unless it is otherwise agreed in writing with NH.</u></p>	<p>16 (High)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
				<p><u>Therefore, in the absence of agreement, the assets which NH will be liable to maintain would be those which fall within the boundaries of the trunk road.</u></p> <p><u>This will be obvious in relation to most of the works and Art 14 makes the position clear.</u></p> <p><u>Art 14 states that the roads in Sch 3, Part 1 are to be special roads (trunk roads) and when GCC notify NH that they are complete and open to the public NH becomes the strategic highway for those roads (and therefore are liable for maintenance). Sch 3, Part 1 is prescriptive in respect of the length of the roads to be special roads and cross refers to the classification of roads plans.</u></p> <p><u>23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways. Given these Articles and the PPs, this should be sufficient to define the assets which NH will be</u></p>	

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
				taking on (the PPs prescribe a process for the construction, adoption and maintenance of the specified works).	
1.8 Article 14	National Highways request that the wording, inventory and associated plans in relation to adoption of the assets are subject to the agreement of National Highways.	Unclear what additional provisions NH are seeking here. NH to confirm wording NH is looking for.	Clarification from NH awaited.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	17 (High)
1.9 Article 17	National Highways request that the wording in relation to access roads inside the order limits excludes motorways and slip roads	To explore amendment in the Order referencing both temp and perm access regulated.	Wording proposed to address this. Legal meeting held 10 July. Awaiting NH response to side agreement.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	18 (High)
1.101.4 Protective Provisions	National Highways object to the Protective Provisions in the draft Development Consent Order and believed this leaves both National Highways and the Strategic Road Network exposed to risk. National Highways confirm that these are still to be agreed with Gloucestershire County Council and will continuing discussing this with the Applicant.	Draft alternative protective provisions with NH for consideration. Awaiting response.	Legal meeting held 10 July. Matters raised verbally by NH for consideration, which GCC are considering. Formal response on PPs awaited from NH. NH retain position that notwithstanding what is included in any side agreement, NH's form of PPs to be included on the face of the Order. <u>23/07 - Discussions continue between</u>	<u>01/10 - Protective provisions are being discussed with NH with the aim of an agreed form being submitted to the ExA.</u> 23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways <u>Notwithstanding discussions on the PPs and side agreement continue. a revised set of PPs have been submitted at this deadline (D5) which reflect discussions to date and which seek to</u>	8 (High)

Topic	Position-Matter Raised	Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)	Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3	NH response /Latest position at D3D10	PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef
			<u>Applicant and National Highways</u>	address concerns raised by NH.	
1.11 Temporary Possession	National Highways require confirmation that all land rights necessary to access all (current and proposed) Strategic Road Network assets affected by the project have been included in the DCO/land requirements.	To be outlined following workshop.	High level principles agreed by NH at Legal Meeting held 10 July. Plot by plot review to be shared with NH w/c 22/07/24	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways The Applicant plot by plot review has been shared with National Highways. A review is in progress. Early feedback is that it aligns to National Highways expectations.	9 (High)
1.12 Article 2	National Highways are concerned that 'pre-construction mitigation works' referred to within the definition of 'commence' in Article 2 are not defined.	To be explored to be included in side agreement based ref 'commence' for SRN elements. Visibility of commence to others means that the face of the order may need to be clearer (aligned to side agreement).	Wording proposed to address this. Legal meeting held 10 July. Response awaited from NH.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	19 (High)
1.13 Requirement 3	National Highways notes that Requirement 3(2)(e) does not clearly set out appropriate working hours on Sundays.	Sunday working hours to be included as exception. 3rd iteration EMP consultation and approval to be captured in	GCC agree to amendments to dDCO to address Sunday working and NH consultation on EMP 3 rd iteration.	23/07 – Working hours resolved via amends to draft DCO at Deadline 2.	20 (High) 21 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>National Highways further requests that Requirement 3(4) require consultation with National Highways on the proposed EMP 3rd iteration.</p> <p>National Highways requests (as noted above) that this requirement is discharged by the SoS.</p>	<p>requirement on face of order.</p>	<p>Wording proposed in D1 submissions.</p> <p>SoS as discharge authority is being considered.</p>		
<p>4.141.5 Deemed consent</p>	<p>National Highways requests that the deemed consent provisions in the draft DCO (for example, article 11, 15, 18 and 20) are altered to a deemed refusal, and ask that a provision be included requiring Gloucestershire County Council to follow the Road Space Booking process.</p>	<p>To be amended in Order to a deemed refusal with side agreement to capture process. Road Space Booking point negated as to be agreed in PP's.</p>	<p>Legal meeting held 10 July. NH suggested deletion of deemed refusal which is being considered.</p> <p><u>Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways for other matters</u></p>	<p>Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways for other matters</p> <p><u>01/10 - It is considered that the deemed consent provisions should remain. To replace with deemed refusal means that if NH fail to respond the scheme cannot proceed which is unreasonable. The revised PPs include deemed consent provisions which are considered reasonable and protect both the Applicant and NH (PP 25(7)).</u></p> <p><u>This is being discussed as part of the side agreement.</u></p>	<p>22 (High)</p>
<p>4.151.6 Article 30</p>	<p>National Highways request that, in respect of Article 13, any airspace or subsoil over</p>	<p>To be captured in side-agreement.</p>	<p>Legal meeting held 10 July. Awaiting NH</p>	<p><u>01/10 - The revised PPs as submitted at D5 should resolve this issue given the provisions</u></p>	<p>23 (High)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	or under the SRN is not to be used without consent from National Highways.		response to side agreement. <u>23/07 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways</u>	in relation to design and construction. <u>23/07 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways This is being discussed as part of the side agreement.</u>	
1.16 Requirement 6	National Highways requests the wording in relation to the liability of replacing trees and shrubs within 5 years of planting is clarified to make this the responsibility of Gloucestershire County Council, and that this is included in the aftercare package between Gloucestershire County Council and the Principal Contractor. National Highways also requests that the aftercare package agreement between Gloucestershire County Council and the Principal Contractor is provided for National Highways oversight to ensure that the agreement is in accordance with National Highways operational requirements,	Sub paragraph (3) to be amended to state that any replacement planting within 5 years of completion to be at the expense of the undertaker. Discussion required regarding commuted sums.	Discussions still to take place regarding commuted sums.	<u>23/07 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways</u>	24 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>e.g. the use of Species Rich Grasses and the application of MPI-85.</p> <p>National Highways request that the aftercare package is to be agreed with National Highways to ensure that the package is maintainable by National Highways and reflects the existing landscaping packages already in place on the Strategic Road Network.</p>				
1.17 Requirement 14	<p>National Highways request clarity in relation to noise mitigation measures that will be handed over to NH for operation and maintenance are subject to agreement with National Highways throughout detailed design and handover.</p>	To be discussed.	To be discussed.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	16 (High)
1.18 Article 11	<p>National Highways request that this Article is drafted to ensure that the power in relation to street works cannot be exercised over the Strategic Road Network without consent from National Highways.</p>	<p>Unregistered highways land can be transferred to National Highways – reference power of the effect of Article 11 mechanics of land entry for NH to review.</p>	<p>Legal meeting held 10 July. Response awaited from NH to side agreement.</p>	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	25 (High)

Topic	Position-Matter Raised	Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)	Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3	NH response /Latest position at D3D10	PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef
1.19 Article 25	National Highways request a review of the interaction with NH lands to confirm re-rerouting of PRowS in both the temporary and permanent case.	GCC and NH to liaise re this.	Legal meeting held 10 July.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	10 (High)
1.20 Freehold of subsoil	National Highways request that all interests within the Strategic Road Network in relation to the freehold of subsoil, including that on unregistered highway land, is transferred to National Highways.	This is agreed and is the intention of the Applicant. Mechanism to deliver this to be discussed with NH. The Applicant intends to transfer the title and all rights to NH during Stage 6. It should be noted that new statutory rights will be introduced, with some others extinguished on the SRN.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024).	16/07 – Agreement reached in principle. Draft wording exchanged between Applicant and NH.	11 (High)
2. Environment Statement					
2.2 Environmental Statement (new item from PADSS)	National Highways request clarification on the approach taken to Biodiversity Net Gain in respect to the Strategic Road Network. National Highways require clarity from the Applicant in respect of any National	This has been agreed in the latest version of the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 (see Item ref 2.7 in Table 4.1) and has been moved to matters outstanding for revised	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024).	23/07 NH request confirmation of compliance for REAC commitments relating to the SRN in relation to standards for maintenance (GM 701, GS 801 and the ADMM).	30 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	Highways maintenance obligations on the SRN including how these align to the REAC.	iteration of SoCG at Deadline 3.			
<u>3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments and Environmental Management Plan (all matters resolved)</u>					
3.6 reference B13	National Highways require further information regarding the replacement planting of 10 years, i.e. is this an EPS licence requirement stipulated by Natural England and is this applicable to all planting or only specific mitigation locations.	Noted and to be addressed as appropriate in 2 nd iteration of EMP prepared by the Contractor.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024). 24/07/2024: REAC item B13 refers to the planting specifically to provide mitigation for dormice. The commitments stated for this planting apply only to the specific mitigation locations. These are all to the north of the A4019 and to the east of the M5. Locations are shown on the Environmental Masterplan sheets 5, 12 and 13.	23/7/24 NH request confirmation of compliance for REAC commitments relating to the SRN in relation to standards for maintenance (GM 701, GS 801 and the ADMM).	28 (High)
<u>4 Land Plans, Book of Reference, Statement of Reasons (all matters resolved)</u>					

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
4.1 Land acquisition	National Highways request a review with the Applicant of the National Highways land interests and all lands associated with the construction, planned handover, operation and maintenance to ensure that the proposed land and its DCO status facilitates the foregoing.	A review of the National Highways land interests is currently being undertaken and an update will be provided to the Examination.	High level principles agreed by NH at Legal Meeting held 10 July. Plot by plot review to be shared with NH w/c 22/07	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways. The Applicant plot by plot review has been shared with National Highways. A review is in progress. Early feedback is that it aligns to National Highways expectations.	11 (High) 26 (High)
4.2 Land Access – Easements	National Highways require easements over the private land side of any fencing for future maintenance/ replacement min 5mts width required. National Highways require easements over the private land for any outfalls, ditches and or buried pipelines that are to remain in NH ownership for future maintenance/ replacement min 5mts width required each side of the apparatus. National Highways require easements over private land to any land locked plots for future maintenance min 10mts required.	Discussion needed with NH as to what they need in relation to such easements, whether the requirements are necessary and deliverable and whether existing statutory powers would be more appropriate. -	Clarity is being sought as to what National Highways are wanting in regard to easements (16/07/2024).	16/07 – to be considered. National Highways plot by plot review planned. Update expected post Deadline 3	9 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>National Highways require easements over private land to any Culverts not deemed structures for future maintenance min 10mts required.</p> <p>National Highways require easements over private land to any structures for future maintenance min 10mts required</p> <p>National Highways require easements for access and the rights for future maintenance in relation to all assets to be adopted by National Highways for operation and maintenance.</p>				
4.3 Statement of Reasons	National Highway request further details of the breakdown of works as they do not follow the structure of Schedule 1 of the DCO.	Noted. A review of the National Highways land interests is currently being undertaken and an update will be provided to the Examination.	High level principles agreed by NH at Legal Meeting held 10 July. Plot by plot review to be shared with NH w/c 22/07	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways The Applicant plot by plot review has been shared with National Highways. A review is in progress. Early feedback is that it aligns to National Highways expectations.	26 (High)
4.4 Land Parcel 5/2n (new item from PADSS)	National Highways request that parcel 5/2n, which appears to leave the redundant length of the old	These have been amended on the Land Plans submitted at Deadline 1.	High level principles agreed by NH at Legal Meeting held 10 July.	23/07 – Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	7

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>northbound on-slip road loop in-situ, including carriageway and retained vegetation, with the maintenance track pushed to west of works, is redesigned so that the maintenance track is designed adjacent to scheme earthworks and that the redundant length of the slip and existing vegetation is removed/integrated into the scheme.</p> <p>The land and works plans will require amendment.</p>		Plot by plot review to be shared with NH w/c 22/07	The Applicant plot by plot review has been shared with National Highways. A review is in progress. Early feedback is that it aligns to National Highways expectations	
4.5 (new item from PADSS)	<p>Omission of a viewport to show stopping up on sheet 5 of 16 of Street, Right of Way and Access Plans.</p> <p>National Highways requests that an insert to the drawings is added to show the stopping up of the old N/B on slip road under the junction overbridge.</p>	The Applicant agrees to update the drawing at Deadline 3.	16/07/2024	16/07 — agreed if submitted	32 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
4.6 (new item from PADSS)	Part 1 compensation claims for diminution of property values caused by physical factors arising from new works—liability to remain with Applicant—National Highways requires confirmation that any Part 1 claims for compensation will remain the responsibility of the Applicant to settle and that the Applicant will retain all liability for compensation payments arising out of CA after the SRN Assets are transferred to National Highways.	N/A as new item from PADSS submitted at Deadline 1 (REP1-059).	Provisions to address this with NH. Awaiting response.	16/07—awaiting update from the Applicant	12 (High)
5.—Transport (including modelling)					
5.1 Transport Assessment	National Highways are unable to support the scheme without full visibility of the transport modelling in order to confirm the findings of the transport assessment. National Highways require the full modelling package including but not limited to future year modelling, slip road design, travel time variances, capacity, modelled queues, model	Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) have undertaken the development of the traffic modelling in full accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and has followed the NH PCF process, with all applicable PCF documents having been	Traffic modelling first shared with NH Spatial Planning on 03/2024. Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24.	24/07—National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium), 2 (Medium) & 4 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	calibration, construction scenarios, signal modelling, local road/SRN interactions, model validation, development assumptions.	approved by NH Transport Planning Group (TPG). This is acknowledged by NH in comment reference 93 of this SoCG. Traffic modelling PCF documents relevant to the traffic modelling, that contain much of the information requested by NH, are included in Appendices to the Transport Assessment and have been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (Ref: APP-138, 139, 140, 141, 142 and 143). The traffic models have been shared with NH.	Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24.		
5.2 Transport Assessment Chapter 1.1 (Introduction)	National Highways request that the study area of impact at the SRN and rationale of J9 and J11 current conditions or impact to the proposals have to the junction.	GCC are unclear about this comment and the clarification requested.	NH to clarify comment. 16/07/2024	24/07—please ensure your proposals have considered, any impacts on the existing J9 and J11 of the M5 to avoid unacceptable impacts on the SRN.	4 (Medium)
5.3 Transport Assessment Chapter	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County	Appendix A of the Traffic Forecasting Report (APP-	NH to review and confirm status of issue following	16/07—agreed based on the response provided by the	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
1.2.4 (Scheme background)	<p>Council provide further information regarding the dependencies between the developments at Coombe Hill and Arle Court Park and Ride development in respect to M5 Junction 10.</p> <p>National Highways have concerns regarding the Coombe Hill development should this not occur and the impacts of this on the cumulative assessments as submitted in the draft Development Consent Order application.</p>	<p>142)-contains the Uncertainty Log that lists proposed developments in the model area and categorises the likelihood of them being implements in accordance with TAG. The Uncertainty Log indicates which proposed developments are included in the traffic modelling for the Core scenario for each of the forecast years of assessment.</p> <p>Coombe Hill is referred to as Land at A38/A4019 Jct in the Uncertainty Log and is included in the Core scenario (100% complete by 2027). Arle Court Park and Ride development is referred to as Christ College Arle Road, Cheltenham Gloucestershire, GL51 8LE in the Uncertainty Log and is included in the Core scenario (100% complete by 2027). A list of proposed developments that are dependent on the</p>	Applicant response (16/07/2024)	Applicant to National Highways' RR (see para 5 of point 22.6 of REP1-043)	

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response-Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>implementation of the M5 junction 10 Improvement Scheme is provided in Table 6 of the Traffic Forecasting Report.</p> <p>Neither the Coombe Hill or the Arle Court Park and Ride developments are dependent on the M5 junction 10 Improvement Scheme being implemented.</p>			
<p><u>5. Transport</u></p>	<p><u>Chapter 2: Planning Policy</u></p>	<p><u>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm how the scheme of works are compliant with 01/22 circular and Planning for the Future (2023) documentation.</u></p>			
<p><u>5.6_5.4-Transport Assessment Chapter 2: Planning Policy</u> National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm how the scheme of works are compliant with 01/22 circular and Planning for the Future (2023) documentation.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) provides a review of the national, regional and local transport related policy relevant to the Scheme. Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/22- Strategic Road Network the delivery of sustainable development and National Highways' (NH) Planning for the Future - A guide to working with National Highways on planning matters (2023) are not referenced in either the Transport Assessment or the Planning Statement (APP-135). This is because both the DfT and NH documents explain how NH will engage with the planning system.</p> <p>GCC has engaged with NH throughout the evolution and development of the Scheme in accordance with these documents."</p>					

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
<u>(Medium including modelling)</u>					
5.5 Transport Assessment Chapter 3: Baseline conditions	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council update the Personal Injury Analysis in relation to the nature of serious and fatal accidents on the SRN. This will allow National Highways to understand what current major PIAs are known and understand if further analysis is required to mitigate issues for any areas of concern in relation to the proposed design for the Strategic Road Network.	Section 3.6 of the Transport Assessment (APP 138) presents a comprehensive analysis of Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data covering the five-year period 2017 and 2021. The area covered by the PIA analysis is shown in Figure 6 in the Transport Assessment and includes M5 junction 10 and appropriate sections of the M5. Thirty PIAs over a five-year period to 2021 have been recorded. This is not considered to be uncharacteristically high for a grade separated junction on the M25, and no concerning clusters of PIAs have been identified. Road safety has been paramount in the design of the scheme and is based on the following road safety objectives:	The Transport Assessment is being updated with reference to the latest available PIA data and will be submitted into Examination at Deadline 3. The TA The Applicant has updated the Transport Assessment to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to relevant policy and guidance that has been updated since the original TA was prepared. • Report on the outcomes of updated operational (Paramics) traffic modelling that has been undertaken to address refinements to the model as suggested by National Highways. • Reference to latest recorded personal injury accidents, reflecting data that has subsequently become 	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	5 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme is capable of being operated in an acceptably safe manner. • A proportionate safety risk assessment has been undertaken. • Safety challenges have and will be addressed. • The safety objectives can be achieved. • Risk management has been continually applied through scheme development and delivery. • Appropriate safety risk governance has been applied. <p>Please also refer to GCC's response to comment 49 above.</p>	<p>available since the original TA was prepared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional and more detailed information on the impacts of the Scheme on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). • Provide information on forecast construction traffic generation for both vehicles delivering materials and equipment and the workforce. 		
5.6 Transport Assessment Chapter 4: Scheme Proposals	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide full scheme designs in relation to the length and type of slip roads	General Arrangement, Works and Engineering and Sections Plans for the Scheme have been submitted with the DCO	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024)	16/07 Applicant to provide detail of how the type of slip road was determined with evidence of calculations and traffic volumes utilised	3 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	as this is not presented in the TA for review.	application (APP-007, 008, 014, 015, 016, 017 and 018).	Please refer to 5.45 below for current status.		
5.8 Transport Assessment Chapter 5: Traffic Modelling, Section 5.14	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the difference between the strategic and operational model to understand the differences and potential impacts between Saturn and Paramics matrices to ensure where there are alternative routes to the M5, that traffic assignment is similar in both models.	Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) describes the approach to the traffic modelling. The Appendices to the Transport Assessment provide more detailed information on the traffic modelling, specifically Appendix J—Transport Model Package (APP-140), Appendix K—Traffic Data Package Report (APP-141) and Appendix L—Traffic Forecasting Report (APP-142). Figure 8 in the Transport Assessment shows the geographical coverage of the Strategic Traffic Model (Gloucestershire Countywide Traffic Model (GCTM)). Figure 9 in the Transport Assessment shows the geographical coverage of the	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>Operational (PARAMICS) Traffic Model.</p> <p>Outputs from the demand matrices of a cordoned section of the Strategic Model, corresponding to the area of covered by the Operational Traffic Model, have been used to provide the inputs to the traffic demand matrices for the Operational Traffic Model.</p> <p>The road network covered by the Operational Traffic Model offers no alternative routes for traffic using the M5 and offers virtually no practical alternatives routes for traffic using the rest of the road network within the modelled area. Consequently, the routing, or assignment, of traffic in the Operational Traffic Model is consistent with that for the Strategic Traffic Model.</p>			
5.9 Transport Assessment Chapter 6: Scheme Assessment	National Highways requests that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the sample	Section 6 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) confirms that the	Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and	4 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
Methodology, Section 6.4.1	size of seeded runs is appropriate to the variability of the future year model and if any of the model runs appear to be a significant outlier from the others.	Operational Traffic Model has been run for all the modelled scenarios with 10 different random seeds (sample size of seeded runs) to account for the daily variability of the traffic arrival patterns and network operation. The sample size of seeded runs was determined with consideration given to the size and type/structure of the modelled highway network, the number of modelled scenarios and model run times. The number of seeded runs is also compliant with NH TPG recommendations. The variations in the overall network performance associated with different seeds, in terms of change in speed and journey time across the five journey time routes that cover all key routes in the model for all scenarios and forecast years, have been reported in Appendices C,	NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling is based on 15 seed runs per scenario. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.	will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>D and E of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Sections 6.6 and 6.7 of the Transport Assessment defines the methodology of assessing and interpreting the variance associated with the different seed runs.</p> <p>None of the seeded model runs were outliers from the others and the differences in overall average journey times across all the seeded runs is within acceptable tolerances.</p>			
5.10 Transport Assessment Chapter 7: Scheme Assessment, Section 7.2	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council confirm the interpretation of the traffic flow differences identified for the Strategic Road Network.	The flow difference plots in Appendix B of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) provide peak hour traffic flow differences for the model impact area covering two comparisons of scenarios, namely with the Scheme, but without Dependent Development compared with the do-minimum (Scenarios S vs P) and with both the Scheme and	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>Dependent Development compared to the de-minimum (Scenarios R vs P) for both the opening (2027) and horizon (2042) years. The results shown in the difference plots are generally as expected. In Scenarios S v P comparison, that shows the impact of the Scheme in isolation, there is re-routing of some of the existing traffic which take advantage of the proposed south-facing slip roads at junction 10, which results in some increases in traffic flows along the M5 between junctions 10 and 11. The Scenarios R v P comparison, that shows the impact of both the Scheme and Dependent Development in combination, shows a notable amount of extra traffic on the road network as a result of the proposed Dependent Development in addition to the rerouted traffic due</p>			

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		to the proposed south-facing slip roads, particularly on the M5 between junctions 10 and 11 and on the A4019.			
5.11 Transport Assessment Chapter 7: Scheme Assessment, Table 9	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the location(s) that are causing the travel time increase on Route 3 WB (A4019 E to M5 N) for the 'with scheme' scenario 2027 AM peak.	Most of the additional delay for this journey time route during the AM peak is due to the introduction of several new signal-controlled junctions along the A4019 as part of the proposed Scheme. These signal-controlled junctions are necessary to provide access for the Dependent Developments and control the resultant additional development generated traffic.	Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increase for Route 3. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	4 (Medium)
5.12 Transport Assessment Chapter 7: Scheme Assessment, Table 10	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the location(s) that are causing the travel time increase on Route 3 WB (A4019 E to M5 N) for the 'with scheme' scenario 2027 PM peak as there is insufficient information to ascertain if	Please refer to GCC's response to 5.11 above.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	4 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	this impact relates to the A4019 or the M5.				
5.13 Transport Assessment Chapter 8 Table 15	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information about the 33% increase in total network travel time (hours) and a 7% increase in the average journey time for the 2024 AM peak as this suggests the scheme has a detrimental impact in some locations.	The additional total network travel time is due to a combination of the extra traffic generated by the Dependent Developments and the introduction of additional signal controlled junctions along the A4019 as part of the Scheme.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	4 (Medium) & 5 (Medium)
5.14 Transport Assessment Chapter 8: Cumulative Assessment, Figure 20	National Highways request that the assessment of the where the predicted journey time increase of up to 10 minutes may occur along the M5 NB route is provided.	Figure 20 in the Transport Assessment (APP 138) shows the variance in northbound journey times over the 10 seeded runs undertaken for the Operational Traffic Modelling for the AM peak period, covering the whole of Journey Time Route 2 along the M5. The maximum increase in the AM peak journey time over the 10 seeded runs is 10 minutes, but the average increase is just over two minutes compared to the Do-	Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling is based on 15 seed runs per scenario. The revised modelling also shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increases. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	3, 4 (Medium) & 5 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>minimum Scenario (Scenarios R v P), as presented in Table 19 of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The additional journey time is in the vicinity of the northbound junction 10 diverge and is due to the extra traffic generated by the Dependent Developments.</p>			
<p>5.15 Transport Assessment Chapter 10: Assessment of Highway Network During Construction</p>	<p>National Highways request zoomed in V/C plots of M5 J9 and M5 J11 as it is currently impossible to ascertain the predicted impacts at the current scale of the plans.</p>	<p>There are 15 V/C plots in Appendix M of the Transport Assessment (APP-138) supporting Chapter 10 which details the assessment of highway network during construction. The plots cover the Do-minimum and four different closure scenarios for three modelled time periods. Gloucester County Council request that NH confirm it requires zoomed out V/C plots for all 15 plots in Appendix M, which will result in 30 new plots. Given the</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response</p>	<p>24/07—National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.</p>	<p>1(Medium) 5 (Medium)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>pattern of impact is the same during the three modelled periods, GCC suggest a sample for each of the closure phases and the Do-minimum scenario for one period (AM peak or PM peak) would be sufficient. This will generate six new plots that are likely to provide sufficient information for NH to understand the impacts during construction of the Scheme.</p>			
<p>5.16 Transport Assessment Chapter 10: Assessment of Highway Network During Construction</p>	<p>National Highways request that information is provided in relation to scenario assessment for potential lane closures on the M5 lane on the M5 is provided so that the impacts about the predicted impact of traffic flows on the motorway and in the local area can be ascertained.</p>	<p>An outline Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for construction of the Scheme has been produced in accordance with the NH PCF process and has been signed-off by NH. The outline TMP specifies the anticipated sequence, timing, and duration of the required temporary traffic management arrangements, including proposed road closures.</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response</p>	<p>24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.</p>	<p>1 (Medium)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>The anticipated road closure phases are shown in Table 21 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138). The construction of the Scheme is not currently anticipated to require any closures of live lanes on the M5 mainline for extended periods, other than at weekends and overnight. Nonetheless, a temporary 50mph speed limit, in combination with narrow lanes, on the M5 will be required during some of the construction phases and this has been included in the Strategic Traffic Modelling of the temporary traffic management arrangements.</p> <p>The outline TMP for the Scheme has been submitted to the ExA (AS-041).</p>			
5.17 Transport Assessment Chapter 18	National Highways requests confirmation from Gloucestershire County	GCC has undertaken further traffic modelling work to confirm its	Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and	2 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	Council to confirm the suitability of flows used in the model validated for a 2017 base year and any comparisons between the 2017 present day (including the impact of COVID flows).	validity, accounting for the impact of COVID-19 on travel patterns and demand. This is reported in the Transport Supplementary Report (AS-046) which has been shared this with NH.	on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	
5.18 Transport Assessment	National Highways request evidence of the calibration of M5 flows as this currently does not appear to show any calibration of flows on the M5 mainline.	Both the Strategic and Operational Traffic Models have been calibrated and validated in full accordance with TAG and pass the relevant TAG traffic modelling calibration and validation acceptance criteria. Calibration and validation of the Strategic Traffic Model is set out in the Chapters 5 and 10 of the Traffic Model Package (APP-140) which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment (APP-138). Baseline traffic flows on the M5 from the Strategic Traffic	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium) 2 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>Model have been calibrated and validated against observed data as shown in Figure 8-1 of the Traffic Model Package. Figures 10-4, 10-5 and 10-6, as well as Table 10-5 of the Traffic Model Package demonstrate that the baseline modelled flows along the M5 north and south of junction 10 all pass the TAG criteria when compared to observed flows.</p>			
<p>5.19 Transport Assessment (same as 5.18)</p>	<p>National Highways request evidence of the queue length calibration of the comparison of modelled and observed queue lengths and confirmation of if this assessment has been undertaken during calibration.</p>	<p>Both the Strategic and Operational Traffic Models have been calibrated and validated in full accordance with TAG and pass the relevant TAG traffic modelling calibration and validation acceptance criteria. Calibration and validation of the Strategic Traffic Model is set out in the Chapters 5 and 10 of the Traffic Model Package (APP-140) which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response</p>	<p>24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.</p>	<p>1 (Medium) 2 (Medium)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>(APP-138). Calibration and validation of the Operational Traffic Model (Local Model Validation Report (LMVR)) is contained in Appendix H of the Traffic Model Package. The calibration and validation of both the Strategic and Operational traffic models have been undertaken using observed traffic flows and journey times and not observed queue lengths. This approach is compliant with TAG Validation Criteria and Guidance, which specifies traffic flow and journey times as the only required criteria. Nonetheless, as stated in Section 18.6 in Appendix H of the Traffic Modelling Package “modelled queuing simulated in the base model runs correlates with the AM and PM peak journey time validation exercise”.</p>			

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
5.20 Transport Assessment	National Highways request further information in relation to the quote "with more notable queuing intermittently present at the signalised junctions and the M5 J10 southbound on slip" as this appears to contradict the validation of journey times on the M5 SB if sufficient delay is present in this part of the model.	The base Operational Traffic Model network includes three signalised junctions, with the remaining junctions being made up of priority give-ways or merges. During base model runs, pockets of queuing around these junctions occur with more notable queuing intermittently present at the signalised junctions and the M5 J10 southbound off-slip, which is to be expected and not uncommon. The modelled queuing simulated in the base model runs correlates with the AM and PM peak journey time validation exercise undertaken (i.e., longer journey times occur on sections of the network with more notable queuing). Therefore, the validation of the model reflects the delay due to the modelled traffic queuing. Tables 18.2 and 18.3 of the Traffic Model Package	Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24. Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. The revised modelling shows a notable reduction in the previously reported journey time increases. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	4 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>(APP-140), which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment (APP-138), show that the modelled journey times for Routes 1 and 3, which cover the section of A4019 where the three aforementioned existing junctions are located, fully validate against the observed data.</p>			
<p>5.21 Transport Assessment</p>	<p>National Highways requests confirmation from Gloucestershire county Council to confirm the suitability of flows used in the model validated for a 2017 base year and any comparisons between the 2017-present day (including the impact of COVID flows).</p>	<p>Please refer to GCC's response to 5.17 above.</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response</p>	<p>24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.</p>	<p>1 (Medium); 2 (Medium)</p>
<p>5.22 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package, Table 14.2</p>	<p>National Highways request information related to modelled journey times validated on 60s TAG criteria is provided to identify how significant the difference between modelled and observed journey times is to</p>	<p>Tables 18.2 and 18.3 in Transport Model Package (APP-140,) which is Appendix J of the Transport Assessment (APP-138), presents comparisons of the modelled and observed journey times where</p>	<p>Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Technical note prepared by the Applicant addressing issues raised by NH regarding the</p>	<p>24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National</p>	<p>1 (Medium) 2 (Medium)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	demonstrate the model is within a reasonable range of the observed.	absolute differences are shown. These tables show that none of the journey times routes in either modelled peak have a difference above 60 seconds when modelled and observed journey times are compared.	Strategic traffic modelling issued to NH on 08/07/24.NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	
5.23 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package, Section 16.5	National Highways requests confirmation in relation to the statement of amendments made to the average signal timings during calibration and if these amendments were also made to factors affecting saturation flows before changing the signal timings.	As stated in the Transport Assessment (APP-138), most of the traffic signals are either demand actuated, or Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) operated. In the absence of functionality to fully simulate these methods of adjusting signal timings in real-time in the Operational Traffic Modelling software (PARAMICS), these signal-controlled junctions in the model have been coded with fixed timings to represent the average conditions during the relevant peak period, with	Applicant provided NH with written responses to NH's detailed comments on the traffic modelling on 10/06/24. Revised operational (Paramics) traffic modelling responding to NH comments shared with NH on 27/06/24. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	4 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		the existing phases and stages retained. These adjustments are quite modest and, in this instance, compensate for the absence of the linkage functionality in the PARAMICS traffic model when the base year model was developed.			
5.24 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide confirmation of how the impacts at the adjacent junctions on the M5, practically Junction 11, is assessed to demonstrate that the scheme is not having a severe impact at these junctions.	M5 junction 11 is not included in the Operational Traffic Model. Therefore, the impact of the Scheme on M5 junctions 9 and 11 has been assessed using the Strategic Traffic Model. The impact of the Scheme on M5 junctions 9 and 11, in terms of changes in total traffic throughput and demand to capacity ratios, will be provided to NH.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	-(Medium)
5.25 Transport Assessment Appendix J: Transport Model Package	National Highways requests full details of what is included/excluded for Appendix J.	The Transport Assessment (APP-138) lists its appendices and their contents. Appendix J	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		is listed as containing the Model Package Report (APP-140) which refers to the Strategic Traffic Model. Appendix J also includes the Operational Traffic Modelling—Local Model Validation Report, which erroneously is not listed in the Transport Assessment contents under Appendix J.		will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	
5.26 Transport Assessment Appendix K: Traffic Data Package Report	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide the comparison information of 2015 and 2017 base years against the present day data for both GCTM and Paramics models.	Please refer to GCC's response to comment 5.17 above.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium)
5.27 Transport Assessment Appendix K: Traffic Data Package Report, Figure 2.2	National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information relating to the validation of journey times on the route through Staverton and Boddington as journey time data does not provide data for validation of the journey times through these	The local road through Staverton and Boddington is included in full in the Strategic Traffic Model, but only in part in the Operational (PARAMICS) Traffic Model. This route is not included in the journey time calibration/validation of either the Strategic or	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium) 2 (Medium)

Topic	Position-Matter Raised	Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)	Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3	NH response /Latest position at D3D10	PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef
	locations. Whilst not being a major road, this information is required as could be a key route choice in the Paramics model and should be included in the journey time validation.	Operational traffic models. Also refer to Gloucestershire County Council's response to comment 5.19 above.			
5.28 Transport Assessment Appendix L: Traffic Forecasting Report	National Highways requests that Gloucestershire County Council provide further information regarding the assignment of traffic in Saturn and Paramics to understand any differences or potential impacts on the proposed scheme.	Please refer to GCC's response to 5.8 above.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium), 2 (Medium) 4 (Medium)
5.29 Traffic Modelling GC3M Model	National Highways request the review and endorsement of the GC3M model, including any amendments to the model baseline and scenarios, as this has not been undertaken by National Highways to date and, as such, are unable to confirm that the model is acceptable to National Highways.	The Gloucestershire Countywide Traffic Model (GCTM) traffic model has been used for the assessment of Scheme, not the GC3M traffic model.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium)
5.30 Transport Assessment	National Highways notes that the Transport Assessment indicates that	NH have not provided a document reference for this comment, and it is	The Applicant has done further interrogation of the	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>increased traffic levels and V/C ratios predicted along the M5 main-line, imply that the motorway will be operating above capacity between Jcns 10-11. National Highways require full visibility of the traffic models to fully assess this concern.</p>	<p>unclear to which scenario comparison it relates. The only reference to V/C in the Transport Assessment (APP-138) is in Chapter 10 under construction impact, where impact is temporary and concludes by saying in section 10.4.13 The general trends observed from changes to V/C categories resulting from the slip road closures indicate that the increases in V/C categories are modest and consistent with the pattern of reassigned traffic, and as such are not considered to be severe. The traffic models have been shared with NH.</p>	<p>model outputs, not shared as yet with</p>	<p>will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.</p>	
<p>5.31 Transport Assessment</p>	<p>National Highways request that further information relating to scheme design including length/type of slips (as supported by traffic modelling) and explanation of 'dependant development'</p>	<p>The full details of the scheme design have been provided in Volume 2 of the submission. Details of dependent developments can be found in Appendix L of</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response</p>	<p>24/07— National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National</p>	<p>3 (Medium)</p>

Topic	Position-Matter Raised	Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)	Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3	NH response /Latest position at D3D10	PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef
	is provided by Gloucestershire County Council.	the TA (Table 6 of Transport Forecasting Package).		Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	
5.32 Transport Assessment	National Highways request that that current flows for M5 J10 (using Webtris) are provided for a comparison for J10 forecast flows since traffic survey data provided in the TA is dated 2017 and then growthed to 2023 levels (using the industry standard TEMPRO).	Please refer to GCC's response to 5.30.	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium) 2 (Medium)
5.33 Traffic Assessment	National Highways have concerns that there is no construction traffic or construction related employee traffic included in the traffic assessments as this could be a significant addition to the traffic patterns and flows.	The TA includes four closure scenarios during construction in Chapter 10 in accordance with the current TMP. The TMP will be reviewed during the next stage of the scheme when the information on construction related traffic would be available. Estimates of forecast construction traffic and workforce commuting trips were not available when the traffic modelling of the temporary traffic management arrangements was	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	24/07 — National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	1 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>undertaken. Nonetheless, the construction traffic generated by construction of the scheme will most likely represent a very small proportional increase in traffic volumes on the M5 compared to baseline flows and is, therefore, unlikely to materially alter the outputs of the traffic modelling of the temporary traffic management arrangements as reported in the Transport Assessment (APP-138). Section 2.8 of Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (AS-010) provides the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Estimated size of the construction workforce. — Estimated construction vehicle generation. <p>Section B.11.2.14 of the Environment</p>			

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		Management Plan Annex B11—Traffic Management Plan (AS-041) provides information on anticipated construction traffic routes.			
5.44 Traffic Management	National Highways request that all Traffic Management will be subject to the agreement of National Highways to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Road Network.	As it stands, this request to too general. It goes without saying that we will need to gain approval for all TM on the SRN. The slip roads will be closed for 9 and 15 months (according to the DCO submission) and TM on the A4019 and B4634 during this time will not affect the SRN. We propose to share our TM proposals with NH and seek approval/acceptance where they are deemed to impact the SRN only, e.g. any works on the M5, including the slip road closures and diversion routes (but these are in the DCO anyway).	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	16/07—National Highways has responded to ExA Q15.0.1 on this matter, which if agreeable by the Applicant may resolve matters post Deadline 3.	N/A
5.45 Merge/Diverge/weaving assessments	National Highways request further information including traffic flows/modelling to	The design of the Scheme has been undertaken in full	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response	16/07—Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways	1 (Medium),

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3</u> <u>D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern</u> <u>NumberRef</u>
	<p>understand if the weaving/merge/diverge provision proposed (as required by CD 122), offer sufficient capacity for the predicted increase in traffic levels. Any assessment also needs to include the impact and safety implications of the new junction proposed between 9 and 10.</p>	<p>accordance with guidance and standards contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). General Arrangement plans showing the Scheme design (APP-014 and APP-015) have been shared with NH. Design development of the Scheme has followed the NH's Project Control Framework (PCF), with all applicable PCF documents having been approved by NH. The proposed designs for all the M5 junction 10 slip roads require departures from standard. These have been uploaded onto NH's Departure Approval System (DAS) and NH's Safety, Engineering & Standards (SES) have confirmed provisional agreement to the departures.</p> <p>Traffic flows used to determine the slip road design, including weaving, diverging and</p>			<p>3-(Medium) 4-(Medium)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3</u> <u>D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern</u> <u>NumberRef</u>
		<p>merging layouts, and inform the required departures from standards are included in the departures form standard submissions uploaded onto NH's DAS.</p> <p>24/7: The requested information is in the documentation submitted in support of the Departure from Standards (DfS) previously issued to NH. It is not included in the Transport Assessment. Nonetheless, the relevant documentation has now been issued to the NH Spatial Planning team.</p>			
5.46 (new item from PADSS)	<p>National Highways requires clarification from the Applicant that a fully GG119 compliant Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been completed for the DCO design.</p> <p>Furthermore National Highways require confirmation of what stage RSA has been completed.</p>	<p>The Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out by the Applicant on the Design Fix 3 Preliminary Design as part of National Highways Project Control Framework Stage 3 and was formed part of the National Highways (NH) Stage Gate Assessment</p>	<p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024)</p> <p>24/07: The RSA was part of the Stage 3 prelim Design submission to NH and</p>	<p>16/07—point here is date of RSA. It was issued in 2022—GCC, is it up to date given that design changes occurred after that date? Clarity in respect to GG119 compliance sought from GCC.</p>	33 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>The response letter implies this is a Stage 1/2 but the report is just that of a Stage 1.</p> <p>National Highways would expect the RSA Stage 2 to be completed after detailed design which National Highways would require consultation for the SRN elements.</p> <p>More specifically this needs to also include a location plan based on the scheme marked up and referenced to understand the impact on the SRN – see clause 5.3 of GG119.</p>	<p>Review Stage 3 (SGAR3) review. The project received a Green SGAR3 outcome from NH on 19th Oct 2023. The DCO is based upon the PCF3 design, therefore the RSA PCF3 product reflects the DCO design.</p> <p>The requirement of the PCF3 stage is for a Stage1 RSA. The brief provided to the auditors a Stage 1 RSA Brief.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that a RSA Stage 2 to be completed after detailed design. The ECI Contractor will be responsible for the detailed design and for producing the RSA Stage 2 Brief in due course.</p> <p>Clause 5.3 of GG19 is shown below;</p> <p>‘5.3 The needs of all road users shall be assessed when undertaking the RSA.’</p>	<p>went through their SGAR. the DCO submission was also based upon the Stage 3 prelim design, so the RSA was carried out on the design reflected in the current DCO application. A further RSA will be done on the contractor's detailed design in due course</p>		

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>However, the Applicant is able to provide the required marked-up location plan.</p> <p>NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response.</p>			
5.47 Slip Roads	<p>National Highways request that Gloucestershire County Council provides a GG104 risk assessment in relation to the design of slip roads and associated traffic modelling analysis specific to the slip roads to outline the proposals potential impact to road user and operational safety.</p>	<p>The design of the Scheme has been undertaken in full accordance with guidance and standards contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). Design development of the Scheme has followed the National Highways (NH) Project control Framework (PCF), with all applicable PCF documents having been signed off from a governance perspective by NH. This is acknowledged by NH in comment reference 8.1 of this Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). A Safety Report for the Scheme has been submitted to, and signed-</p>	SoCG at Deadline 3	24/07—matter remains outstanding.	<p>N/A</p> <p>3 (Medium)</p> <p>33 (High)</p>

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		<p>off by, NH in accordance with the NH PCF process. The Safety Report includes risk assessments in accordance with GG104 of the DMRB. The proposed designs for all the M5 junction 10 slip roads require departures from standard. These have been uploaded onto NH's Departure Approval System (DAS) and NH's Safety, Engineering & Standards (SES) have confirmed provisional agreement to the departures.</p> <p>The design of the Scheme has also been subject to an independent road safety audit (RSA) and an Audit Response has been prepared by the Scheme design team. These have been issued to, and signed off by, NH (SES) in accordance with the PCF process and will be issued to the Examining Authority (ExA) by 22/03/24.</p>			

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
		The M5 junction 10 slip roads are included in both the Strategic and Operational traffic models."			
6.7. Funding					
6.1 Homes England Infrastructure Funding	National Highways request that the Homes England grant for the project is provided for information to confirm any caveats to funding noting this funding represents some, but not all, of the funding streams and may provide a cash surety mechanism noting the shortfall in committed funds.	To be discussed.	Matter remains outstanding	24/07—matter remains outstanding.	34 (Medium)
6.2 6.1 Funding Security	National Highways have concerns about the significant reliance on unsecured developer contributions, as previously raised to Gloucestershire County Council, due to no guarantee that any or all of the identified developments will come forward within the timescales when funding is required and with the necessary level of financial contributions secured.	Approach needs discussion.	Matter remains outstanding <u>24/07 – matter remains outstanding.</u>	<u>24/01/07—matter remains outstanding</u> <u>10 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways.</u>	34 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	National Highways require funding security before the start of construction activities due to the risk of beginning construction without the full funding package in place.				
6.36.2 Cash Surety	National Highways request that discussions continue regarding cash surety for pre and post Notice to Proceed to ensure that any delays or unforeseen risks do not affect the construction and operation of the Strategic Road Network. National Highways requests sight of commercial documentation to ensure affordability of completion of all aspects of the scheme impacting on the SRN).	To be discussed.	Matter remains outstanding <u>24/07 – matter remains outstanding.</u>	24/01/07 – matter remains outstanding <u>10 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways.</u>	34 (Medium)
6.46.3 Notice to Proceed	National Highways request that the Notice to Proceed decision is captured in a legal agreement with Gloucestershire County Council to ensure that construction does not start on the Strategic Road	To be discussed.	Matter remains outstanding <u>24/07 – matter remains outstanding.</u>	<u>01/10 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways.</u> 24/07 – matter remains outstanding. <u>The protective provisions can be amended to incorporate a suitable notice to</u>	34 (Medium)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	Network without funding secured.			<u>proceed process if agreement is not reached.</u>	
6.5 Commuted sum	National Highways seeks a milestone schedule to provide visibility of when the commuted sum figure will be updated and how this aligns to the detailed design programme.	The Applicant requires further discussion regarding commuted sums, as we do not consider that they are required.	Matter remains outstanding	24/07 — matter remains outstanding.	34 (Medium)
6.6 6.5 Collateral warranties	National Highways request that a copy of the contract with Galliford Try, copies of the professional appointments in place with consultants engaged in relation to the works, confirmation of the levels of professional indemnity insurance each warrantor will be obliged to maintain and evidence from their broker pf said insurance and any technical appendices are provided to be able to agree and approve any collateral warranty agreements.	The Applicant understands that this has been done. However a meeting is to be arranged to discuss as NH has further queries.	Matter remains outstanding <u>24/07 – matter remains outstanding.</u>	24 <u>01/07 — matter remains outstanding10 - Discussions continue between Applicant and National Highways.</u>	34 (Medium)
<u>7.8. Construction (all matters agreed)</u>					
<u>8.9. Operations and Maintenance</u>					

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
8.1 Access	National Highways request that access onto land parcels affected by the development for future maintenance by the Operations Directorate are applied and agreed with National Highways. This includes, but not limited to, easements over the private land for any outfall, ditches and/or buried pipelines that are to remain in National Highways ownership with a minimum 5m width required at each side of the apparatus for maintenance, easements over private land to any land locked plots for future maintenance with minimum 10meters width required, easements over private land with any culverts not deemed as structures for future maintenance with minimum 10 meters width required, easements for any drainage or other national highways assts and the rights to carry out future maintenance to these.	To be discussed – likely to only relate to getting to culverts over private land as the rest is accessible over strategic network.	Matter remains outstanding.	24/07 – Discussions are ongoing in relation to this matter.	9 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> <u>Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
8.28.1 Liabilities	National Highways request that a maintenance plan is provided and agreed for all assets, including but not limited to structures, flood storage areas, attenuation basins and embankment, in event of an issue affecting SRN.	To be discussed.	Legal meeting being held on 10 July. NH response to side agreement awaited. <u>24/07 – Discussions are ongoing in relation to this matter.</u>	24/01/07 – Discussions are ongoing in relation to this matter. 10 - This is being discussed as part of the side agreement.	6 (Low)
8.3 Reservoir	National Highways would require provision for the drainage asset in relation to the reservoir in the commuted sum figure (£TBC)	The Applicant has produced a Technical Note on the Reservoir which was shared with National Highways on 30 April 2024. Awaiting a response from National Highways.	Further detail has been provided by the Applicant to NH. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response. 16/07/2024	16/7 – National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	6 (Low)
8.4 Ownership	National Highways would like it secured in the DCO and supporting documentation that ownership and maintenance of the reservoir lies with GCC and that responsibility of the construction and maintenance of the M5 southbound on slip embankment, up to formation level, lies with Gloucestershire County Council in accordance with	The Applicant on has produced a Technical Note on the Reservoir which was shared with National Highways on 30 April 2024. Awaiting a response from National Highways.	Further detail has been provided by the Applicant to NH. NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response. 16/07/2024	16/7 – National Highways are reviewing the information provided by the Applicant and will respond with any comments in due course. Conversations between the Applicant and National Highways are ongoing in relation to this matter.	6 (Low)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	the requirements of the Reservoirs Act 1975 of an above-ground reservoir. Ownership and maintenance of the M5 southbound on-slip road drainage to be with National Highways.				
9 Project Control Framework and Governance					
9.1 PCF	National Highways confirms that its role prior to the acceptance of the DCO was to provide support to the Applicant to ensure that the application documentation met the requirements of governance for projects on the SRN at the Preliminary Design at Project Control Framework Stage 3 (PCF 3). National Highways did not review any products that have been de-scoped from the PCF 3 process or any documents that were sent for National Highways information only at PCF 3 stage. National Highways reviews and advice at PCF 3 are intended to ensure that documents are in accordance with	The Applicant has consulted and liaised with National Highways throughout the evolution and design development of the Scheme. This has included discussions with National Highways' technical teams, regarding the traffic modelling that quantifies the impact of the Scheme on the Strategic Road Network, highway design and road safety. The evolution and design development of the Scheme has also been undertaken in accordance with National Highways' Project Control Framework (PCF) process and all required	NH to review and confirm status of issue following Applicant response (16/07/2024)	National Highways position is that they have endorsed, for the purposes of joint governance, PCF products rather than approved them.	31 (High)

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response Position at D1(18 June)</u>	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response-/Latest position at D3D10</u>	<u>PADSS Point of Concern NumberRef</u>
	<p>governance requirements and include the chapters, headings and topics that should be covered. The PCF 3 review does not provide any level of technical assurance or endorsement of the scheme's viability or design, nor comment on the accuracy or acceptability of any substantive consent, simply that content is there. The PCF 3 process is to ensure that documents meet governance standards only. If it assists the examination process, a full list of which documents that National Highways reviewed at PCF 3 stage can be provided to the Examining Authority, as well as a list of documents that were de-scoped. National Highways confirms that despite reviewing a selection of documentation for PCF 3 stage, there are a number of matters which were not resolved by the Applicant and National Highways can provide the Examining Authority with</p>	<p>PCF documents relating to the Scheme have been issued to and approved by National Highways, following detailed review.</p>			

Topic	<u>Position-Matter Raised</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u> Position at D1(18 June)	<u>Status and date of latest Position between D1 and D3</u>	<u>NH response /Latest position at D3</u> D10	<u>PADSS Point of Concern Number</u> Ref
	further information should this be required.				

AtkinsRéalis

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

Tel: +44 (0) 8000 514 514

