

Sharpness Rail Connection Consultation Summaries

Background

Stroud District Council (SDC) submitted the draft Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in October 2021. Hearing sessions commenced in March 2023 and were paused in June 2023 to allow a summer break. The majority of the hearing sessions have already been held and have covered all strategic and local site allocations and most of the policies set out in the draft Local Plan. Details of the Examination and the Examination Library are available on the Local Plan Examination webpage.

During the Examination summer break, the Inspectors wrote to the Council on 4 August 2023, ID-010 in the Examination Library, setting out concerns with three areas of soundness:

1. The capacity of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), specifically the capacity of M5 Junctions 12 and 14 to accommodate proposed housing growth;
2. The proposed passenger train service and bespoke Mobility as a Service transport scheme (MaaS) at Strategic Site Allocation PS36 Sharpness New settlement on the grounds of viability and deliverability.
3. The provision of the pedestrian and cycle bridge over the M5 motorway at Strategic Site Allocation PS37 Wisloe New settlement on the grounds of viability and deliverability.

Additional information and a commitment to address the Inspectors' specific viability and deliverability concerns relating to Strategic Site Allocations PS36 Sharpness new settlement and PS37 Wisloe new settlement were submitted to the Inspectors in September 2023.

A Joint Action Plan with National Highways (NH), Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) and South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) to address issues relating to the capacity of the SRN was submitted to the Inspectors on 30 November 2023.

A further letter from the Inspectors dated 5 February 2024, ID-015 in the Examination Library, granted a pause in the Examination until December 2024 to allow the work set out in the Joint Action Plan and additional work relating to PS36 and PS37 to be completed and a six-week period of public consultation on the outcomes of the workstreams to be carried out.

Summary of representations:

The outcomes of this additional work were published for consultation between Monday 9 September to 5pm on Wednesday 23 October 2024. The representations will be published in full alongside this summary document, but as requested by the Inspectors a summary of comments and responses is available below.

The following responses have been provided by the site promoter who undertook the consultation work.

Q. Do you have any comments on the next steps evidence provided by the promoter on the reintroduction of Sharpness Vale Passenger Rail Service?

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
001	Avison Young on behalf of Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarification is required as to how the proposed housing allocation, both during construction and once complete, may impact on the need to maintain emergency access to the Berkeley site and the impact of the proposals on the operations of the NDA site;• Further information is requested regarding the relationship between the Berkeley NPS and adjacent Sharpness new settlement is required;• That the Council should confirm how the “Agent of Change” principle has been considered and assessed within the proposed housing allocation at Sharpness.	Detailed construction programming for rail upgrade not yet undertaken. Existing track to be retained with local tamping only to improve according to Arcadis report. The future new station will be located beyond the existing Berkeley siding used by NDA. It is acknowledged that only one train per week is used by NDA which is considered in the Sharpness Passenger Rail timetable study. Passenger rail now planned for beyond the local plan period.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
002	Nexus Planning on behalf of Crest Nicholson Operations	N/A	N/A
003	McLoughlin Planning on behalf of Seven Homes	The documents underline the fact that the delivery of the Sharpness Garden Village in the form proposed by Policy PS33 is not precise and as a result, cannot be considered Justified or Effective	Relates to LP PS36 and delivery of rail within the lifespan of the local plan, confirming that the proposed allocation is not reliant on the rail to be delivered. Notwithstanding this, the evidence confirms that there is a wider strategic approach for the rail then goes beyond the local plan period.
005 Email	Knight Frank on behalf of Harper Crewe Limited	The proposed passenger train service for the Sharpness new settlement faces significant viability and deliverability challenges, as highlighted by the Local Plan Inspectors in their August 2023 letter. Key concerns include the lack of agreed cost estimates with Network Rail or Train Operating Companies, raising doubts about the scheme's financial feasibility. Although the	Network Rail recommended that an SOC be produced for the proposed Sharpness Passenger Rail service. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The SOC indicates that it would be beneficial to re-

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
	<p>The submitted rep did not follow the consultation questions set by the Council and did not provide a summary to assist the Inspectors.</p> <p>The Council has summarised in 250 words the comments that seem relevant to this topic but take no responsibility for accuracy and the rep should be read in full.</p>	<p>developer suggests the project would be self-funded, the Inspectors express scepticism, particularly regarding the short three-year subsidy period, which may be insufficient for establishing a sustainable service. The proposed train service would connect only to Gloucester, excluding Bristol, a critical economic hub, and there has been insufficient recent engagement with essential stakeholders.</p> <p>In response to these concerns, a Strategic Outline Case (SOC) was prepared, focusing on the reintroduction of services on the Sharpness branch line and the establishment of a new station. However, the SOC does not identify a preferred solution, raising further doubts about its effectiveness in addressing the Inspectors' concerns. The financial analysis within the SOC indicates that both proposed rail options would incur significant losses, estimating a deficit between £22 million and £90 million</p>	<p>introduce the south facing chord at Berkely junction to enable the reintroduction of services towards Bristol. Key rail stakeholders were consulted during the development of the SOC.</p> <p>The SOC was prepared to assess the possible options reintroducing passenger rail services at Sharpness. Whilst it identified alternative options which were then ranked the scope of the SOC was for the proposed rail services as recommended by Network Rail and not business cases for alternatives. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>Moreover, the additional Mobility as a Service (MaaS) proposals lack clarity on implementation costs and funding sources, with examples cited not applicable to new settlements. The absence of detailed financial planning for coach services further underscores the project's sustainability issues. Consequently, without a viable transport plan, the development risks relying on private car use, conflicting with the sustainable vision intended for the Sharpness new settlement.</p>	<p>for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p> <p>Subsequent to the Local Plan EiP a publication by the DfT Science Advisory Council on Land Use and Transport Planning (29 April 2024) recommends that due to the limited UK examples of good practice in innovative and technology based transport provision examples should be drawn from outside of the UK. The updated MaaS technical note follows this guidance and provides information of non-UK examples although detailed financial information is not readily available for these. The form of the MaaS platform is dependent on the level of Multi modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>The rail Outline Business Case does not pursue the highest ranked strategic options but instead focuses on railway solutions, all of which by the current assessment offer poor value for money. There appears to be little prospect of increasing passenger demand or revenue but a high probability that, as more work is undertaken, construction, operation and opportunity costs will significantly increase. As stated above, the case is not compelling for support from Network Rail, the Department for Transport or the wider rail industry.</p>	<p>The SOC was prepared to assess the possible options reintroducing passenger rail services at Sharpness. Whilst it identified alternative options which were then ranked the scope of the SOC was for the proposed rail services as recommended by Network Rail and not business cases for alternatives.</p>
		<p>GCC officers consider the vehicular trip rate estimates for the Sharpness site to be relatively low and the internalisation factor of 18% quite high. Similarly, GCC officers feel that the assumption that bus/coach trips can be increased from 6% to 15% is unrealistic. In particular, the remote location of Sharpness means that bus proposals cannot credibly compete against private car and that DRT loses effectiveness as range extends and number of destinations increase, and benefits decrease as availability falls</p>	<p>The trip generation, distribution and mode share aspects will be discussed in detail separately with GCC.</p> <p>The road based public transport options currently being developed do not follow a traditional bus operating model but are being assessed on the basis of express coach services calling at key employment nodes between Sharpness and Gloucester and Sharpness and Bristol in order to reduce journey time. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line as well as demand responsive bus operators to design and cost this service.
		<p>GCC officers are concerned that such service would require significant on-going revenue support in the long term.</p> <p>GCC officers are of the opinion that the public transport solutions proposed are more akin to an on-demand private hire service to employment centres, than a genuine public transport offer. It is not clear how this would be funded.</p>	The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform.
		GCC officers are not convinced that viable public transport services (by rail or bus) that offer a real alternative to the car can be achieved at this location and is therefore concerned that such an assumption, as well as the low trip rate estimates and high internalisation factor, would likely underestimate traffic impact by car on the highway network.	The Site Promoter will work directly with GCC to address these aspects.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
009	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<p>The Inspectors have expressed serious concerns regarding the viability and deliverability of the rail scheme.</p> <p>EB136 Appendix 3 makes clear that there is not a financial case for the rail proposal and instead suggests that it be considered as part of the wider strategic context.</p>	<p>Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>
		<p>The Inspectors have expressed concerns relating to the likely cost, funding and viability of the Mobility as a Service (MaaS) offer.</p> <p>EB136 Appendix 4 does not provide the detail in respect of cost, funding and viability that the Inspectors would need to have confidence that MaaS could be effectively deployed at Sharpness.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the Local Plan EIP a publication by the DfT Science Advisory Council on Land Use and Transport Planning (29 April 2024) recommends that due to the limited UK examples of good practice in innovative and technology based transport provision examples should be drawn from outside of the UK. The updated MaaS technical note follows this guidance and provides information of non-UK examples although detailed financial information is not readily available for these. The form of the MaaS platform is dependent on the level of Multi modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform
		There is no appetite for a passenger service to/from Sharpness as confirmed by the National Rail/GWR letter to Gloucestershire County Council of 27 November 2023, which stated that the proposal has the status of an unfunded aspiration that does not feature in industry strategic or investment plans. It is disappointing to learn that despite having this letter SDC did not consider it necessary to pass it on to the Inspectors nor Members nor include it in this consultation, as its importance to the issues at hand are fundamental.	<p>SDC Comment – the letter referred to was communication between GCC and NW. This was not formally sent to SDC and is only in the public domain due to an FOI that has no connection to SDC.</p> <p>Network Rail have been consulted appropriately through this consultation.</p>
		The relatively remote location of the site, some significant distance from the main movement corridors and major centres of employment, make the location unattractive to transport providers, as demonstrated by the lack of public transport operating in the area.	Using the existing low level of public transport associated with the existing low level of development as a basis implying that there will be low level of public transport under future development is not logical.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		Both GCC and Stagecoach in their representations to the Local Plan have expressed concerns about the promoter’s public transport proposals, which have not been addressed by EB136 Appendix 5.	The SOC was commissioned by the site promoter in response to concerns by GCC and Network Rail. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand.
		Without the participation of relevant multi-modal transport operators that can compete with the private car, MaaS would be irrelevant and would not lead to a mode shift from car use.	The form of the MaaS platform is dependent on the level of Multi modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform
012	Mark Sweeting	The questions the viability short term of a passenger branch line and raises the necessity of improve fixed infrastructure to cope with any	Express coach services towards Gloucester and Bristol are part of the public transport strategy for the site regardless of the

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		development as well as the need for improved bus services, particularly to Bristol and Cam station. Developers has made a significant point of promoting this aspect of the development, making it seem essential.	timeframe for rail implementation and are proposed for implementation from early in the development and before rail services come forward which have a longer timeframe and greater degree of complexity for implementation.
		The SOC makes clear the lack of viability of a rail service. It also demonstrates that this is the wrong location for a development of such size, which will clearly become a commuter town for Bristol.	The SOC indicates that the introduction of the rail service is of regional importance, but the timeline is pushed beyond the local plan period in terms of passenger demand profile requirements. It must be noted that Sharpness Vale is not the only development in the area that would benefit from the rail.
		I am disappointed that this feedback is phrased in such a way as to request comments on the rail link NOT the development PS36 itself. Berkeley is a small community of less than 5,000 and Newtown a few hundred. The recent Canonbury Park developed could be seen as organic growth necessary for the sustainability of the community, and support of local services. The size of the PS36 settlement will destroy the local community and it's environment, will and be detrimental to local services, with lose of local amenity and green spaces. This would better append to an existing	The Sharpness Vale Development will enhance the local community, providing a range of community uses, consist of approximately 50% of new accessible green space which is currently privately owned and therefore inaccessible. Internalisation and the promotion of sustainable transport initiatives make it a sustainable location for development.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		conurbation of similar size, nearer Bristol, Gloucester or the M5, rather than dumped on the flood plain of the River Severn.	
013	Nik Handford	<p><i>"embrace a wider regional rail service that was inclusive of localised rail destinations such as Sharpness, Berkeley Road and Bristol Road, Stonehouse and included stops at Cam and Dursley as well as Charfield. A strategically inclusive service would ensure slower commuter trains left the network at Sharpness"</i></p> <p>This would be difficult due to C&D, Charfield being on a different line to Stonehouse. At present from Cam to Stonehouse takes 20mins by car, 40mins by bus and 1hr or more and one change on the train!</p>	different scheduled services could serve different destinations at different times
		<p>How does the Sharpness Station and the reopening of Charfield Station work together? As it is, these will at least halve the stops at Wisloe. Will the new Sharpness station mean only third train stop at each of these stations. Cam, Dursley, Wisloe and Charfield are all being sold as frequent trains per hour and now they won't be.</p>	<p>The initial rail proposals intended a separate service operating on the branch line to Gloucester up to 2 trains per hour at the end of the local plan. The SOC now indicates that this could be served by trains from the mainline using the branch as a passing loop. This would then mean that the Sharpness Services would be linked to the mainline</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>Commuters from Cam may have to drive to Sharpness to catch the train they need because it doesn't stop there, or wait until the next one in an hour or so. Commuters won't want to waste time on a bus transfer they will use their cars. Sharpness/Berkeley to Stonehouse, won't work, they should be on different</p>	<p>schedule. Sharpness to Berkeley is on the same line and the train will stop at Stonehouse. Normal mainline rail services will continue to operate and stop at stations as normal. The Sharpness Vale Service will be in addition. The Sharpness Branch line could function as an extended passing loop to the mainline with the added benefit of receiving passengers and ticket revenue. This will enable different scheduled services to stop at different stops and the slower trains to move out of the way of the faster trains by using the Sharpness Branch line as a passing loop.</p>
014	<p>Jim Ford Avon sports and classic car club</p>	<p>Trains that now stop at Charfield no longer stop Cam/Dursley. So the service is already halved. trains that stop at Cam/Dursley don't stop at Charfield. Already the great link for commuters in Cam and Dursley are at a lost. How will this affect Wisloe as well.</p>	<p>Changes to the current services are implemented by the current train operating company. The integration of the proposed northbound and ultimately also the southbound services from Sharpness will be subject to a comprehensive timetable study in consultation with network rail and the train operating company. The Sharpness Vale site promoter has no input to operational changes on the current services.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
015	Paul Tempest	N/A	N/A
016	Lucy Biddle	<p>A viable, successful rail link to Sharpness is nothing more than a deranged dream of a deluded and desperate developer with an over inflated ego.</p> <p>There is no incentive for any resident of Sharpness to use a rail service which is less efficient than driving. All the arguments presented at the hearings remain. There is no robust business case for any investment in this project, other than that of a heritage railway managed as a community project.</p> <p>The costs of introducing any public transport scheme at this location are prohibited due to the journeys being split equally between travelling north or south.</p> <p>Any plans that are supported, are very much in their infancy and require huge amounts of time, energy and effort before they become even a remote possibility. Which again does not align</p>	<p>The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line.</p> <p>The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		with the housing trajectory plans for this development.	
017	Martin Coles	N/A	N/A
018	Rohan Torkildsen	N/A	N/A
019	Grace Lewis AT Network Rail	Network Rail is aware of this proposed scheme. It is not committed and does not form part of endorsed industry strategy. We have not been involved in the production of the SOBC. The SOBC is clear that a rail reopening would require significant capital and operational funding. If public funding were to be sought then the scheme would need to fulfil government Value for Money criteria as well as affordability. The SOBC suggests this is unlikely, with all rail options being highlighted as having a 'Poor' Value for Money rating.	Industry rail strategy at the time of developing the initial Sharpness Rail vision did not include branch lines and only considered mainline services and stations. Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and Network rail including a site visit to the Sharpness Branch Line. Network Rail recommended that an SOC be produced. Network Rail through consultation with the site promoter recommended that the DfT Specialist Technical Advice for Rail (STAR) framework be used as a basis for identifying a suitably qualified and recognised rail consultant. The SOC was conducted independently by a STAR framework approved

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			consultant. NR were consulted as a key stakeholder in the preparation of the SOC. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.
020	Carole Jeffes	N/A	N/A
021 & 022	Virginia Jackson & Steve Jackson	The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to J14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.
024	Susan Leleu	<p>The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to junction 14 requires additional modelling and costing to include additional Charfield traffic which have not been provided.</p> <p>For PS37 to share the 1000 housing allocations between multiple sites does not take into account the significant up front costs of diverting the gas pipeline and building the bridge over the M5 to be shared by a smaller number of houses.</p>	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		Option B shows a 10 year pause before building recommences once Junction 14 is improved , therefore delivery of PS37 is post 2041 . This makes PS37 unviable and the LP undeliverable and unsound.	would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.
026	Graham Ellis	I am regularly travelling south down the A38, turning left to the motorway on the B4509. In my experience most delays occur at the traffic lights at the motorway slip roads, and due to the lack of coordination between these lights and those at the A38. Therefore any alteration to the A38/B4509 junction is unlikely to support additional traffic from Sharpness or Wisloe. Why has the base traffic flow data not been updated from 2021 (which was probably affected by covid)? It appears little additional modelling has taken place. It would appear that National Highways have reservations about the A38/B4509 alteration as an interim measure. With developments at both Charfield, and Sharpness, any junction	The National Highways have provided their microsimulation model for use in assessing development impact at the M5J14. The model is validated with a 2021 base year. The site promoter for Sharpness Vale commissioned extensive traffic surveys during 2023 to collect post covid traffic data. The site promoter suggested that the National Highways model be recalibrated to a 2023 base year using the new observed data. National Highways indicated that their 2021 model should be used as the acceptable and validated model for the junction. The Sharpness assessment shows additional infrastructure required at A38/B4509 to provide additional capacity.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		alteration would leave little scope to incorporate any development at Wisloe.	
027	Sian Hill	Not had time to read	N/A
028	PJS Development Solutions Ltd on behalf of Bathurst Ltd	The Sharpness Branch line Strategic Outline Case seems to be indicating that including the additional southern links will result in an inordinate cost increase. We question whether this is deliverable/viable and will ever happen. There needs to be a degree of certainty to support directly related development allocations, and that certainty does not appear to be evidenced.	The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term
029	Sarah Bowles	Strategic decision-making should not be based on interim measures and selective data modelling. The local plan is undeliverable and unsound.	The interim scenario demonstrates deliverability ahead of the major improvements to J14, M5 forming part of the wider delivery of the proposed allocation. It does not determine the local plan undeliverable or unsound.
030	Glenn Fifield	N/A	N/A
031	John Humphries	I have never been able to envisage this coming to fruition. Sheer cost is the first hurdle. I have worked on HS2, it illustrated clearly that our political structure, planning and funding mechanisms are poor in the UK. Pie in the sky.	Comment in noted
032	David Thombs	EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material. For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline relocation and footbridge etc and the PS37 proposal is unviable. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound.</p> <p>No SoCG from NH has been made available to clarify their position regarding EB136.</p>	<p>National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
033	Suzanne Prosser	<p>No - funding has not been agreed for the schemes and they are unlikely to be prioritised. The only viable transport option for residents of these developments at Sharpness and the inflight developments at Berkely is car. The inspectors fundamental concerns have not been addressed at all.</p>	<p>The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock the process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>
034	Owen Leleu	<p>EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material. For PS37 (Wisloe), the</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline relocation and footbridge etc and the PS37 proposal is unviable. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound.</p> <p>No SoCG from NH has been made available to clarify their position regarding EB136.</p>	<p>generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
035	Danielle Ellis	N/A	N/A
036	Jessica Cuthbert-Smith	N/A	N/A
037	David Scammell	the cost is not justifiable for the low number of passengers this service would serve.	The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		The main line infrastructure is already at capacity so extra passengers and traffic cannot not be handled	rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.
038	Vanessa Davies	Low level of confidence with the evidence and proposals.	Comment is noted

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
039	Philip Butcher	The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to Junction 14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic has not been provided.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.
040	Doreen Brimble	I support the Slimbridge Parish Council response. The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to M5 Junction 14 requires	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.</p> <p>For proposed site allocation PS37 Wisloe, the option B proposal to share the 1000 housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the significant up-front infrastructure costs (including on and off site) that would be incurred e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc to be shared by a smaller number of houses (& therefore impacts viability) and that it would result in a 10-year pause or not going ahead at all or with no infrastructure.</p>	<p>Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
041	Thomas Owens	<p>The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to M5 Junction 14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.</p> <p>For proposed site allocation PS37 Wisloe, the option B proposal to share the 1000 housing</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>allocations between multiple sites ignores the significant up-front infrastructure costs (including on and off site) that would be incurred e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc to be shared by a smaller number of houses (& therefore impacts viability) and that it would result in a 10-year pause or not going ahead at all or with no infrastructure.</p>	<p>modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
042	Andrew Davis	<p>EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material.</p> <p>For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc. Option B shows a 10-year</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>pause before building recommences following completion of the J14 roundabout. Under such circumstances the PS37 proposal becomes unviable. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound. No SoCG from NH has been made available to clarify their position regarding EB136.</p>	<p>further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
043	Kirk Walton	<p>The railway line from Berkeley curves north to meet the main line, in the direction of Gloucester and Cam, Bristol where the demand will be.</p> <p>The Cam railway station is already heavily used by people who moved there for cheaper housing whilst working in Bristol. Cam station is in the wrong direction for Berkeley (or Sharpness extension).</p> <p>Cam station has small platforms and cannot fit main line trains.</p> <p>Berkeley Station is not in use and the owners have taken back possession.</p>	<p>The initial rail proposals intended a separate service operating on the branch line to Gloucester up to 2 trains per hour at the end of the local plan period. The SOC now indicates that this could be served by trains from the mainline using the branch as a passing loop. This would mean that the Sharpness Services would be linked to the mainline schedule. Sharpness to Berkeley is on the same line and the train will stop at Stonehouse. Normal mainline rail services will continue to operate and stop at stations as normal. The SOC further indicates that it would be beneficial to re-introduce the south facing chord at Berkely</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>The proposal was for a smaller gauge railway service not legal for main line services.</p> <p>Who will run the service now and it be funded in future years.</p> <p>Gloucester station still does not have all trains calling at the station because of its position.</p> <p>Network Rail queried space to fit extra trains on the timetable.</p> <p>Assuming the demand for train use is predominantly for Bristol how will the Sharpness line link to the main line to service Bristol?</p> <p>The alternative option of a bus service for rail seems unlikely to be a useful option and would be unattractive due to journey times and would create further congestion.</p>	<p>junction to enable the reintroduction of services towards Bristol. The Sharpness Branch line could then function as an extended passing loop to the mainline with the added benefit of receiving passengers and ticket revenue. This will enable different scheduled services to stop at different stops and the slower trains to move out of the way of the faster trains by using the Sharpness Branch line as a passing loop. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The road based public transport options currently being developed do not follow a traditional bus operating model but are being assessed on the basis of express coach services calling at key employment nodes between Sharpness and Gloucester and Sharpness and Bristol in order to reduce journey time. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			as well as demand responsive bus operators to design and cost this service.
044	Helen Bamber	<p>The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to J14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.</p> <p>For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the 1000 housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the significant up-front costs that would be incurred e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc to be shared by a smaller number of houses and that it would result in a 10-year pause.</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
045	Berkeley Town Council	No. All the evidence suggests the proposal for a local passenger train service is not viable.	<p>The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
046	Wisloe Action Group	<p>EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material. For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc. Option B shows a 10-year pause before building recommences following completion of the J14 roundabout. Under such circumstances the PS37 proposal becomes unviable. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound.</p> <p>Without detailed access to the models to show that improvements at J14 could sustain the extra traffic, it is not possible to validate this proposal. It is assumed that NHs are happy with the technical aspects of the proposal. No SoCG from NH has been published so this cannot be confirmed.</p>	1000 units for Sharpness. Additional assessment is currently being undertaken in consultation with National Highways to assess Sharpness together with the Charfield to identify mitigation which serves both developments.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
047	Stagecoach West	We have reviewed the consultation documents, we don't believe that there is any additional detail or mitigations to what was raised at the reg 19 stage.	Comment is noted
048	Anne Szabo	N/A	N/A
049	Kevin Lee	N/A	N/A
050	Hamfallow Parish Council	The proposal for a Sharpness passenger railway link itself concedes that that there is not a strong case for its feasibility. Some of the methodology used and assumptions made are seriously flawed, such as the stakeholder engagement process and costing of options. It is clear to us that these proposals cannot help to justify the PS36 development.	The consultation undertaken during the development of the Sharpness Rail SOC targeted key stakeholders in the rail industry and was not intended or required to be a wider public consultation. The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>
051	Scott Temlett	N/A	N/A

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
052	Alex Hunter	The above undermines the feasibility of the Plan and is not achievable	Further timetable studies will be conducted to determine the operational aspects of re-introducing rail services south bound towards Bristol on the back of the rail SOC identification of the benefit of re-introducing the south facing rail chord at Berkeley junction. Further work currently being undertaken in consultation with National Highways using their transport model to identify a combined interim highway mitigation scheme for the M5J14 that accommodates development traffic from both the Sharpness and Charfield developments.
053	James Carpenter	N/A	N/A
054	Stephen Willetts	EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, yet NH state they do not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>The option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality of significant up-front costs and further shows a 10-year pause before building recommences following completion of the J14 roundabout. Under such circumstances the PS37 proposal becomes unviable and PS24 at 60% of the houses would be unviable or if infrastructure and service needs were relaxed unsustainable and breaking existing already stretched services. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound.</p>	<p>generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.</p>
055	Slimbridge Parish Council	<p>EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material. For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory</p>	<p>Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc. Option B shows a 10-year pause before building recommences following completion of the J14 roundabout. Under such circumstances the PS37 proposal becomes unviable. The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound.	would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.
056	Cllr Lindsey Green Stroud District Council	EB136 includes a proposal to introduce an interim modification to the B4509, where it joins the A38 at J14, to permit a further 1000 dwellings' worth of car journeys at J14, despite NH stating they did not support the proposal. Further modelling work is required, and this has not been included within the consultation material. For PS37 (Wisloe), the option B proposal to share the housing allocations between multiple sites ignores the reality that significant up-front costs would be incurred associated with incorporating mandatory infrastructure, e.g. gas pipeline move and footbridge etc. Option B shows a 10-year pause before building recommences following completion of the J14 roundabout. Under such	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		circumstances the PS37 proposal becomes unviable.	Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.
		The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would therefore make the LP undeliverable and unsound. No SoCG from NH has been made available to clarify their position regarding EB136.	Comment is noted
		Rail options fall in the POOR VALUE FOR MONEY category.	Further timetable studies will be conducted to determine the operational aspects of re-introducing rail services south bound towards Bristol on the back of the rail SOC identification of the benefit of re-introducing the south facing rail chord at Berkeley junction. Further work currently being undertaken in consultation with National Highways using their transport model to identify a combined interim highway mitigation scheme for the M5J14 that accommodates development traffic from both the Sharpness and Charfield developments.
		Rail is still UNFUNDED, NOT VIABLE AND NOT DELIVERABLE	

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
057	John Mace	The Sharpness Vale Passenger Service is, given the comments in my full dissertation, a white elephant. The scheme would be costly to instal (the Sharpness branch as is would need a total revamp and new stations) and whichever way the branch train was operated would severely impinge upon the main Gloucester to Bristol operations which are currently very close to capacity. An expensive scheme for few to use (once a few trains are late, delayed or not run most will revert to their cars) this is a non starter in my view.	A comprehensive timetable study was undertaken by a specialist rail consultant to assess the introduction of passenger rails services towards Gloucester as part of the initial rail proposals prior to the commissioning of the SOC. This timetable study determined that it was possible to accommodate the service within the existing mainline schedule and was determined to be sound by Network Rail (see previous EiP evidence). This study was further updated to assess the increased frequencies associated with the Metro West service. The later rail SOC was commissioned on the recommendation of Network Rail which identified the benefit of reintroducing southbound services towards Bristol. Specialist timetable studies will be commissioned to assess the possibility of introducing south bound trains within the mainline schedule as part of the long term development of the Sharpness Rail Proposals.
058	Carl Merry	N/A	N/A

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
059	Haydn Jones	<p>Proposals provided by the promoter on the reintroduction of a Sharpness Vale Passenger Rail Service do not overcome the clear challenges presented in the REP-904-001d Gloucestershire County Council Sharpness Review of Transport Report (https://www.stroud.gov.uk/media/h1coka4i/rep-904-001d-gloucestershire-county-council-sharpness-review-of-transport-report.pdf)</p> <p>This report establishes that a reintroduced Sharpness rail link is not realistic, feasible or viable without significant Government funding together with long term support. A previous application to the Restoring Your Railways fund was unsuccessful.</p> <p>Proposals to incorporate interim changes to road layout at M5J14 and B4509 to allow for traffic generated by 1000 homes is not supported by National Highways. The further proposal to split said 1000 homes between proposed strategic sites ignores the significant associated setup costs for these sites. At PS37 for instance, a gas pipe line would need to be relocated and a pedestrian footbridge over the motorway. The</p>	<p>The rail SOC was commissioned in response to GGC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		associated costs makes this proposal completely unviable and undeliverable.	must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken. This will then be presented to National Highways for approval.
061	Denis Bannister	Study of current rail usage suggest that the rail service would make little difference to commuter habits. Simply saying significant numbers of commuters will ride bicycles and take trains is simply wishful thinking.	Comment is noted
062	Stuart Rackham	N/A	N/A
063	Shelagh Daley	N/A	N/A

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
064	Jo Kendall	<p>The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to J14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided</p> <p>* It is quite clear reading the document that there is absolutely no way the rail service could ever be seriously considered either on cost or practicality. The proposal makes no sense on any level</p>	<p>The rail SOC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken. This will then be presented to National Highways for approval.
065	Elaine Pearce	How does the Sharpness/Berkeley line fit in with the reopening of Charfield Station, as it is this will halve the stops at Wisloe. So would the new Sharpness/Berkeley mean only one in three trains stop at each of these sites, all of which appear to be sold on the frequency train of service, which may no longer be true. Commuters from Cam/Dursley(Wisloe) may have to drive to Charfield or Sharpness/Berkeley to catch the train they used to catch at Cam/Dursley, or wait 60-90 minutes for the next train and vice-versa. Users will not waste time on a bus transfer they will use their cars. As for their thoughts on Sharpness/Berkeley to Stonehouse, they're on different lines and would require 2 trains and a transfer!	The initial rail proposals intended a separate service operating on the branch line to Gloucester up to 2 trains per hour at the end of the local plan. The SOC now indicates that this could be served by trains from the mainline using the branch as a passing loop. This would then mean that the Sharpness Services would be linked to the mainline schedule. Sharpness to Berkeley is on the same line and the train will stop at Stonehouse. Normal mainline rail services will continue to operate and stop at stations as normal. The Sharpness Vale Service will be in addition. The Sharpness Branch line could function as an extended passing loop to the mainline with the added benefit of receiving passengers and ticket revenue. This will

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			enable different scheduled services to stop at different stops and the slower trains to move out of the way of the faster trains by using the Sharpness Branch line as a passing loop.
066	Catherine Wayne	<p>There are no hard costings or timescales indicated for the wider rail scheme, and very limited evidence of consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Again, nothing in these documents positively addresses the understandable concerns raised by the Inspectors, nor do they suggest that the proposals for PS36 are any more sustainable or deliverable.</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. It was through this SOC process that the south facing link towards Bristol was identified as being beneficial. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service and infrastructure as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through following steps.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>Subsequent to the Local Plan EIP a publication by the DfT Science Advisory Council on Land Use and Transport Planning (29 April 2024) recommends that due to the limited UK examples of good practice in innovative and technology based transport provision examples should be drawn from outside of the UK. The updated MaaS technical note follows this guidance and provides information of non-UK examples although detailed financial information is not readily available for these. The form of the MaaS platform is dependent on the level of Multi-modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
067	Sally Allen	<p>If there is any real possibility of the reopening of any branch line, I would be wholly in favour, although cost and timescales are likely to have a huge impact on whether this actually becomes a viable option, and whether the service delivered actually met the needs of the commuters. For this to be workable there needs to be adequate parking and public transport links. Cam and Dursley station has far exceeded the expectations and services offered are fast becoming outstripped by the demands. Lack of parking had been an increasing problem, not helped by the additional car park being f need off and used by the building companies which results in huge amounts of cars parking along a very narrow lane. So if this project gets the go ahead then parking allocation should be the highest figure given for users not the lowest</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. It was through this SOC process that the south facing link towards Bristol was identified as being beneficial. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service and infrastructure as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through following steps.</p>
069	Berkeley and Sharpness Residents' Action Group (BaSRAG)	<p>The developers have widened their ambitions for a rail link from Sharpness and in doing so have demonstrated that the criticisms of the original scheme were entirely valid. The Strategic Outline</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>Case envisaging a more strategic approach renders any idea of a rail link completely unachievable within the Plan period. In doing so, and in combination with the uncertainty over junction 14, the projections about an express coach service have been scrapped.</p> <p>Again, nothing in these documents positively addresses the understandable concerns raised by the Inspectors, nor do they suggest that the proposals for PS36 are any more sustainable or deliverable.</p> <p>There are no hard costings or timescales indicated for the wider rail scheme, and very limited evidence of consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>The Inspectors noted the absence of indicative costs for the proposed MaaS scheme. These still have not been provided; instead just vague references to other schemes on other sites which don't bear meaningful comparison with Sharpness</p>	<p>benefits that such a service would provide. It was through this SOC process that the south facing link towards Bristol was identified as being beneficial. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service and infrastructure as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through following steps.</p> <p>Subsequent to the Local Plan EiP a publication by the DfT Science Advisory Council on Land Use and Transport Planning (29 April 2024) recommends that due to the limited UK examples of good practice in innovative and technology based transport provision examples should be drawn from outside of the UK. The updated MaaS technical note follows this guidance and provides information of non-UK examples although detailed financial information is not readily available for these.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>The form of the MaaS platform is dependant on the level of Mult modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform.</p>
070	Gillian Delve	<p>If this line is to be considered for passenger use it must have the southern line resurrected to allow travel to Bristol. No one is going to want to go the Cam and Dursley and wait for anther train to take them south. If it is to be done it should be done properly. However where is the evidence that it would be used enough to warrant the considerable expense involved?</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service operational design to meet the passenger demand, the infrastructure requirements as well as costing thereof will be</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			defined as the process progresses through following steps.
071	Darius Ferrigno	The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to J14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
072	Conor Flanagan	Review of the additional information submitted confirms that it remains the case that the Sharpness Vale Passenger Rail Service is highly aspirational rather than tangible, and that the allocation continues to rely upon a private funded bus service. Grave questions over the sustainability and deliverability of Sharpness therefore remain.	The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. It was through this SOC process that the south facing link towards Bristol was identified as being beneficial. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service and infrastructure as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through the next business case steps. The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>
073	Copperfield on behalf of L&P Limited	EB136 provides a range of options and costs, but does not demonstrate a commitment to delivering passenger services by those responsible for the rail network and the operators.	The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			series of business cases required and detail of service operational design to meet the passenger demand, the infrastructure requirements as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through following steps.
074	Grass Roots Planning on behalf of Redrow Home Ltd	<p>The documentation submitted shows that the introduction of the passenger rail and station would not be viable over the 60 year period and would represent poor value for money. Options such as improving bus connections to the existing train stations should be explored given these rank higher overall.</p> <p>The examples given for the MaaS are brief and cannot be used as comparisons given their differing scales and services offered. It is therefore questionable what additional benefit the MaaS service provides above the route finder service operated by Stagecoach West.</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required. The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. It was through this SOC process that the south facing link towards Bristol was identified as being beneficial. Most rail projects, as strategic transport investment, require long term commitment by multiple stakeholders and funding. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service and infrastructure as well as costing</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>thereof will be defined as the process progresses through the next business case steps. The Sharpness Vale Development is not contingent on the re-introduction of passenger rail services on the Sharpness Branch line. The travel demand can be accommodated by road-based alternatives. This would result in the need for highway mitigation to accommodate the additional traffic. Whilst this may be easier and quicker to accomplish the site promoter has first sought to make use of a currently underutilised strategic transport asset in the form of the rail branch line as this aligns with the National Governments long term vision of transport decarbonisation and promotion of more sustainable car alternative forms of transport. The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Sharpness Branch Line remains a long-term objective. Road based forms of public transport will be pursued in the short to medium term. The Sharpness Vale site promoters are working with key regional stakeholders to unlock process required to further develop the case for the reintroduction of rail services on the Sharpness Branch Line.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>Subsequent to the Local Plan EIP a publication by the DfT Science Advisory Council on Land Use and Transport Planning (29 April 2024) recommends that due to the limited UK examples of good practice in innovative and technology based transport provision examples should be drawn from outside of the UK. The updated MaaS technical note follows this guidance and provides information of non-UK examples although detailed financial information is not readily available for these. The form of the MaaS platform is dependent on the level of Multi-modalism required to be incorporated and with the outcomes of the Rail SOC this platform may initially incorporate only bus & shared mobility options. The site promoter is currently working with a demand responsive public transport operator to determine the operational requirements and costs associated with an incrementally implemented system linked to demand which will have its own user interface and ticketing platform.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
075	Sarah Jones	For proposed site allocation PS37 Wisloe, the option B proposal to share the 1000 housing allocations between multiple sites (especially if this rail service is not implemented) ignores the significant up-front infrastructure costs (including on and off site) that would be incurred e.g. for PS37 the gas pipeline move and footbridge etc to be shared by a smaller number of houses (& therefore impacts viability) and that it would result in a 10-year+ pause or not going ahead at all or with no infrastructure. The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to M5 Junction 14 still requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate the additional Charfield traffic, which have not been included amongst other recognised additional costs which have been ignored.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken. This will then be presented to National Highways for approval.
077	Sarah Davis Sarah Davis Glass	The proposal to include the Option B scenario within the LP would make the LP undeliverable and unsound.	Several meetings have been held between the site promoter with their consultants and National Highways since the EiP. National Highways have provided their validated

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>microsimulation transport model for use in assessing the development impact at the M5J14 by future Sharpness Development generated traffic. The outcomes of this modelling process has been presented to National Highways who indicated that more than one interim highway mitigation scheme would not be supported and that the site promoter for Sharpness Vale must undertake further modelling work to test a highway mitigation scheme that would accommodate the additional traffic associated with a Charfield Development together with Sharpness. This further modelling work is currently being undertaken. This will then be presented to National Highways for approval.</p>
079	Cam Parish Council	<p>The proposal for achieving 1000 dwellings by modifications to J14 requires additional modelling and costings to incorporate additional Charfield traffic, which have not been provided.</p> <p>Report 3 states the rail network to Sharpness is not viable. Therefore, this development is unsustainable and will have a detrimental impact</p>	<p>The rail SoC was commissioned in response to GCC and Network Rail comment that a business case was required . The SOC acknowledges this as well as the regional benefits that such a service would provide. The Strategic Outline Case is the first step in a series of business cases required and detail of service operational design to meet the</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		on the motorway junctions due to the number of car movements.	passenger demand, the infrastructure requirements as well as costing thereof will be defined as the process progresses through following steps.
080	Eastington Parish Council	Propose a railway-led plan with a station at Hunts Grove is put forward for Sharpness and Wisloe.	Comment is noted