

Consultation Summary Wisloe New Settlement

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 costings provided on behalf of both landowners to deliver the proposed M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing?

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
007 Email	RPS on behalf of Cotswold Homes The submitted rep did not follow the consultation questions set by the Council and did not provide a summary to assist the Inspectors. The Council has summarised in 250	The Local Plan Inspectors expressed significant concerns regarding the viability and deliverability of a proposed pedestrian and cycle bridge over the M5 in their letter to SDC dated August 4, 2023. They emphasized the necessity of recent evidence demonstrating the bridge's feasibility, particularly given that the projected costs and timelines had not been confirmed with National Highways. Without this bridge, sustainable access to local services and the railway station would be compromised, raising questions about the new settlement's overall accessibility.	The Planning Inspector requested that GCC & The ECT undertake additional engagement with National Highways to validate the bridge design work and the associated capital cost that was presented at the EIP. This has been done as set out in the response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2). The Viability & Deliverability Statement dated June '23 included a phasing strategy that clearly demonstrated the sequencing of work to support installation of the bridge at the earliest viable opportunity.
		In response, SDC issued a document titled 'Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August	The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the Wisloe

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
	words the comments that seem relevant to this topic, but take no responsibility for accuracy, the rep should be read in full.	2024 R2,' which includes updated information on the bridge's viability and cost estimates from consultants Stantec and Ward Williams Associates LLP. However, critical components of this evidence, particularly the Viability & Deliverability Statement and cost summary, were dated June 2023 and had not been revised since the examination pause in February 2024. This raises doubts about the reliability of the claimed costs, which were stated to remain at approximately £3.77 million.	M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable. GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe.
		While National Highways did not object to the costs provided, their response indicated only a broad agreement in principle, failing to establish a formal agreement on costs and timelines as requested by the Inspectors. Furthermore, a recent cost plan indicated a total cost of £6.285 million for the bridge, revealing a significant discrepancy with previous estimates. Overall, the additional information provided does not adequately address the Inspectors' requests, leaving uncertainty about the bridge's viability and deliverability.	Please refer to the Response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2). The net £ nil change in capital cost of the M5 Wisloe pedestrian cycle bridge reflects an accurate costing exercise.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
013	Nik Handford	<p>This only benefits Ernest Cook Trust as it lands on their land. There is already a perfectly good pedestrian crossing by the A4135, there are paths up from Wisloe and down the other side but at present no way to walk to the Halmore bridge. Yet this seems to be glossed over as the M5 crossing is wholly dependent the Halmore bridge being reduce to a single lane with traffic lights so half the bridge can be for pedestrians and cyclist. Using the existing A4135 M5 bridge also means anyone living south west of the A4135(lighten brook) could get to the station without having to walk to Wisloe first. Also it would stop people walking through the new community and passed the school saying they are going to or from the station.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>The costing for the bridge is just the same one again. It's based on one where the land is above the level of the M5 not below it.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2).</p>
		<p>No mention of cost or timescale for the final crossing on the trainlines.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		The High Pressure Gas Pipeline in the quotes never covered the route proposed but it's still the same price and time scale.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		What are the cost implications on the M5 bridge if the High Pressure Gas Pipeline is moved first. As some if not all bridge equipment will have to move over High Pressure Gas Pipeline?	There is no consequential impact on the capital cost of the proposed Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge.
		We've been told the studies say it doesn't flood but twice in a year now the A38 has.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Local roads will become rat runs as soon as Traffic lights go in on the A38.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		How do existing homes blend into the new Wisloe, ah they don't, they've put them in recreational areas!	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		"Allotments and Community Gardens" Phase W2, "New Sports Pitches" Phase W3?	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		What happened to "Delivery Policy ES9 Equestrian development" What is Wisloe Farm at the Moment? Stables and Equestrian Development!	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		"Allotments and Community Gardens" Phase W2, "New Sports Pitches" Phase W3?	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
014	Jim Ford	More thought perhaps on Halmore bridge which the promoters just pass by.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
	avon sports and classic car club		connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Why in all their Phase drawings is this bridge labeled Main Road. Is it safe to have all this equipment and materials travelling over the rerouted High Pressure Gas Pipeline.	Please view drawing LHC-00-00-DR-UD-01.02. Wherever referenced, the proposed Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge is referenced correctly.
		<p>The M5 bridge costing was not revised it's just the old one again. These appear to be based on the Micheal Woods, where the land is above the level of the M5 not below it. The M5 is metres above the surrounding lands.</p> <p>The Bridge is only part of the solution but gets you no further than the existing A4135 bridge, which on the wrong side of the train tracks from the station, what of the cost and timescale of the bridge over the railway, which could be linked up to the A4135 bridge as well or instead of.</p> <p>The HPG Pipeline is moved first, what are the cost implications on the M5 bridge and bunds as they will require transportation over the HPG pipeline as well as possible work taking place near the pipeline.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2).</p> <p>There is no consequential impact on the capital cost of the proposed Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		waste of money to help ECT make more money by selling their useless piece of land to Wisloe Community at great expense.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
016	Lucy Biddle	The plans are for a pedestrian/ cycle bridge to the rear of the development. The more pressing need is for a pedestrian/ cycle bridge across the railway on the A4135. Without this connectivity, Wisloe is an island, cut off from neighbouring communities and facilities by the motorway and railway.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
020	Carole Jeffes	The promoter's cost was £6.285m with the additional cost of 2.5m to be borne by the developer. There is no lead developer who had undertaken due diligence for the proposal. The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions in SDC viability assessment report without supporting evidence. Correcting the Savills report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the Wisloe M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>The net £ nil change in capital cost of the M5 Wisloe pedestrian and cycle bridge is indicative of an accurate costing exercise. GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivering the proposed development at Wisloe.</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
021	Virginia Jackson	The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated but merely reissued 15 months later. The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £ nil change in capital cost of the M5 Wisloe pedestrian and cycle bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report (EB111) without supporting evidence.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
022	Steve Jackson	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated but merely reissued 15 months later. The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.	calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to various contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station. The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.
		The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report (EB111) without supporting evidence.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
024	Susan Leleu	The conclusion of my answering these questions is that the Draft Local Plan is not deliverable and is unsound.	Comment is noted

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
025	Jeremy Akers	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has NOT been updated.</p> <p>The footbridge costs are significant and are pie in the sky without a lead developer willing to take this on. No one has undertaken a due diligence for this proposal which perhaps indicates this site is unattractive and uneconomic to developers</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
026	Graham Ellis	<p>The Michaelwood bridge was installed in 2022. As material and construction costs have been significantly increasing recently, it is unlikely that the Wisloe bridge can be installed at a similar cost.</p> <p>There seem to be quite a few elements that have been excluded from the costings - especially the access to the bridge site, which will have to be</p>	<p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors.</p> <p>Where comparison to the Michaelwood M5 Service station is made, an allowance for construction (tender) price inflation has been made to ensure price parity.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>completely refreshed, and banked up to the height of the bridge.</p> <p>There has been no independent validation of the cost of the bridge or the whole Wisloe project.</p>	<p>Embankments to form the approach to the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge will be formed utilising subsoil arisings from the site (suitably engineered). The cost for this is element of the work is included in the wider project costings and does not form part of the bridge.</p>
027	Sian Hill	<p>I could not read anywhere that the full costing and funding of this has been agreed. Which leads me to fear that it will be dropped altogether by the developers and, if the huge cluster of houses are built will force even more traffic onto the local roads.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
029	Sarah Bowles	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been updated and there is a broad assumption that the lead developer will take on a significant up-front cost, despite a lead developer not yet having been appointed.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document has varied the terms upon which SDC made their own viability assessments. This means that the Wisloe development is being assessed on terms which are not consistent with other sites included in the local plan - this is neither fair nor appropriate.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>Based on the comments above, PS37 is not viable and the local plan, which is based on inclusion of strategic sites such as PS37, is therefore undeliverable and unsound.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
031	John Humphries	Is it value for money?	The costs are being met by the promoter and ultimately the developer.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
032	David Thombs	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later. NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However the total cost is later given as £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £ nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of and accurate costing exercise.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report. EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. Correcting the Savills viability report assumptions results in PS37 becoming not viable.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
034	Owen Leleu	<p>The quote given by Savills cannot be relied upon to give a true indication of cost as little effort has been made to ensure it is accurate. Their own contractor has quoted a different figure .</p>	<p>When grouping cost for various presentation purposes, similarity is purely coincidental, and parity cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>For example the allocation of Risk, Overhead & Profit will significantly distort the cost heading, as raised in this comment.</p> <p>The comparison made is erroneous.</p>
		<p>NH have not committed to the cost saying 'it looks right', but that is not what they said at the hearing. They use a contractor themselves when building the bridges so how can that comment be relied upon ?</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p>
		<p>At least 150 houses will be built before the bridge is constructed so at least 150 car journeys will already be established and the train station has no more capacity for commuter parking.</p>	<p>The adequacy of the trigger point for the delivery of the M5 Wisloe pedestrian and cycle bridge was specifically considered by the Planning Inspectors at the PS37 Wisloe</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			Hearing Session that was held on 23 rd June 2023 which resulted in them being satisfied it was appropriate.
		The conclusion of my answering all these questions is that the Draft Local plan cannot be delivered and is therefore unsound	It is the role of the Inspectors to consider the evidence and make a final decision.
035	Danielle Ellis	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been updated but merely reissued 15 months later.</p> <p>The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p> <p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p>
036	Jessica Cuthbert-Smith	The costings have not been updated.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan RM5 Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
037	David Scammell	The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been updated, merely reissued 15 months later.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.	The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian and Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report (EB111) without supporting evidence.</p> <p>Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming non viable.</p>	<p>GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p> <p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
039	Philip Butcher	The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated and has merely been reissued 15 months later. The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional £2.5m cost will be borne by the developer. To date there remains no lead	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>developer who has undertaken any due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in Stroud district Council's viability assessment report (EB111) without any evidence to justify the approach. Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
040	Doreen Brimble	<p>I support Slimbridge Parish Council's response. The council have not validated the costs submitted by the Landowners (Ernest Cook Trust and Gloucestershire County Council). The council should not accept what has been provided without independently assessing this. The footbridge cost estimate was reissued 15 months on and has not been updated or any evidence to demonstrate why the costs are validate. The landowners total cost was £6.285m and the</p>	<p>The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivering the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
		<p>Where the bridge entry and exit points land do not take into account existing infrastructure such as the gas pipeline, acoustic barriers (the height of these has not been considered), consents required from National Highways and Network Rail etc.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>The viability document prepared by Savills does not align with the baseline assumptions contained in the council's viability assessment report (EB111) and does not explain why it has been changed without supporting evidence. If the Savills viability report is updated it demonstrates that PS37 becoming not viable. The conclusion is</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		that the Draft Local Plan is not deliverable and is unsound for all the questions above.	
041	Thomas Owens	The council have not validated the costs submitted by the Landowners (Ernest Cook Trust and Gloucestershire County Council). The council should not accept what has been provided without independently assessing this.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Where the bridge entry and exit points land do not take into account existing infrastructure such as the gas pipeline, acoustic barriers (the height of these has not been considered), consents required from National Highways and Network Rail etc.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		The viability document prepared by Savills does not align with the baseline assumptions contained in the council's viability assessment report (EB111) and does not explain why it has been changed without supporting evidence. If the Savills viability report is updated it demonstrates that PS37 becoming not viable. The conclusion is that the Draft Local Plan is not deliverable and is unsound for all the questions above.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
042	Andrew Davis	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later. NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However, the promoter's own contractor's assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		<p>A dedicated Hearing session should be scheduled to review PS37 against EB111, as was originally planned, recognising the previous PS37 viability Hearing session on the 23rd June 2023 was focussed entirely on reviewing the Savills report.</p>	<p>Administration of the hearing sessions is led by the Inspectors.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report, EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken. To minimise the risk of a future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111. Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
043	Kirk Walton	Not an expert but question costs based on most projects involving National Highways going over budget.	It is intended that the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle Bridge will be delivered by the Private Sector via the 3 rd Party Works route. Comparison to Public Sector overspend are therefore considered to be erroneous.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
044	Helen Bamber	The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated but merely reissued 15 months later.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p>
		The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.	The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>GCC and ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC’s viability assessment report (EB111) without supporting evidence.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable. The conclusion is that the Draft Local Plan is not deliverable and is unsound for all the questions above</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
046	Wisloe Action Group	The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate costing exercise.</p>
		NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However, the promoter's own contractor's assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of an accurate costing exercise.
		The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report, EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken. To minimise the risk of a future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		A dedicated Hearing session should be scheduled to review PS37 against EB111, as was originally planned, recognising the previous PS37 viability Hearing session on the 23rd June 2023 was focussed entirely on reviewing the Savills report.	Administration of the hearing sessions is led by the Inspectors.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
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.	Noted. It is therefore clear that Stagecoach West still support the comprehensive bus improvement strategy that was previously agreed with them.
051	Scott Temlett	With all the additional costs involved, building a footbridge over the M5 and railway line is simply just not feasible and will not be built by the developer.	The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
052	Alex Hunter	The above undermines the feasibility of the Plan and is not achievable	Comment is noted
053	Falfield Parish Council	There's also no pedestrian footpath provision between Falfield and Tortworth over M5 Junction 14 and no designated cycle lane.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		A pedestrian and cycling provision should also be provided at M5 J14 either as part of the remodelling or via another new pedestrian &	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		cyclist bridge as the current proposals make it more unsafe for these user groups.	connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
054	Stephen Willetts	The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later. NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However, the promoter's own contractor's assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer(s). Further various other costs have not been accounted for and there is no developer(s) to carry out due diligence.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of an accurate costing exercise.</p>
		EB133b 4.3.15 suggests a super cluster of Wisloe and Cam allocations is considered. This would need to be considered holistically and therefore the issues raised for PS37 would be a part of a PS24/25/37 consideration.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>in SDC’s viability assessment report, EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken.</p>	<p>in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>To minimise the risk of a future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites not just PS37 be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
055	Slimbridge Parish Council	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later. NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However, the promoter’s own contractor’s assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an</p>	<p>The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.</p> <p>GCC and ECT remain fully committed to delivering the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
		<p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report, EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken. To minimise the risk of a</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111. Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.</p>	
		<p>A dedicated Hearing session should be scheduled to review PS37 against EB111, as was originally planned, recognising the previous PS37 viability Hearing session on the 23rd June 2023 was focussed entirely on reviewing the Savills report.</p>	<p>Administration of the hearing sessions is led by the Inspectors.</p>
056	Cllr Lindsey Green Stroud District Council	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has not been refreshed but merely reissued 15 months later. NH received insufficient data but confirmed the bridge costs were broadly in line with expectations. However, the promoter's own contractor's assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.
		The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report, EB111 is the only viability document to have been subjected to consultation. Unlike EB111, the Savills document provides no supporting evidence to substantiate the assumption changes beyond Savills own opinion, which were not supported by any independent third-party opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken. To minimise the risk of a future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111. Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		A dedicated Hearing session should be scheduled to review PS37 against EB111, as was originally planned, recognising the previous PS37 viability	Administration of the hearing sessions is led by the Inspectors.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		Hearing session on the 23rd June 2023 was focussed entirely on reviewing the Savills report.	
057	John Mace	Costs need to be current when planning is established. Seems very expensive for a few to use.	Costs are consistent with the appropriate base date. The ECT & GCC are committed to delivering the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge to unpin the sustainable transport strategy which is at the heart of the Wisloe vision.
058	Carl Merry	There remains no lead developer who has undertaken the due diligence as £2.5 million of the project was to be borne by the developer.	In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.
059	Hadyn Jones	Costings associated with the M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge appear to stem directly from a Savills	We wish to clarify the following points. 1. Timing of viability statement: The Wisloe project team shared the

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>report delivered to the inspection less than 24 hours before this matter was due to be discussed.</p> <p>At the time of the inspection I served as the District Councillor for The Berkeley Vale Ward. Over the protracted local plan process my fellow District Councillors and I had worked hard to keep our residents informed and to act as best we could on their behalf. The promoters of PS37 had consistently claimed to be engaging constructively, working with residents and the Parish Council to take on board concerns. Nothing could be further from the truth and introducing a critical report to the process with less than 24 hours notice after years of work, clearly demonstrates the real approach adopted to circumvent the legitimate concerns expressed by District Councillors, the Parish Council and local residents. This late introduction of costs associated with this important component of the PS37 site prevented residents from engaging with the process via their elected representatives and effectively excluded their participation. I believe the promoters and their agents acted immorally in order to silence protest and I am disappointed that this document was admitted to the examination process.</p>	<p>completed viability statement with the Examination Officer a week before the hearing in question. The timing of its circulation to others is not in our control. Any concerns about the timing of circulation of evidence is a matter for inspectors. We note that this matter was discussed and addressed at the hearing on 23 June 2023.</p> <p>2. Community engagement: The Wisloe project team has consistently engaged professionally with stakeholders, parish councils, residents, and businesses. Details of our engagement are available on the project website. We remain open to constructive dialogue and are happy to meet to address any specific concerns.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		In terms of comment on costings for the bridge I support the detailed work of Wisloe Action Group and Slimbridge Parish Council.	
061	Denis Bannister	The cost of the footbridge has escalated every time it has been reviewed and the current version has no more credibility than the previous versions.	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p>
		Where is the evidence that a developer has undertaken due diligence?	The ECT & GCC have undertaken extensive technical and design work which underpins the appraisals provided.
		An objective review of the Savills viability report demonstrates that PS37 is not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
063	Shelagh Daley	Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
064	Jo Kendall	With no promoter for Wisloe having come forward in the past three years the coatings cannot be accurately verified.	<p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p> <p>ECT & GCC have undertaken extensive technical and design work which underpins the appraisals provided.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
065	Elaine Pearce	The costing for the M5 bridge is just the old one again. The costing is based where the land is above the level of the M5 not below it.	<p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors.</p> <p>Embankments to form the approach to the Wisloe Bridge will be formed utilising subsoil arisings from the site (suitably engineered). The cost for this is element of the work is included in the wider project costings and does not form part of the bridge.</p>
		Your still the wrong side of the railway lines, no mention of Cost or Timescale for the bridge over the railway.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		The Gas Pipeline quotes never covered the route ECT/GCC are proposing and yet they still insist the quotes are correct.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		If the Pipeline is moved first what are the cost implications on the M5 bridge and bunds which will require transportation over the pipeline as	There is no consequential impact on the capital cost of the proposed Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		well as possible work taking place near the pipeline.	
		Where is a Developer if this is such a great opportunity why have none come forward.	In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.
		Only days ago the A38 flooded, yet again, which apparently doesn't happen according to the studies carried out so how can we trust anything else?	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		The local roads will become rat runs as soon as Traffic lights go in on the A38.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		At Lightenbrook traffic will go through the housing estate, all A38 traffic has to go around the roundabout whether it comes from.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		The only entrance W1E business park goes through the housing estate?	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Still no indication of how the existing homes blend seamlessly into the new plan, oh they don't, they ignore them and put them in recreational areas!	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		What happened to “Delivery Policy ES9 Equestrian development” What is Wisloe Farm at the Moment? Stables and Equestrian Development!	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
067	Sally Allen	The costs of this footbridge/cycle bridge are totally out of proportion with the benefits it will provide. The impact and disruption while this is undertaken and the spiralling costs cannot make this a viable option. It will not ease traffic flow or	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		help with the traffic at either exit into the a38.the cost alone will prevent any builder enabling this to go ahead before any houses are built, and more importantly if it is not done at the first stage then it will unlikely be done at all, as demonstrated by the lack of traffic calming still not in place 20years after SDC's flagship Littlecombe was started	connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
070	Gillian Delve	Much like the railway at Sharpness, is there any evidence to suggest that there would be enough use of the bridge to justify the cost?	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
071	Darius Ferrigno	The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated but merely reissued 15 months later.	Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)
			The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>The promoter's total cost was £6.285m and the additional cost of £2.5m to be borne elsewhere by the developer. There remains no lead developer who has undertaken due diligence for the proposal.</p>	<p>bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p> <p>The Viability & Deliverability Statement, dated June 23 included full costings for the M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge, as clarified in the Land at Wisloe: M5 Pedestrian & Cycle Bridge – August 2024 R2 note in response to the Stroud District Local Plan Review – Action Plan September 2023. The appraisal concluded that the proposed development at Wisloe is viable.</p> <p>GCC and ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			The ECT & GCC have undertaken extensive technical and design work which underpins the appraisals provided.
		The Savills viability document made significant changes to the baseline assumptions contained in SDC's viability assessment report (EB111) without supporting evidence.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
		Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.
074	Grass Roots Planning on behalf of Redrow Home Ltd	Figures in the viability are not reflective of on the ground data and should be revised accordingly. The value for employment land for example is likely less than half of that shown.	This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
075	Sarah Jones	<p>The cost estimate for the footbridge has merely reissued 16 months later, which fails to take into account other site mitigations which would impact it's location and costs (i.e. acoustic bund/gas pipeline mitigation, last year archaeology scan report).</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p>
		<p>The promoter's own assessment estimated a total cost of £6.285m, the difference of £2.5m being an additional cost to be borne elsewhere by the developer. Several line items are not included in the total cost. There remains no lead developer (promised 07/23) who has undertaken due diligence.</p> <p>The Savills viability document made significant changes to baseline assumptions in the council's EB111 report. Unlike EB111, the Savills report provides no supporting evidence to substantiate</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2)</p> <p>The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge, have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		<p>the assumption changes beyond their own opinion. If they are to be accepted, to compare sites fairly these assumption changes should be applied equally to other strategic sites subject to assessment, this has not been undertaken.</p>	<p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p> <p>GCC and The ECT remain fully committed to delivery of the proposed development at Wisloe.</p> <p>In line with commitments made at the EIP, an initial Soft Market Testing Process commenced in April 2024 following the issuing of a Prior Information Notice (PIN). Strong interest was received and GCC are in the process of seeking approval to commence a formal procurement process in early 2025.</p>
		<p>To minimise the risk of a future developer applying for alleviation, in order to achieve a profit target, it is recommended that all strategic sites be reassessed for their relative viability against EB111. Correcting the Savills viability report results in PS37 becoming not viable.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>
		<p>Home England state “there’s been no Homes England involvement in the proposed sites...”. therefore funding not committed.</p>	<p>This consultation seeks to address the specific matters of soundness raised by the Inspectors in relation to M5 J12 and J14, Sharpness rail connection and M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge crossing.</p>

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
		I support a dedicated hearing session to review PS37 against EB111, as the matter 5 hearing session 23/05/23 was focussed on the un-evidenced Savills report. It would require an input from the dedicated EB111 review.	Administration of the hearing sessions is led by the Inspectors.
077	Sarah Davis Sarah Davis Glass	How can the LP be taken seriously when the costings provided by the promoter are not correct? The figures provided lack credibility and the implication is that the promoters recognise that the inclusion of properly evidenced costing will make PS37 unviable.	The capital cost of PS37 (Wisloe) has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who are regularly assist PLC's acquire large development sites. Please see the viability appraisal produced by Savills which clearly demonstrates financial viability.
079	Cam Parish Council	The cost estimate for the footbridge was not updated.	Please refer to the Response to Stroud District Local Plan Review, dated August 2024 (R2) The capital cost of the Wisloe M5 pedestrian and cycle bridge has been more than adequately considered by a qualified team of quantity surveyors who in addition to calculating the bespoke cost of the bridge,

Rep Number	Stakeholder Name Organisation OBO	Comments	Promoter Response
			<p>have benchmarked it to contemporaneous bridge schemes, such as that at Michaelwood M5 Service station.</p> <p>The net £nil change in capital cost of the Wisloe bridge is indicative of accurate cost estimation.</p>
081	Avison Young on behalf of The Tortworth Estate	The Tortworth Estate has no comments to make with regards to the bridge crossing.	Comment is noted