

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange TR010030

5.1 Consultation Report: Annex I - Section 47 Regards tables

Section 37(3) and Regulation 5(2)(q) Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

The M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange
Development Consent Order 202[x]

5.1 CONSULTATION REPORT:

ANNEX I – S47 REGARDS TABLES

Regulation Number:	Section 37(3)(c) Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010030
Application Document Reference	TR010030/APP/5.1
Author:	M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	June 2019	Development Consent Order application

Table of Contents

	Pages
Annex I. Tables Evidencing Regard had to Consultation Responses	4
I.1. S47 regards tables	4
No table of figures entries found.	

Annex I. Tables Evidencing Regard had to Consultation Responses

I.1. S47 regards tables

I.1.1 S47 regards tables – Statutory consultation and additional consultation

Table I.1.1 Scheme principles and operations

Table I.1.2 Scheme design

Table I.1.3 Environmental Impacts

Table I.1.4 Stakeholder specific issues

Table I.1.5 Traffic and economic modelling

Table I.1.6 Planning

Table I.1.7 Safety

Table I.1.8 Construction

Table I.1.1 Scheme principles and operations

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
BHS-S-3	Object to the scheme and endorse the comments of the Open Spaces Society.	This is noted.	No
18691004	Guildford needs improvement, A3 traffic at junction 10 can be managed.	The M25 junction 10 / A3 Wisley Interchange Scheme was included in the Dept for Transport's Road Investment Strategy published in 2014. Any future proposals for Guildford have yet to be endorsed by the Dept for Transport	No
18691004	Believe that the access arrangements for Elm Lane and Old Lane are not adequate bearing in mind the potential housing developments nearby.	Elm Lane direct access / egress to the A3 mainline shall be from Elm Corner to Old Lane by converting the existing Byway Open to All Traffic (B.O.A.T). This will provide a single-track road, a design consistent with residential accesses such as this one. With regard to the housing development planned nearby, we assume this is referring to Wisley Airfield. As the site has not received planning permission it is not part of our design for considerations for Elm Lane and Old Lane. Safety improvements to the Old Lane/A3 junction make access to the A3 safer than it is currently. These arrangements are considered adequate, and have been agreed with the residents of Elm Lane during the consultation process.	No
18691004	How will HE manage the HGVs which thunder through the village to reach the old A3 just past the Burnt Common roundabout, used at a stopping area for the HGVs.	A survey of the existing HGV lay-by provision between M25 junction 10 and Guildford concluded that there is sufficient capacity for the displaced vehicles from near the junction to park and rest safely.	No
18689337	Wisley Lane proposal will deter visitors to RHS.	We acknowledge that whilst some journeys, via the bridge, may require visitors to travel a further distance however this new route is both safer and considerably more pleasant than the current arrangements. Highways England has developed a much safer solution than the current arrangement. 80% of visitors will have a comparable journey to now, and 20% a slightly longer, but considerably safer journey.	No
18689670 18687525	HE should consider the RHS proposals for Wisley Lane access.	Noted. We are in ongoing discussions with RHS Wisley and their proposals for access and egress have been considered in detail. The proposed bridge access is the safer option and therefore the preferred option by Highways England.	No
18687437 18687525	Concern that the traffic and safety benefits are modest for the level of investment / The scheme does not provide value for money.	The estimated benefit-cost ratio (BCR) at Preliminary Design stage (PCF3) is 2.22 suggesting a High Value for Money. The scheme is forecast to save 595 accidents over 60 years generating an accident benefit of £44m Present Value.	No
18687493	Objects to Wisley Lane access on environmental grounds.	This has been noted.	No
18687484	Support the RHS Wisley alternative plans - should be fully or partly considered as they overcome problems of the current proposals.	Noted. We are in ongoing discussions with RHS Wisley and their proposals for access and egress have been considered in detail. The proposed bridge access is the safer option and therefore the preferred option by Highways England.	No
18692696 18687437	The division of responsibility between Highways England and Surrey County Council has impacts on the wider geographic area have not been undertaken. They need to work together.	Highways England and Surrey County Council have been working closely together in the development of this scheme. Please refer to chapter 3 of the consultation main report to find out more information about how the two organisations have been working together on this project.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
18687423 18691286	Objects to Wisley Lane access due to congestion issues at Ockham roundabout.	The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the Ockham Park Junction have been modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 8% and 13% at peak times. In the morning peak average delay per vehicle is predicted to reduce by between 40 and 110 seconds, whilst in the PM peak average delay is anticipated to increase by up to 12 seconds. LINSIG junction modelling of the Ockham Park Junction anticipates that the scheme will allow the junction to operate within practical capacity at all times - an improvement on the without scheme scenario where the junction would operate beyond practical capacity in all peak periods.	No
18692706	What arrangements are being made for HGVs on this stretch of the A3? - when lorries can no longer park as currently they do in the A3 laybys, where will they go.	A survey of the existing HGV lay-by provision between M25 junction 10 and Guildford concluded that there is sufficient capacity for the displaced vehicles from near the junction to park and rest safely.	No
18690511	Objects to RHS Wisley Lane proposal due to safety and manoeuvring across 2 lanes northbound.	The scheme's proposal is to close direct access from Wisley Lane to the A3, removing the possibility of vehicles attempting to cross two lanes of traffic a short distance before the junction 10 off slip road. A new link between Wisley Lane and the Ockham Park Junction via a bridge across the A3 will be provided as an alternative.	No
18689638	Support the removal of Wisley Lane to A3 Left Turn.	Your support is noted.	No
18690468 ANON-5GEV-NGHH-V ANON-5GEV-NGHZ-E ANON-5GEV-NGJZ-G ANON-5GEV-NGU7-R ANON-5GEV-NGXT-R	Reconsider entire scheme.	Highways England are taking forward this scheme as a result of the Dept for Transport's road investment strategy published in 2014.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHA-N ANON-5GEV-NGRJ-8 ANON-5GEV-NGU3-M ANON-5GEV-NGUB-3 ANON-5GEV-NGUS-M ANON-5GEV-NGV4-P ANON-5GEV-NGX8-V	Reconsider Option 9.	Option 9 which included right turn free flow was dropped in preference to the current option 14 following a public consultation on the scheme.	
CCH-S-1	Believe that Old Lane must be left open.	This has been noted and there is no planned change to Old Lane's operation.	No
CCH-S-3	State that Highways England should build Ockham South facing slips as a result of changing Wisley Lane access.	South facing slips from Ockham Park Junction are not within the scope of this scheme.	No
CCH-S-4	Support the improved access arrangements for Feltonfleet School.	This is noted.	No
EHP-S-2	Concern that the significant additional congestion at Ockham Park roundabout will undermine the A3 through travel improvements.	Signalising the junction will reduce delay at Ockham Park and enable the A3 to run smoothly.	No
EHP-S-3	To avoid additional congestion in Ripley, either retain/improve entry/exit into Wisley Lane or provide South facing slip roads at Ockham Park junction.	South facing slips from Ockham Park Junction are not within the scope of this scheme.	No
ERA-S-1	Support the scheme apart from the revised access arrangements for Wisley	Note the support for the overall scheme and the objection to the revised	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	Lane.	Wisley Lane access arrangements.	
ERA-S-2	Support the RHS Wisley alternative plans.	Noted.	No
HRA-S-1	Broad agreement with Wisley Lane proposals.	This is noted.	No
HRA-S-2	However, suggest to mitigate increases in traffic through Ripley, Ockham South facing slips should be built.	South facing slips from Ockham Park Junction are not within the scope of this scheme.	No
HRA-S-3	Suggest that replacement bus stops in surrounds of Wisley Lane be re-provisioned in Wisley Gardens.	Revised bus stop arrangements have been agreed with Surrey County Council (the effective operator of the 715 service) and RHS Wisley, to provide a bus stop facility within the RHS Wisley site. The scheme design has been updated to reflect this.	Yes
HRA-S-6	Do not close off direct access from San Domenico and use an underpass to link the new side road to Seven Hills Road South. Petrol station at this location would provide an important amenity for A3 users.	A petrol station at this location would be considered dangerous as the site is both too close to the M25 J10 and Painshill Junction. Access to the existing San Domenico site will be provided by a new road linking to Seven Hills Road South.	No
HRA-S-7	Support the improved access arrangements for Feltonfleet School.	This is noted.	No
HRA-S-8	Suggest introducing a free-flow left turn at Seven Hills Road southbound to A245 eastbound.	This option is out of scope of this project and we will pass the suggestion on to Surrey County Council.	No
HRA-S-9	Support the NMU route north to Painshill Roundabout but state that it should properly tie into the roundabout.	The Non-Motorised-User (NMU) route has been redesigned to tie into the Painshill Junction. Access from the NMU route to the A245 westbound will be provided by pedestrian crossings on the south facing slip roads of the roundabout.	No
HRA-S-10	Turn off traffic lights on Painshill Roundabout in the inter-peak period.	There is no intention to change traffic light operation hours.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGXG-B ANON-5GEV-NG81-N ANON-5GEV-N89E-U ANON-5GEV-NGX8-V	Providing free-flow left turns only, similar to junction 8, would provide traffic benefit and cost a lot less. Just build these instead of the whole scheme.	A scheme just constructing free-flow left turns at the junction 10 would not deliver as positive traffic flow and safety benefits as the proposed scheme. Junction modelling has shown that removing the left-turns only will not be sufficient to leave the junction operating within capacity. Additional lanes on the entries and circulatory are required. Additional length of lanes on the circulatory are also required.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGRF-4	Need to consider provision of new HGV parking within the extent of the design.	There are no HGV lay-bys being constructed as part of this scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGXK-F	Provisions for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders are not required - remove from the scheme.	Non-Motorised-User provision is affected by the scheme and thus needs to be treated. Furthermore, Highways England recognise the importance of their network in connect places and Non-Motorised-User enhancements is an important objective.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGXU-S ANON-5GEV-N466-5	A more substantial redesign of Sevens Hills Road Junction is required to improve rather than move congestion at this location.	This is not in scope of this scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4E9- QANON-5GEV-N4KR- PANON-5GEV-N4PD- DANON-5GEV-NEUS- JANON-5G3V-NEXB- 4ANON-5GEV-NECM-T	Need to agree on relocated bus stops in/near Wisley Gardens for 715 service.	The relocated bus stop locations are to be agreed during detailed design.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NERN-A	All that is required is traffic light phasing at junction 10 to solve the problem.	Analysis suggests that far more than this is required. Given the environmental sensitivity of the area we are doing as little construction as possible to meet the aims of reducing congestion and improving safety.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F	What mitigation is proposed in Ripley for the increase in traffic?	No measures are currently proposed in Ripley as is beyond scheme limits. Discussions are continuing with SCC on the local road network. An intended aim of the scheme is to enhance road safety and the operational efficiency of the SRN. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions to improve the overall flow of traffic across the local road network.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8U2-4	Don't believe that the current design meets the scheme objectives.	An intended aim of the scheme is to enhance road safety and the operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions to improve the overall flow of traffic across the local road network.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W	Don't widen the A245 as you are just moving the car park.	The aim is to allow more stacking capacity away from the A3 to improve safety on this section. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions to improve the overall flow of traffic across the local road network.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGCT-3	Introduce smart motorway on A3 10 miles north and south of A3.	Current road classifications do not allow smart motorway operations to be constructed on a section of non-motorway. MIDAS (a system of advisory speed information) will be installed on the A3 between Ockham Junction and Painshill Junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHX-C	Ensure that sufficient commuted sums are provided to SCC to pay for maintenance on new roads.	This will be addressed at a later stage in the scheme development.	No
ANON-5GEV-N428-3	Resurface the M25 between junctions 9 and 10, removing the concrete.	This is out of scope for this project.	No
ANON-5GEV-N44F-K	Consider introducing tolling along the M25 and A3 to reduce demand.	This is out of scope for this project.	No
ANON-5GEV-N461-Z	Move the Redhill Road Bridge further north to land in San Domenico - reducing impact on Painshill.	The bridge at Redhill Road has been redesigned to be Non-Motorised-User only. Access to the properties alongside the A3 is via a dedicated local access road from the A3 slip road/bus stop layby.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2 ANON-5GEV-NEKM-2	Objects to Wisley Lane access.	Noted.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2 ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K	Provide south facing slips at Ockham roundabout.	This is not within the scope of this scheme and would have to be developed as a separate scheme in the future.	No
ANON-5GEV-N466-5	Proposed Wisley Lane access adds unnecessary complexity to a small roundabout (Ockham Roundabout).	There is a need to provide an alternative access to Wisley Lane, as the A3 is being widened to four lanes in each direction. This means that for safety reasons the existing direct access for Wisley Lane needs to be stopped up. A number of alternative approaches to access to Wisley Lane were considered, with a link to Ockham Park Junction deemed to be the most appropriate. The roundabout being signalised and design improved to make more efficient and safe.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U ANON-5GEV-NERE-1	Scrap / Reconsider A245 widening.	The widening of the A245 provides important stacking capacity and helps move queuing traffic off the A3 where it currently poses a safety risk. Widening the A245 to the east of Seven Hills Road, combined with a free-flow left turn lane to the A3 northbound, will help discharge traffic more effectively away from the Seven Hills road junction in this direction.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-UANON-5GEV-NERK-7	Provide direct access between Wisley Lane and A3 south.	The new access route to Wisley Lane and RHS Wisley's car park, via the two-way bridge over the A3, will result in longer journeys for some visitors. Visitors to RHS Wisley travelling from the Guildford direction (20% of the current visitor traffic) will have to travel for an extra 7 minutes – but this route is both safer and considerably more pleasant than the current arrangements.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEC3-Z	access road to the A3 southbound (Painshill to M25 Junction10) should come from the Cobham roundabout off the A3 (Painshill interchange) - prevent A3 road bridge and convoluted route accessing properties on southbound carriageway.	This design option has now been adopted.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NF98-V	As an alternative to the scheme, consider other methods such as enforcing speed limits, driver awareness education and re-education as a means to improve safety, roadside information boards, information installed into sat-nav devices.	These measures may have some impact in terms of road safety, but will do little to alleviate congestion, one of the key objectives of this scheme.	No
18687437	Providing free-flow left turns only, similar to junction 8, would provide traffic benefit and cost a lot less. Just build these instead of the whole scheme.	A scheme just constructing free-flow left turns at the junction 10 would not deliver as positive traffic flow and safety benefits as the proposed scheme. Junction modelling has shown that removing the left-turns only will not be sufficient to leave the junction operating within capacity. Additional lanes on the entries and circulatory are required. Additional length of lanes on the circulatory are also required.	No
ANON-5GEV-N872-6	Fewer vehicles (especially ones with only one occupant) will instantly achieve all the aims and objectives and with considerably less expense, disruption and permanent adverse impacts.	Noted however traffic modelling and forecasting has been undertaken on both the M25 and the A3, considering the likely impacts of the scheme on traffic levels both at the point the scheme opens (in 2022) and for the design year of the scheme (2037). Assessments of the housing and commercial development plans in the boroughs of Woking, Guildford and Elmbridge along with background traffic growth, suggest a daily traffic increase of over 22% at the junction. The scheme is designed to accommodate this growth.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8FR-N	We support these subject to our disagreement to your proposals for access to Wisley Gardens as the RHS proposal is better from an environmental impact point of view.	The solution closing direct access from Wisley Lane to the A3 provides a safer alternative to the current arrangement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGKH-Y	I have no criticism of the plans now that you have abandoned the land grab on Wisley RHS, except your plan to close the turn off access approach to the Garden. Find another way.	The solution closing direct access from Wisley Lane to the A3 provides a safer alternative to the current arrangement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGU8-S	In regard to the locations where replacement common land etc. is proposed. Can it be confirmed that none of these sites involve the compulsory purchase of other people's land? It would be unjust to, in effect, compel others to meet the Highways Department's statutory commitments in relation to the scheme. If they can be acquired by free negotiation, then they seem unobjectionable.	The project team is working with landowners to try and ensure that any replacement land acquired is done so via agreement. However, where there is a statutory requirement to acquire replacement land, Highways England will use its compulsory purchase powers if required.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	In addition, I also note that some of the mitigating measures to link populations include bridges - but that in a number of cases these are to be built only 'subject to sufficient funding'. This is not adequate - we need to have agreed and budgeted for measures else mitigation will be even weaker that it currently appears.	All of the proposed Non-Motorised-User bridges around J10 will be provided. It is the nature of that bridge that is subject to funding, i.e. whether there is additional funding available to enhance some bridges by making them green bridges providing links for fauna.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVD-6	As noted above, the scheme will be used to rationalise why further developments can occur in the surrounding areas and in particular Wisley airfield. As a consequence, without further assurances about future	One of the objectives of this scheme is to support local growth. Assumptions about housing and job growth have been taken from the emerging Local Plans of Guildford, Woking and Elmbridge Borough	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	restrictions, this development will result in increased air quality and noise issues.	Council's, including allocated sites in the vicinity of the A3. Highways England has not used specific data from the Wisley Airfield in the planning of this scheme. As far as the noise assessment is concerned, there are no significant effects in this area that are directly attributable to the Scheme, but there are large noise increases on local roads at the southern boundary of the development that are caused by the development and not the Scheme (as shown by comparing the Future Year noise contour change maps to the Opening Year maps – the large changes appear in both the Do Minimum and Do Something Future Year indicating the change is independent of the Scheme). It is outside the remit of the Scheme to provide mitigation for developments, including Wisley Airfield. This would be an obligation for the developer, not Highways England as part of the M25 J10 project).	
ANON-5GEV-NGVU-Q	Especially keen to see the introduction of green bridges across the A3 and M25.	The project has received funding to take forward the feasibility design of green bridges at the locals of Cockcrow bridge and Clearmount bridge.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGVY-U	I would avoid carving new roads into countryside. Instead, I would look at widening the A3 where needed (i.e. at the traffic hot spots).	The project is adding extra capacity to the A3 between Ockham Park Junction and junction 10 and junction 10 and Painshill Roundabout by widening from three to four lanes. Land take for the construction of this scheme has been minimised as far as possible.	No
ANON-5GEV-N444-1	Probably not at all and my girls and other WAC members will have nowhere to continue their archery. We live in Pyrford and so moving to another archery club will affect their training as they will need to travel further. Perhaps another very local alternative could be provided? It would be relatively easy for us to move with minimal disruption to our members if something else in the Wisley area could be provided.	The design has been amended to avoid the need to replace Buxton Wood Bridge. There is now therefore no impact on the Wisley Archery Club lease.	No
OSS-S-1	Open Spaces Society does not support the scheme.	This is noted.	No
OSS-S-2	Open Spaces Society welcomes much of the NMU provision.	This is noted.	No
RHA-S-2	Believe that the whole scheme is a short-term fix to the problems of congestion on the SRN in this area.	Traffic modelling and forecasting has been undertaken on both the M25 and the A3, considering the likely impacts of the scheme on traffic levels both at the point the scheme opens (in 2022) and for the design year of the scheme (2037). Assessments of the housing and commercial development plans in the boroughs of Woking, Guildford and Elmbridge along with background traffic growth, suggest a daily traffic increase of over 22% at the junction. The scheme is designed to accommodate this growth.	No
RHA-S-3	Highlighted concern about the lack of information regarding HGV lay-bys in the scheme.	Accident analysis has been undertaken for all recorded accidents both on the M25 around junction 10 and on the A3 for the whole stretch between Ockham and Painshill junctions over a five-year period between 2012 and 2016.	No
RHA-S-3	Clarification on the access arrangements for San Domenico site are required.	Direct access to the San Domenico site from the A3 will be closed as a result of the construction of the scheme. Alternative access will be provided via Seven Hills Road South The effects on the site are assessed in the People and Communities Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Development Land).	No
RHA-S-4	Believe that the access arrangements for Elm Lane and Old Lane are not adequate bearing in mind the potential housing development at the airfield.	Elm Lane direct access / egress to the A3 mainline shall be from Elm Corner to Old Lane by converting the existing Byway Open to All Traffic (B.O.A.T_). This will provide a single-track road, a design consistent with residential accesses such as this one.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		Safety improvements to the Old Lane/A3 junction also provides an auxiliary lane is provided both at the exit and entry to/from Old Lane to ensure safer a merging / diverging arrangement.	
RHA-S-5	Do not believe that adequate thought has been given to the level of local and regional growth.	Traffic modelling and forecasting has been undertaken on both the M25 and the A3, considering the likely impacts of the scheme on traffic levels both at the point the scheme opens (in 2022) and for the design year of the scheme (2037). Assessments of the housing and commercial development plans in the boroughs of Woking, Guildford and Elmbridge along with background traffic growth, suggest a daily traffic increase of over 22% at the junction. The scheme is designed to accommodate this growth.	No
RSP-S-1	Support the selection of Option 14.	Noted.	No
SCC-S-5	What arrangements are being made for HGVs on this stretch of the A3?	A survey of the existing HGV lay-by provision between M25 junction 10 and Guildford concluded that there is sufficient capacity for the displaced vehicles from near the junction to park and rest safely.	No
WCP-S-1	Council ask HE to clarify their position on Burnt Commons slips.	This is out of scope for this project.	No
WCP-S-1	Don't believe that the modest accident reduction predicted is a sufficient outcome for the scheme to meet its safety objective.	There is no target for safety improvements at specific schemes. Our reduction contributes to Highways England network-wide targets.	No
WH-S-1	Concern that the traffic and safety benefits are modest for the level of investment.	The estimated benefit-cost ratio (BCR) at Preliminary Design stage (PCF3) is 2.22 suggesting a High Value for Money. The scheme is forecast to save 595 accidents over 60 years generating an accident benefit of £44m Present Value.	No
WH-S-1	Concern that safety record will worsen during the construction period.	The construction management plan and traffic management plan will ensure safe operation during construction. This will include speed limit, layout and signage to support customers.	No
WH-S-1	Support the proposal for closing off direct access to/from Wisley Lane to the A3.	Note the support for this element of the scheme.	No
WAG-S-1	Concern that Old Lane proposals don't take into account the potential northbound closure of Old Lane associated with the Wisley Airfield development.	Our scheme has to assume that the development does not happen as they do not have permission at this stage. Discussions with developers and Surrey County Council will take place should permission be granted.	No
WAG-S-3	Do not understand the rationale behind moving the queue up at Painshill Interchange/Seven Hills Road.	This will improve the safety of the A3 between Painshill and M25 J10.	No
WLT-S-1	Strongly object to the scheme on the grounds of direct loss and disturbance to several ancient woodlands within the vicinity of the scheme.	The amount of land take required to deliver the scheme has been minimised wherever possible. In particular, options have been chosen that further minimise the impact on parcels of ancient woodland in the vicinity of the scheme. Where impact on ancient woodland has been unavoidable, its loss will be compensated.	Yes

Table I.1.2 Scheme design

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
RHA-D-1	Being the A245 improvements are flawed as Seven Hills Road junction will still be a bottleneck.	The single two-way roads beyond Seven Hills Junction (i.e. Byfleet Road and Seven Hills Road) are owned and operated by Surrey County Council and are outside the remit of Highways England. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Modelling Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation and allow for improved signal timings.	No
RHA-D-2	Believe that the designs for Old Lane and Elm Lane are not adequate bearing mind the increase in traffic likely from the Airfield development.	Elm Lane direct access / egress to the A3 mainline shall be from Elm Corner to old lane by converting the existing Byway Open to All Traffic (B.O.A.T). This will provide a single track road, a design consistent with residential accesses such as this one. Safety improvements to the Old Lane/A3 junction make access to the A3 safer than it is currently.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHA-N	Reduce the speed limit on the A3 to improve safety instead of widening.	Highways England do not believe that this would address current and future projected traffic capacity at peak times. The police have also raised concerns about enforcement of a lower speed at this location.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHH-V	Provide a dedicated free flow left turn from A245 westbound - A3 Southbound.	This is not feasible as a new dedicated free-flow left turn at this location would impact on the existing private access on this side of the roundabout, and require the possible demolition of listed properties. Performance on the Cobham arm of the A245 is within capacity in the Do Something modelling. There is no evidence to suggest a free-flow left is required.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHH-V	Provide yellow boxes on the roundabout across the Painshill Roundabout junctions.	We will discuss this with Surrey County Council as part of detailed design.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D	Ensure that NMU bridges are wide enough for cycling.	Non-Motorised-User bridges will accommodate minimum dedicated widths of (3.5m) to comply with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) design standard BD 29/17. Non-Motorised-User routes are shared use with dedicated pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian corridors.	No
ANON-5GEV-N89C-S	How will the new NMU routes link into RHS Garden Wisley?	From the A3 southbound side a new overbridge connecting Wisley Lane shall accommodate vehicular and all Non-Motorised-Users. On the northbound side a new Non-Motorised-User route shall connect Wisley Lane to a new Cockrow Bridge. All Non-Motorised-User routes shall be designed to tie in and match existing at interface locations. A controlled crossing across Wisley Lane, linking the Non-Motorised-User route and the entrance to RHS Wisley is proposed.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8T-R ANON-5GEV-NGXK-F	Ensure that NMU facilities are complete an end at destinations.	Non-Motorised-User facilities will run the full length of the scheme from Ockham Junction to Painshill Junction, as they currently do. They will connect with the Portsmouth Road cycle lanes at the Ockham end (leading to/from Ripley) but there is currently no dedicated cycling infrastructure at the Painshill Junction end of the scheme. Our scheme will enable cyclists and pedestrians to cross the western side of Painshill Junction on shared facilities with controlled crossings but there is currently no dedicated cycle route leading into Cobham.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W ANON-5GEV-NG8R-P ANON-5GEV-NG8V-T ANON-5GEV-NG4A-P ANON-5GEV-NGV5-Q ANON-5GEV-N44W-4	Do we think that the Old Lane entrance/exit can be built safely? Should speed limits along Old Lane be considered?	Since the statutory public consultation, the entry and exit to Old Lane from the southbound A3 slip road from junction 10 has been improved as much as possible. Auxiliary lanes provide deceleration and acceleration space for people exiting and joining the A3 respectively. The current speed limit of 40mph along Old Lane will be retained.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W ANON-5GEV-NERE-1	Can the proposed Redhill Road bridge be moved 60-70 metres further to the south to reduce the impact on Painshill Park?	The current positioning of the Redhill Road has been optimised based a number of factors including, proximity to the Gothic Tower in Painshill Park, ground topography, conflict with overhead directional signing, land constraints, overhead electricity power lines, common land, site of special scientific interest (SSSI) and Grade II listed buildings. It would not be possible to move the bridge 60 to 70m further to the south as this would require a considerably larger structure to accommodate the change in ground topography, requiring a bridge starting at near road level with the A3, rather than several metres above it.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGR8-P	What intelligent traffic light phasing design has been undertaken at the new junction 10	It is proposed is to run Junction 10 on MOVA which is an adaptive method of control and is capable of reacting to changing traffic conditions by adjusting the traffic signal timings accordingly. This site will also be connected to the Highways England urban traffic control system such that an operator can force certain restrictions or priorities in the event extraordinary events on the surrounding network.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVD-6	Concern that the new Elm Lane access onto Old Lane will be unsafe.	The revised access to Elm Corner residents will provide an access route via an existing Byway Open to All Traffic (B.O.A.T), which serves as an existing access to some properties off Old Lane. Highways England believe that as this access sites on the outside of the bend in Old Lane, sight lines are adequate for this sort of junction, and therefore believe that this arrangement will be safe.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVF-8	Change the allocation of lanes at A245 w-bound Seven Hills Road junction to two straight on - one right.	The demand for right-turn movements from the A245 westbound requires two lanes, and the scheme improves on the existing situation by converting the outside-lane flare to a full lane back to the Painshill Junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVT-P	Suggestion that there should be 2 lanes diverging from A3 to M25 instead of 1 to cater for greater capacity.	Traffic modelling carried out for the design year confirmed that a single free flow left turning lane is sufficient to meet the required capacity for the design year. Therefore, a single lane free flow left turns have been provided accordingly.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVX-T ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R ANON-5GEV-NGHK-Y	Dual carriageway for the A245 between Seven Hills Road and Brooklands.	This is outside the scope and ownership of Highways England. The A245 between Seven Hills Road and Brooklands is owned and maintained by Surrey County Council.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R	Future proof design so that right turns can be made free flow in the future.	Option 9 which included right turn free flow was dropped in preference to the current option 14 following a public consultation on the scheme. Option 14 is designed to meet traffic demands at the design year of 2037 and has been revised in order to include free-flow left turns on all arms.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4X4-5 ANON-5GEV-NGUV-Q	Improve cyclist safety at Ockham Park roundabout.	New Non-Motorised-User facilities have been included in the design. This will include signalised crossings at the junctions with the New Wisley Lane, Ockham Road North and Portsmouth Road.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4RE-G ANON-5GEV-NEFF-P ANON-5GEV-NEJW-B	Traffic light phasing between Painshill Park roundabout and Seven Hills Road needs improvement.	The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the combined Painshill Junction and Seven Hills Road junction have been modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NERN-A ANON-5GEV-NGR8-P ANON-5GEV-NEFF-P ANON-5GEV-NEJW-B		anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 3 and 8% through the Painshill Junction and between 6% and 17% at the Seven Hills Road junction at peak times. The average delay per vehicle is anticipated to reduce by approximately 90 seconds in the both AM peak period hours. In the PM peak period, average delay is anticipated to reduce by 14 seconds between 1600 and 1700, although an increase of 30 seconds is predicted between 1700 and 1800. LINSIG junction modelling of the network predicts that all arms of both junctions will operate within capacity.	
ANON-5GEV-NEPV-G	Physical barrier between the diverging lanes and the northbound A3 to reduce late weaving.	Introducing a physical barrier between traffic lanes would be a safety hazard. Signing, signalling and CCTV cameras are proposed to control traffic.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8Q-N	The replacement Cockcrow bridge needs to be two way to accommodate traffic levels.	Cockcrow bridge access road has been designed as a single-track road with passing places shared with the Non-Motorised-User route due to low traffic flows. Highways England are also working on a feasibility design for this structure to become a green bridge, providing a link for fauna between these two sections of the common.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGVG-9 ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Quiet road surfacing needs to be used throughout.	Low noise surfacing is proposed on the A3 including slip roads and Junction 10. The M25 is currently not being resurfaced.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D	Cycle infrastructure should be high quality and segregated from pedestrians.	Proposed cycle infrastructure is in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TA 90/05. A 3m shared use Non-Motorised-User route is proposed by the A3 between Painshill and Ockham Park junctions. We will be including some sections of dedicated cycling infrastructure segregated from both motor traffic and pedestrians, but most of the route is likely to be shared. In practice, we anticipate that the main route (running parallel to the scheme) will attract considerable cycle flows but light pedestrian flows as they will be making mainly recreational trips on the more scenic and quieter public rights of way (e.g. footpaths and bridleways). Given the expected light pedestrian flows, it is anticipated that the usual problems of paths shared between cycle users and pedestrians, particularly when adjacent to a carriageway, will not apply.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGRF-4	Raise kerbs on any HGV laybys to prevent them parking on verge/footways.	There are no HGV lay-bys being constructed as part of this scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGV5- QANON-5GEV-NG8Z- XANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Consider providing Old Lane with a dedicated slip road before merging onto A3.	An auxiliary lane is provided both at the exit and entry to/from Old Lane to ensure safer merging / diverging arrangement is provided.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F ANON-5GEV-N44W-4	Consider measures to reduce the speed of vehicles entering Ockham Park Roundabout from the A3.	The design for Ockham Park Junction has been updated since the statutory consultation to include full signalisation. This ensures that entry speeds onto the roundabout will be reduced and that the roundabout will operate safely.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGVP-J	Need to provide a pedestrian crossings on Painshill Roundabout.	New signal controlled crossings for pedestrians and cyclists will be provided at Painshill Junction.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGVS-N	Widening the A3 from 3 to 4 lanes will not improve safety	Congestion and queuing is a key factor in collisions on the approaches to M25 J10. Extra capacity on the A3 and the free-flow lanes provided will facilitate improved movements between the A3 and M25 without affecting the capacity of the mainline A3. Accident analysis using the standard DfT tool COBA-LT shows that the	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		scheme will save 157 accidents on the mainline A3 between Ockham and Painshill over the 60 year appraisal period.	
ANON-5GEV-NGXT-R	Build an additional roundabout on top of the existing one. Existing one used for M25 right turns, new one for A3 right turns.	This design would require major structural works and replacement of the A3 viaduct which would exceed the scheme budget.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W	Ensure that cycle infrastructure is fully segregated from the mainline A3.	The proposed cycle infrastructure has been designed in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TA 90/05. The 3m Non-Motorised-User route will be segregated from the A3 mainline carriageway. Furthermore, all points where the route crosses the Strategic Road Network, it will do so on bridges rather than 'at grade' (at the level of the road).	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Can more of the A3 widening occur on the North as opposed to the South side of the A3 reducing impact on Painshill Park?	This option has been considered but would require extensive realignment of the A3 between junction 10 and Painshill junction. This would cause a substantial increase in construction costs and require additional land take in Wisley Common to the north west of junction 10.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Move the NMU route to the North side to reduce impact on Painshill Park.	Moving the Non-Motorised-User route to the north side of A3 away from Painshill Park will require an additional bridge to be constructed to allow people to re-cross the A3 in order to be able to access Cobham. This would incur in additional costs to the scheme. The impact on Painshill Park of this element of the scheme has been considered carefully. To reduce impact on the Park, the Redhill Road bridge has been converted into a Non-Motorised-User bridge only restricting vehicle access. This allows reduced land take at Painshill Park in this location and reduced the visual impact on the Gothic Tower.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGMM-6	Consider that the new Wisley Lane arrangements are not appropriate as they are not being designed for HGVs.	Wisley Lane realignment is designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards and will be checked for HGV swept paths. This means that the new route will be able to cater for HGV use.	No
ANON-5GEV-N416-Z	Create an alternative route linking Wisley Lane directly into junction 10.	It is not possible to connect directly to junction 10 because the new design will include a free-flow left turn from the A3 northbound to the M25 eastbound. This option was also rejected because it would require additional land take from Wisley Common which is a Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	No
ANON-5GEV-N466-5	A re-design of Ockham Park roundabout is required to accommodate the additional movements and extra junction.	The design for Ockham Park Junction has been revised to include full signalisation, Non-Motorised-User facilities, and a widened two lane approach from Ockham Road North.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N46Z-9 ANON-5GEV-NGCT-3	Considers there needs to be traffic lights on the free-flow left turn A3-A245 to regulate traffic flow.	The design for the free-flow left turn from the A3 Northbound off slip road to the A245 westbound has been revised to include a traffic signal on the turn to provide pedestrian and cyclist access across. Note that this does not include traffic regulation function which would cancel the purpose of the free-flow.	No
ANON-5GEV-N48Z-B	Concern re the traffic implications of additional HGVs on the network during construction.	The traffic impact of construction vehicles has been carefully considered and is included in all of the environmental and traffic assessments for the scheme. Construction vehicle movements will be planned carefully to minimise the impact wherever possible.	No
GT-D-1	Develop an alternative design that serves Painshill side properties that doesn't have any impact on the registered park and garden.	In total, approximately 15 arrangements were considered but all have some negative impact on the registered Park and Garden. The revised design for the local access road reduces the impact on the Park at one of the most sensitive areas - near to the Gothic Tower. Painshill Park Trust have acknowledged that land take in the area of the park close to the A3	Yes

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		Southbound slip, whilst undesirable, would be more acceptable that impact land take adjacent to the Gothic Tower.	
WHP-D-1	Concern about the safety of Old Lane now that the free flow left turn from the M25 will reduce traffic gaps.	An auxiliary lane is provided both at the exit and entry to/from Old Lane to ensure a safer merging / diverging arrangement is provided which allows better opportunities for gap finding.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N428-3	Keep Old Lane open.	The scheme proposal is for Old Lane to remain open with improvements entry and existing arrangements provided via auxiliary lanes.	No
WAG-D-1	Concern that the proposed Elm Lane / Old Lane link is in an accident blackspot and that currently road conditions haven't been properly taken into account.	An auxiliary lane is provided both at the exit and entry to/from Old Lane to ensure a safer merging / diverging arrangement is provided which allows better opportunities for gap finding.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N466-5	The volume of traffic coming off the A3 will have precedence and therefore stop traffic coming off the wisely lane on to the Ockham junction roundabout.	The design for Ockham Park Junction has been revised to include full signalisation, NMU facilities, and a widened two lane approach from Ockham Road North. This will mean that traffic attempting to exit from the new Wisley Lane alignment will benefit from traffic signals, providing them with dedicated time to access the roundabout.	No
ANON-5GEV-NECM-T ANON-5GEV-NG8Q-N	Provide separate footbridge over A3 to Wisley.	The new bridge over the A3 at Wisley lane will provide Non-Motorised-User facilities, including a shared cycle/footway and separate equestrian trail, separated from the vehicular carriageway. This removes the need for a separate structure, which would add cost and require additional sensitive land take.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEJW-B	Provide clearer more logical road markings to improve the current ambiguity and poor lane discipline.	All traffic signs and road markings shall comply with DfT national standards (Traffic Signs Regulations and Traffic Signs Manual). Any particular issues deemed necessary (e.g. site layout unclear and could create a safety issue etc.) shall be assessed with appropriate features.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	access arrangements for properties along the A3 southbound (Painshill to M25 junction 10) - provide two vehicular traffic lanes or additional passing places on proposed bridge over the A3 on safety grounds.	The proposed Redhill Road Bridge has been re-designed to be a Non-Motorised-User only bridge. The bridge has now therefore been designed to be narrower than the one previously presented, reducing its impact on the surrounding environment.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	create a slip road from Hersham to Seven Hills Road to enable left turns to A245 without having to stop at the traffic lights.	This is outside the scope of the scheme. Provision of a free-flow left turn lane will require more land take and extend the red line boundary beyond the current extent of the scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Allow Seven Hill road traffic flow freely towards the Painshill junction to reduce pollution / traffic jams.	The single two-way roads beyond Seven Hills Junction (i.e. Byfleet Road and Seven Hills Road) are owned and operated by Surrey County Council and are outside the remit of Highways England. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation and allow for improved signal timings.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP5-F	Widen A245 between Seven hills Road and Brooklands to avoid worsening of bottleneck for North bound traffic.	The extent of Highways England land finishes at Seven Hills Road junction. The A245 Byfleet Road is owned, operated and maintained by Surrey County Council. Any proposals relating to this matter should be addressed to Surrey County Council.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP5- FANON-5GEV-NGHA- NANON-5GEV-NGR3-H	Do not remove left turn from Wisley lane onto A3 - Wisley Lane traffic volume is not substantial.	Retaining the Wisley Lane left turn onto A3 reduces the weaving distance between Ockham Northbound on slip and Northbound Junction 10 off slip. This results in a substandard weaving lengths therefore will not be a compliant design as per the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		standards. Highways England therefore do not consider this to be a safe arrangement, in particular considering the A3 northbound being widened to four lanes. Between 2010 and 2017 14 collisions were recorded between the end of the Wisley Lane / A3 merge and the start of the signed M25 diverge lane (approximately 300m apart). On this section of the A3 the collision rate is three times the normal rate for the type of road.	
ANON-5GEV-NER8-M	Widen A245 between Seven hills Road and Byfleet.	The extent of Highways England land finishes at Seven Hills Road junction. The A245 Byfleet Road is owned, operated and maintained by Surrey County Council. Any proposals relating to this matter should be addressed to Surrey County Council.	No
ANON-5GEV-NFYU-S ANON-5GEV-NGVS-N	redesign bridge next to Woking archery club to reduce land take.	The design has been amended to avoid the need to replace Buxton Wood Bridge. There is now therefore no impact on the Wisley Archery Club lease.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N48Y-A	Traffic signals need updating to a MOVA system.	MOVA (which is an adaptive method of control and is capable of reacting to changing traffic conditions by adjusting the traffic signal timings accordingly.) will be the primary method of control for all new sites. The current proposal is also to upgrade Painshill Junction to the MOVA system. All sites will also be connected to Highways England Urban Traffic Control (UTC) and if deemed beneficial, will have a MOVA / SCOOT hybrid control.	No
ANON-5GEV-N444-1	The amount of land being taken for the bridge movement is unnecessarily large and does not need to take all of our shooting line. (Buxton Wood Bridge).	This is no longer applicable as the Buxton Wood bridge structure is being retained in the revised design.	No
ANON-5GEV-N44E-J	Ensure continued good access from Mill Lane under the A3 & across the new link road, with a good crossings of the roads including the new Wisley link road to the footpaths into the old Wisley airfield area.	The existing Mill Lane access arrangement will be maintained in the revised design for Ockham Park Junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	DOT absorptive noise abatement fencing to be provided and low noise surface proposed for A3 resurfacing is extended to include resurfacing over the Ockham Park roundabout, which is at a higher elevation and contributes a large portion of local noise pollution.	This section is outside the scheme limit. The cost of noise barriers to be attached to the existing Ockham Bridge structure would be likely to very high.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4D5-J	Low noise road surface, resurface the concrete surface of the M25 within a 1km of the village of Downside.	It is not feasible to provide low noise resurfacing on the existing M25 concrete carriageway. The cost would be prohibitive as not part of this scheme remit. The issue should be addressed to Highways England's long-term maintenance regime.	No
ANON-5GEV-N84M-X	The proposed scheme increases traffic miles in and out of Wisley Garden and therefore has a negative environmental impact, specifically when forcing more vehicles to use the A3 / M25 interchange to access their route south on the A3. This means more congestion and more pollution and this part of the scheme should be removed from the proposals.	The new access route to Wisley Lane and RHS Wisley's car park, via the two-way bridge over the A3, will result in longer journeys for some visitors. Visitors to RHS Wisley travelling from the Guildford direction (20% of the current visitor traffic) are most affected by the changes and will have to travel for an extra 7 minutes whereas visitors arriving from the rest of the country who travel through M25 J10 will be largely unaffected. For all users of Wisley Lane this new route is both safer and considerably more pleasant than the current arrangements.	No
ANON-5GEV-N873-7	Proposals will have a negative impact on the local area – communities such as Send, Wisley Village, Ripley, Pyrford, Ockham and Woking where traffic will unnecessarily increase.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the SRN. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8P3-Z	The removal of land from within the RHS Wisley to be used in widening the carriageway is not acceptable.	There is no land take required from RHS Wisley to widen the A3 from three lanes to four lanes. A modest amount of land is required permanently to	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		construct the realigned Wisley Lane bridge, all of which is situated outside the fence line of the Gardens itself. An improved entry and exit to the RHS Wisley Gardens will also be provided, including a new bus stop arrangement.	
ANON-5GEV-N8UK-W	New route into Wisley. You will push traffic onto the only other road through Pырford which takes traffic over the very small river bridge crossing which is one way and very narrow.	The route to Wisley village, and to Pырford and West Byfleet via Pырford Lock is unaffected. The realignment of Wisley Lane between RHS and Ockham Junction shall be improved to provide a full width two-way carriageway and Non-Motorised-User routes (pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian). This is a safer arrangement to avoid the existing direct access/egress from Wisley Lane to the A3 which is exacerbated by widening of the A3 from dual three lanes to dual four lanes.	No
ANON-5GEV-NECN-U ANON-5GEV-NERE-1 ANON-5GEV-NERE-1 ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z	I feel very strongly that the project design should not take land from Painshill Park unless absolutely essential, and definitely not in the proposed area.	All landtake from Painshill Park has been considered meticulously to minimise the impact on the Park. Alternative access for properties adjacent to Painshill Park/the A3 has to be provided. Engagement with Painshill Park and all landowners in this area have been ongoing for some time. Approximately 15 options have been considered. The current design considers landtake, property owners, Non-Motorised-User (i.e. pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian) routes, the Grade 2 country park, environmental and ecological issues, ancient woodland, major utility diversions and paramount to all, safety of road users. The specific land take is as follows: Permanent landtake: 0.568 Ha Temporary possession: 0.032 Ha HE land to be reacquired: 0.430 Ha	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEFE-N	Ensure that the land take impact of the two-way access road from Ockham Junction on my client's agricultural land holding is minimized by restricting the requirement to temporary working space use only.	At present permanent land take is 0.203 Ha.	No
ANON-5GEV-NF39-Q	Properly linking the cycling routes is very important to me, it's the only viable way for me to get to work at the moment.	Included within this scheme is a continuous cycle route from Ockham Roundabout from Painshill Junction. There will also be a direct link from this route in to RHS Wisley. All new cycling infrastructure will be physically separated from the A3.	No
ANON-5GEV-NFT2-H	Wisely should be accessible by bicycles.	Included within this scheme is a continuous cycle route from Ockham Roundabout from Painshill Junction. There will also be a direct link from this route in to RHS Wisley. All new cycling infrastructure will be physically separated from the A3.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Suggest you reduce the amount of land take required by combining the proposed cycle path with the access lanes to properties along the sides of the A3 - the access roads will not be used a lot and so this will be safe and reduce the impact on the SSSI.	This suggestion has been incorporated into the design. For the length of the revised local access road from the junction with the A3 southbound slip road to the entrance to Court Close Farm, the cycle route will run along the main carriageway. From Court Close farm to the south, the cycle route will run on a dedicated cycle/pedestrian surface.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGUV-Q	If there are problems using land over Bolder Mere Lake, put a pontoon over the water with the non-motorize route going over the pontoon.	The scheme design has been revised to provide the Non-Motorised-User route on the western side of the A3, removing the requirement to provide a route close to Bolder Mere.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGV4-P	Provision of a continuous local access road should be provided between the Painshill and Ockham junctions to remove all motorway prohibited and non motorised traffic from the A3. This would allow motorway regulations to be applied on a section of the A3 from Hook junction to near Guildford.	This proposal is outside the scope of this scheme. The legal ramifications, environmental effect and significant cost associated with this proposal could not be justified.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGWC-6	As above, RHS expertise can help improve the area outside of Ockham and old Wisley Airfield. Noise pollution will increase if nothing will block it, given	An underpass has been considered at this location as part of a variety of options. Key considerations for adopting the overbridge are as follows: 1).	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	the area is relatively flat, and plans are to raise the road over the A3 to Wisley. It would be better to tunnel under the road and avoid losing a large amount of forest in the process, even if the economic cost is greater.	Easier and quicker construction cost; 2). Whether a bridge or underpass solution is adopted the land footprint that affects tree roots would be fairly similar; 3). the use of an underpass would not be suitable for equestrians (horses likely to reject) and possibly some pedestrians; 4). an underpass would need a pumping station for drainage and lighting which would require long-term maintenance and associated costs; 5). noise of piling and jacking during construction would likely be unacceptable to RHS Wisley and residents of Elm Corner; 6). less disruption to the travelling public, and 7). lower construction cost. The provision of an overbridge for vehicles to access Wisley Lane is not expected to noticeably alter the noise environment given the already high levels of noise in the area and the low speeds of traffic on the realigned Wisley Lane.	
OSS-D-1	Providing a pavement for NMUs is unacceptable. It should be a hard wearing but unsealed surface.	The NMU pavement is a sealed surface as it is a cycle route.	No
OSS-D-2	How will NMUs gain access to Elm Lane and what provision is made for crossing Wisley Lane?	Non-Motorised-User (NMU) (i.e. Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian) provision is included on the new Wisley Lane overbridge, which shall also include a two-way vehicular carriageway. The NMU route shall be on the northern side of the bridge. A connection then links to Elm Lane.	No
OSS-D-3	What steps will be taken to restrict speed on the new Wisley lane on the approach to the bridge?	The new component of Wisley Lane has been designed to accommodate a speed of up to 30mph and along this stretch of Wisley Lane the proposal is for the speed limit to be 30mph. New traffic signs and road markings will be provided in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	No
OSS-D-4	Will access for all NMUs be maintained along Elm Lane with a connection to the new Cockcrow Bridge.	A connection will be provided between the realigned Wisley Lane and Elm Lane. The new route between Elm Lane and Old Lane will be public highway and so will be available to cyclists. However, there are no specific proposals to provide cycle facilities along this route or along Old Lane.	No
OSS-D-5	What is the purpose of including part of the Ockham Bites car park in the red line boundary?	All proposed works (permanent and temporary) have to be included in the red line boundary. The land adjacent to Ockham Bites is to construct earthworks for the new replacement Cockcrow Bridge that shall provide access for vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.	No
OSS-D-6	NMUs should be separated from car park traffic between Old Lane and the NMU route/Cockcrow Bridge access.	The arrangement is likely to be similar to the existing arrangement. Details are to be developed. Vehicular access over the new Cockcrow Bridge will be restricted by a security gate (i.e. Not full public vehicle access), controlled by Surrey Wildlife Trust and property owners. Speed limit is likely to be 5mph or 10mph (yet to be determined).	No
OSS-D-7	How will NMUs and vehicles use Cockcrow Bridge?	Vehicular access over the new Cockcrow Bridge will be restricted by a security gate (i.e. Not full public vehicle access), controlled by Surrey Wildlife Trust and property owners. Speed limit is likely to be 5mph or 10mph (yet to be determined). Non-Motorised-Users (NMUs) (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) shall have unrestricted access to the bridge.	No
OSS-D-8	Will there be sufficient visibility over the curved bridge, i.e. the Redhill Road Bridge for traffic to see each other from either side?	This bridge has been revised in the design to carry Non-Motorised-Users only. The design has also been revised to now provide a straight span bridge. Sight lines across the bridge will be appropriate for non-motorised users.	No
OSS-D-9	Is it intended that the road over the bridge will be part of a through route, with freely available connections off the A245 at each end? Will it be a	This bridge has been revised in the design to carry Non-Motorised-Users only. The design has also been revised to now provide a straight span	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	public road? What is the expected volume of use of this road? - Redhill Road Bridge.	bridge. Sight lines across the bridge will be appropriate for Non-Motorised-Users.	
PHP-D-1	Request that all new road surfaces adjacent to the registered park and garden are low noise surfacing.	All new A3 road pavement shall have low noise surfacing. The local access road will be of low speed and infrequent use and may not warrant low noise surfacing.	No
RHS-D-4	Questioned the justification of using TD41/95 as a rationale for stopping up public highway connection to trunk roads.	For clarity, TD 41/95 has been used for stopping-up accesses to the A3. TD 42/95 has been used for side road junction connections.	No
CCH-D-1	Would like to see NMU routes surrounding the scheme maintained and enhanced.	Non-Motorised-User routes will be greatly improved as a result of the scheme. The current cycle/footpath directly beside the A3 and slips roads will be widened and properly segregated from the main carriageway, there will be both new and improved bridges (either dedicated Non-Motorised-User bridges or general traffic bridges with Non-Motorised-User facilities), and some footpaths will be upgraded to bridleways opening them up to horse-riders and cycle users, as well as pedestrians'	No
EHP-D-4	Concerned about the safety of Old Lane exit as a result of the free-flow left from the M25.	The entry from Old Lane onto A3 includes a 100m long auxiliary lane. This lane provides sufficient time for drivers merging onto A3 from Old lane to find a gap and merge safely. Since the statutory public consultation, the entry and exit to Old Lane from the southbound A3 slip road from junction 10 has been improved as much as possible. 100m long auxiliary lanes provide deceleration and acceleration space for people exiting and joining the A3 respectively.	No
HRA-D-1	Suggest that the new Wisley Access road be sufficiently wide to allow vehicles to park to enjoy the ancient woodland.	There are no plans to provide parking facilities along the realigned Wisley Lane. Access to the ancient woodland could be achieved from parking in the amenities area of the adjacent airfield development (should a future application be consented) and connecting via links to existing footpaths etc.	No
HRA-D-5	Suggest that curved bridge over the A3 at Redhill Road needs to be two way to prevent any safety issues.	This bridge has been revised in the design to carry non-motorised users only. The design has also been revised to now provide a straight span bridge. Sight lines across the bridge will be appropriate for non-motorised users.	No
HRA-D-5	Measures need to be taken to prevent Redhill Road becoming a rat run with the new Seven Hills Road South connection.	Proposals are to close off the end of Redhill Road or alternatively the access road near a point to Long Orchard Farm. These options shall be subject to further discussions with the local residents concerned. Closure would be to vehicles (e.g., gated barrier or remountable bollards) to allow emergency vehicle access. Non-Motorised-Users (NMUs), (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) would have uninterrupted access.	No
HRA-D-6	Suggest that cyclists be allowed to re-enter the A3 mainline at the bottom of Sven Hills Road South.	There will be a cycle ban on the A3 between Ockham Park junction and Painshill Junction. Cyclists will be able to join the carriageway travelling northbound from Painshill Junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-NERN-A	Noise levels - it would be helpful if more of the A3 carriageway could be resurfaced in low noise surfacing. There is considerable noise heard from the A3 all the way across to Burnt Common and Ripley/Send.	All new A3 road pavement shall have low noise surfacing.	No
ANON-5GEV-N449-6	Clear signage for the RHS Gardens on the northbound is essential and although visitors will probably follow the Satnav on their first visit, if they are badly held up because of the additional U-turn they will find a different way the next time, which will mean going through Ripley village.	Road signage will be used to encourage drivers to use the A3 and M25 junction 10 to access RHS Wisley from the South. Road signage will begin before the Burnt Common junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U	Cycle route - why haven't you asked people what they think of the proposed cycle route? This is a really good idea and I would hope that it would be very much segregated away from the main A3 with adequate lighting.	Stakeholder engagement has been ongoing with various Non-Motorised-User (NMU) organisations (i.e. Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian). Proposed cyclist routes were presented to a variety of Non-Motorised-User	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	Buses - again, not mention of the bus routes and bus stops. Please can you consider expending buses into Wisley and making the bus stops more accessible and safe. This is so important that I can't understand why you haven't made more of it.	organisations at a one day meeting. A plan was also provided at statutory consultation events where people could view the proposals. We have also engaged with Surrey County Council, the bus route owner, to service impacts and opportunities to improve this by adding a link direct to RHS Wisley.	
ANON-5GEV-NF7W-S	If you are going to lose the front entrance off the A3, then use it to improve your entrance off MILL LANE = everything is already in place.	Access to RHS Wisley via Mill Lane has not been part of the discussions with RHS Wisley and has not been part of their list of concerns or alternative proposals. As such no change to Mill Lane is proposed.	No
OSS-D-5	How will NMUs crossing Cockrow bridge to the west, pick up the road to the north?	The main Non-Motorised-User route will now use Cockcrow Bridge, and will therefore continue to the north via its own dedicated alignment via a new bridge over the M25 and then onwards to the Painshill junction.	No
OSS-D-9	Is it intended that the road over the bridge will be part of a through route, with freely available connections off the A245 at each end? Will it be a public road? What is the expected volume of use of this road?	Proposals are to close off the end of Redhill Road or alternatively the access road near a point to Long Orchard Farm. These options shall be subject to further discussions with the local residents concerned. Closure would be to vehicles (e.g., gated barrier or remountable bollards) to allow emergency vehicle access. Non-Motorised-Users (NMUs), (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) would have uninterrupted access.	No
ANON-5GEV-NECB-F	I suspect that my views will not be taken into account. It is apparent to me from the Statutory Consultation Brochure that local views have not been taken into account. I suspect it would be impossible to find a single person that lives locally that would support the proposed changes to the Old Lane/A3 junction and the relocation of the recreational area that abuts it. It makes no sense whatsoever and is a complete waste of tax payers money. The junction is seldom used and (other than perhaps making it clear that the inside lane is for joining traffic) there is no need for any improvement. Traffic joins the slip road - NOT the A3. I live on Ockham Lane and use the junction 2 or 3 times a day. I am therefore well placed to make this observation.	The proposed design requires a two lane ghost island merge from Junction 10. Old lane entry is positioned in close proximity to the A3 merge. Therefore, provision of an auxiliary lane from Old lane to A3 provides a safe arrangement to allow sufficient time for gap finding.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGUB-3	I would hope that consideration would be given to a smaller scale scheme, providing only the freeflow left turns, and without the elongated roundabout.	The revised scheme has delivered much of the change as requested by this respondent, with free flow left turns and a smaller elongated roundabout.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGV4-P	I hope feedback will lead Highways England to reconsider provision of a fully free flowing interchange between the M25 & A3.	A fully-free flowing scheme is beyond the budget of this scheme and as such is not a feasible option.	No
ANON-5GEV-N416-Z	I doubt my personal views (which are broadly in support) will cause it to evolve or change that much. I hope the traffic signal phasing at A245 Painshill improves!	The current proposal is to upgrade Painshill to MOVA (an adaptive method of control). This will provide a much more responsive and reactive method of control which is capable of adjusting timings in response to traffic conditions. In the AM/PM peak however the gains may be limited by any exit blocking issues from downstream junctions - additional Highway work beyond Seven Hills Road junction are outside the scope of this scheme, and would be the remit of Surrey County Council.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8J-E	Use continuous white lines and camera enforcement to improve lane discipline.	Continuous white lines are only used as edge lines or as part of a system where they must not be crossed and not for use as lane lines. Using them would suggest drivers are not allowed to change lanes which would be incorrect. Camera enforcement is not generally used to monitor crossing white lines.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGU7-R	Amend the design so that free flow right turns can be added at a later date when required.	This is not possible.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R	Consider a tunnel or cutting for the A3 to reduce impacts.	An underpass has been considered at this location as part of a variety of options. Key considerations for adopting the overbridge are as follows: 1). Easier and quicker construction cost; 2). Whether a bridge or underpass solution is adopted the land footprint that affects tree roots would be fairly similar; 3). the use of an underpass would not be suitable for equestrians (horses likely to reject) and possibly some pedestrians; 4). an underpass would need a pumping station for drainage and lighting which would require long-term maintenance and associated costs; 5). noise of piling and jacking during construction would likely be unacceptable to RHS Wisley and residents of Elm Corner; 6). less disruption to the travelling public, and 7). lower construction cost.	No
ANON-5GEV-N86T-7	What measures are being considered in the design to prevent last minute cutting in on the approaches to the junction?	Queues on the approaches to the M25 Junction 10 roundabout mean that some drivers will cut-in at the last minute to avoid queues and slow moving traffic. By providing increased capacity through the roundabout and slip roads, there will be less benefit in carrying out this risky manoeuvre. Improved signs, road markings and additional signals will also provide better information for drivers on the approach to the junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8AZ-R	When will the construction impacts on commuters be made available to the public?	The construction implications are considered as part of the Environmental Statement and the Construction Management Plan.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8TT-5	Should a variable speed limit scheme, i.e. like smart motorways.	Above lane control signals similar to those in use on smart motorways are currently being considered. These signals would be linked to the incident detection and automatic signalling systems which can automatically set variable, advisory speed limits dependant on traffic conditions. They can also be set by traffic operators in the event of incidents or planned operations on the road network.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVF-8	Improve signage at the junction, and sign lanes further back from the junction.	Gantries will sign the lanes prior to the junction in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	No
ANON-5GEV-N416-Z	Improve lane markings at the roundabout junction	The proposed road marking and signing will be compliant with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Should a trial of the free flow junctions be undertaken before they are built?	The intent of the free flow left turns is to increase the capacity of the junctions. Traffic modelling carried out for the design year confirms that providing the free-flow left turns aids in increasing the capacity where provided. Free flow left turns have been introduced in previous projects and have been effective in relieving congestion.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4G1-H ANON-5GEV-NGRF-4	Ensure that the layby to the north of Wisley Lane is removed.	The proposals are to stop-up the lay-by/frontage road providing access/egress to the A3 from Wisley Lane. A new overbridge shall be provided from Wisley Lane to the opposite side of the A3 (on the line of Elm Lane) and turn southwards and connect to Ockham Junction.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4KB-6	Need to improve provision for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Painshill Roundabout.	All Non-Motorised-Users (NMUs) (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) provision at the Junction 10 roundabout shall be closed. Alternative dedicated Non-Motorised-User routes shall be provided. A combined pedestrian/cycleway shall run primarily adjacent to the southbound carriageway. A bridleway shall also run locally outside this between Redhill Road Bridge and the new Cockcrow Bridge. A dedicated Non-Motorised-User bridge shall span the M25 to the south-east of J10 to complete the link on the A3 southbound side. The two aforementioned bridges shall accommodate all three Non-Motorised-User routes to connect to the northbound side of the A3. These routes shall provide a safer and more	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NFT2-H ANON-5GEV-NG8J-E ANON-5GEV-NGEP-1 ANON-5GEV-NGMM-6 ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGU8-S ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R ANON-5GEV-NGX4-R 18691286 18691004			
18689337	Extend A3 beside/adjacent to RHS and Ockham Roundabout to provide access egress to RHS instead of proposed Wisley Lane.	The safest access arrangement is via the bridge over the A3, given the upgrade to four lanes.	No
18672091	Concern about the lack of public transport available.	Proposals are to provide a bus route which includes retaining the existing bus stops where feasible. Discussions with bus operators and Surrey County Council have begun.	Yes
18672400 ANON-5GEV-NGXU-S ANON-5GEV-NGVX-T	Concern that widening the A245 and the increased traffic will cause congestion at the A245/Seven Hills Road junction.	Widening the A245 will provide greater capacity and improve traffic flow at this location.	No
18672400	Replacing Cockrow Bridge with a green bridge.	Highways England has secured extra funds to explore the opportunity to make the replacement Cockrow Bridge a green bridge. This work is ongoing.	Yes
18681491 18681822	Concern that congestion will just be moved elsewhere.	Dedicated free-flow left turns on the proposed new roundabout will add more capacity, which will help smooth the flow of traffic and reduce journey times. The extra capacity on the A3 delivered by increasing the road to four lanes (from three) on two stretches, will also help reduce congestion on the A3. Firstly, by improving the traffic flow at the roundabout, it will reduce delays for people using the roundabout and consequently reduce queuing on the slip roads up to the junction from the M25. Secondly, by reducing conflict at the roundabout and improving safety, there will be fewer incidents on both the A3 and M25 that cause congestion. Finally, by delivering this scheme alongside the M25 junction 10-16 smart motorway scheme, the results will be complementary to each other reducing congestion on both the A3 and the M25.	No
18681822	Reposition the RHS Wisley access bridge to take land from the old aerodrome rather than ancient woodland.	The access bridge has been positioned to avoid ancient woodland and minimises environmental impact of land take.	No
18681822	The damage to Painshill is inexcusable and unnecessary. There is no call for a service road along this side of the road - don't build one - if you must and I say you needn't just have a scruffy, narrow pedestrian path as now. I have lived here for 40 years and driven this road on average daily - and have never seen anyone use the existing dilapidated pedestrian path. This is a historic throwback and can easily be dropped.	It is a requirement of the scheme to maintain the Non-Motorised-User connections and ensure that Non-Motorised-Users can complete their journeys from start to end. Where possible the designers will provide improved facilities to provide safer Non-Motorised-User facilities. With regard to the access road to the properties alongside the A3, the updated design minimises land take from Painshill Park.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
18682885	Concern around the longer journey to RHS Wisley.	The new access route to Wisley Lane and RHS Wisley's car park, via the two-way bridge over the A3, will result in longer journeys for some visitors. Visitors to RHS Wisley travelling from the Guildford direction (20% of the current visitor traffic) will have to travel for an extra 7 minutes – but this route is both safer and considerably more pleasant than the current arrangements.	No
18689322	Take land from the RHS to build access road without impacting ancient woodland at Ockham.	Impact on the ancient woodland has been minimised.	No
18691283 18691275 18689322 18689344 18687484 18687437 18691286	Concern about the effects of additional traffic on the local road network.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	No
18691286 18687437	Concerned about traffic impact on Newark lane due to closure of Wisley Lane.	Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak. Highways England will be working hard to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and will work to ensure that the same number of lanes will be open during construction. However, it is likely there will be narrower lanes and speed restrictions during the construction of the scheme. The development of this scheme will improve congestion at the junction in the longer term.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5 ANON-5GEV-N4R7-2 ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Reopen Redhill road to mitigate negative traffic impacts at Seven Hills Road.	Redhill Road will not be re-opened as part of this scheme.	No
18692696	If the A3 were to be lowered into a cutting (or better still cut and cover) there would be a lot more room to solve the problems at ground level.	This is not a feasible solution that can be taken forward within the budget of this scheme.	No
18690511	RHS Wisley should build an access route using land currently used for the Trial Beds.	We have engaged extensively with RHS Wisley in order to develop the new access arrangements. This land take will have no impact on the operations of the Garden and we are working with the RHS to ensure that the designs will complement the re-designed car park that forms part of their masterplan improvements. Under our proposals, there are some trees at risk on RHS Wisley's land. These trees are located outside of the payline of RHS Wisley and are not protected by any tree preservation orders.	No
18689344	Consider using Mill Lane as alternative access to RHS Wisley Gardens.	RHS Wisley do not favour a revised access via Mill Lane, and it has not been taken forward as a design concept.	No
18689345	Don't agree with appeasing excess traffic on the M25 as it only builds up again after widening is completed.	Traffic modelling and forecasting has been undertaken on both the M25 and the A3, considering the likely impacts of the scheme on traffic levels both at the point the scheme opens (in 2022) and for the design year of the scheme (2037). Assessments of the housing and commercial development plans in the boroughs of Woking, Guildford and Elmbridge along with background	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		traffic growth, suggest a traffic increase of over 22% at the junction. The scheme is designed to accommodate this growth.	
18690511	RHS Wisley should build an access route using land currently used for the Trial Beds. This noisy area below Bartelston Hill would be an ideal approach and entrance and lead visitors towards the car parking area.	We have engaged extensively with RHS Wisley in order to develop the new access arrangements. This land take will have no impact on the operations of the Garden and we are working with the RHS to ensure that the designs will complement the re-designed car park that forms part of their masterplan improvements. Under our proposals, there are some trees at risk on RHS Wisley's land. These trees are located outside of the payline of RHS Wisley and are not protected by any tree preservation orders.	No
HRA-D-6	Is there an intention to provide an NMU route at the fragmented orange line beside the A3 slip road to the Painshill junction from the M25. If so, extending it back to the Seven Hills Road junction and pains hill junction will be most sensible for nm users to gain access to both premises.	The scheme will deliver safe dedicated facilities for Non-Motorised-Users away from road traffic – including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Around the junction, the existing crossings on the roundabout will be replaced with bridges. All the existing pedestrian bridges in the vicinity of the junction will need to be replaced due to the A3 and the M25 being widened.	No
SGT-D-2	The proposals for the A3 between Painshill and M25 junctions are of serious concern to SGT. The consultation plan shows that the DCO would involve a land take of some 30 metres on average from the full length of the Register site boundary. Significant land take. At the south end and close to the Register site would be the proposed bridge for southbound side access. This would be prominent in views from the Gothic Tower. Lighting, gantries and other signage would be further visual intrusions. Surrey Gardens Trust objects to the proposals for the A3 southbound widening because of the particular and cumulative adverse impacts upon the Painshill Park Register Site and in particular the Painshill Park trust are around and including the Gothic Tower.	Concerns noted.	No
WAG-D-3	Access to Pond Farm could have been via the RHS access route but that the RHS have refused permission as it would involve re-siting their compost heap. This may be hearsay, but in my opinion, this is not an acceptable reason.	Access would be viable via the RHS access route but could not be available at all times as the site is restricted when the facility is in operation. This is a safety critical consideration and as such the access via Cockcrow Bridge is the preferred option.	No
ANON-5GEV-N89E-U ANON-5GEV-NG8V-T ANON-5GEV-NGVY-U	Close Old Lane.	The entry and exit to Old Lane from the southbound A3 slip road from junction 10 has been improved as much as possible. 100m long auxiliary lanes provide deceleration and acceleration space for people exiting and joining the A3 respectively.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4E9-Q ANON-5GEV-N81V-4 ANON-5GEV-NGNK-5 ANON-5GEV-N867-A ANON-5GEV-N8FR-N ANON-5GEV-NGKH-Y	Consider RHS's proposal.	There are ongoing discussions with RHS Wisley and their proposals for access and egress have been considered in detail. The proposed bridge access is the safer option and therefore the preferred option by Highways England.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K	Include Ockham south facing slip roads as part of this scheme.	This is outside of the scheme brief.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NFYC-7 ANON-5GEV-NG81-N ANON-5GEV-NG81-N ANON-5GEV-NG81-N ANON-5GEV-NG8K-F ANON-5GEV-NG8Z-X ANON-5GEV-NGUY-T ANON-5GEV-NGVA-3 ANON-5GEV-NGWC-6 ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U ANON-5GEV-N84M-X ANON-5GEV-N85X-A ANON-5GEV-N873-7 ANON-5GEV-N8D2-K ANON-5GEV-NEPV-G ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D 18689315 18687486			
ANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NEP4- EANON-5GEV-NG8A- 5ANON-5GEV-NGR4- JANON-5GEV-NGXG- BANON-5GEV-NGXG-B	Reconsider Option 16.	This option has been rejected on environmental grounds and exceeding the budget cost.	No
ANON-5GEV-N44F-K ANON-5GEV-N872-6 ANON-5GEV-N8TT-5 ANON-5GEV-NECB-F ANON-5GEV-NECB-F ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B ANON-5GEV-NGRM-B ANON-5GEV-NGV5-Q ANON-5GEV-NGV5-Q ANON-5GEV-NGVD-6 ANON-5GEV-NGVD-6 ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F ANON-5GEV-NGVP-J	Abandon the scheme.	Highways England are taking forward this scheme as a result of the Dept for Transport's road investment strategy published in 2014.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-N44W-4 ANON-5GEV-N4JR-N ANON-5GEV-N4JR-N ANON-5GEV-N4KB-6 ANON-5GEV-NGHK-Y ANON-5GEV-NGHW-B ANON-5GEV-NGXB-6	Agrees with the scheme.	Noted.	
ANON-5GEV-NGR7-N ANON-5GEV-NGXD-8	Negative impact on local roads.	Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. However, traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth and this scheme adds a further 4% more traffic through Newark Lane junction in the AM peak in 2037. Highways England will be working hard to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and will work to ensure that the same number of lanes will be open during construction. However, it is likely there will be narrower lanes and speed restrictions during the construction of the scheme. The development of this scheme will improve congestion at the junction in the longer term.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVT-P	2 lane slip road from A3 onto M25.	Two lane slip roads are proposed at Junction 10	Yes
OSS-E-6	What steps are being taken to improve access to replacement land that will be open access land?	Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are proposed within the scheme to provide access across some of the larger replacement land areas and to create a better PRoW network. Other paths will be established as part of the preparation of the land parcels for public access, in liaison with SWT as the intended managers of the land.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Ancient Woodland - Despite the proposed scheme mainly avoiding designated ancient woodland, the RHS over bridge proposals nonetheless 'island' the ancient woodland, and will require removal of other ancient native trees in Elm Corner SNCI adjacent to SSSI and SPA designated land. If this option goes ahead, a wildlife corridor should be constructed under the bridge to link the ancient woodland to SPA designated land.	Highways England are working on design options for 'green bridges'. There will be access for wildlife between these areas with the revised scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-N86P-3	The proposed closure of direct access to some of the surrounding local amenities and properties cannot possibly be good for air quality (which your Environmental Information report states has already breached national air quality objectives in places) when you are proposing significant increases in journey lengths.	Unclear which parcels of land are being referred to - air quality assessments can be found in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-N486-7	For Painshill Park At the very least, the following mitigations must be incorporated in the scheme: 1. noise reducing surfaces (porous asphalt) on ALL 8 lanes, north and south, running past Painshill Park from the Painshill roundabout to Junction 10; 2. the proposed light-screening fence between the new Painshill properties access road and the A3 must be upgraded to a noise-cancelling barrier reflecting latest technology.	Low noise surfacing is proposed on the A3 and slip roads Anti-dazzle fencing is proposed where the local access road is close to the A3. Replacement noise barriers will be provided on the M25 and Junction 10. A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This can be found in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Re:- 3.1.3 (Your say) Because the existing noise levels are high it is not expected that the Scheme would result in a significant change in noise:- By incorporating broken/crushed stone filled 1m cubed wire baskets, as I have suggested and detailed elsewhere in this reply, but this time to the whole	Replacement noise barriers will be provided on the M25 and Junction 10. A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This can be found in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>length of the widened carriageways to say 2m above the carriageways and the surrounding ground levels, these will absorb a considerable amount of the sound and prevent nearly all sound hitting them from being reflected which if done contiguously will result in a significant sound reduction.</p> <p>In addition, if it is your intention to use central reservation concrete crash barriers these too need to be designed and finished with a porous crushed stone finish to again minimise the reflection of sound. The same treatment should also be given to all bridge supports and bridge fascias and soffits.</p> <p>In using the suggested stone, due consideration should be given to its surface colour where perhaps a self cleaning white stone may enhance the appearance of the road; and/or the use of different stone colours in different locations to add some contrast.</p>		

Table I.1.3 Environmental Impacts

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
BHS-E-1	Concerned about getting best possible outcome for horse riders who use the common land and open spaces surrounding the junction and need to move safely between quadrants.	The Scheme provides areas of replacement land for the loss of common land and open space at a ratio of 1 lost to 3 replaced and includes improved access around the junction. Revision of historic errors also being addressed re bridleway/footway designation. Equestrian access and routes will be more joined up as a result of the Non-Motorised-User work stream.	Yes
CCS-E-1	Ask that the wider picture is considered to ensure minimal disruption to the environment.	The Scheme has been developed to minimise as far as possible effects on the local environment. Construction works will be controlled to ensure that effects during the building of the Scheme are also minimised.	No
CCS-E-2	Concerned about increases in light, air and noise pollution and impacts on community and SPA, SSSI, common land, & on flora and fauna on Ockham & Wisley Commons. Ask for it to be minimised.	The Scheme has been developed to minimise as far as possible effects on the local environment. Construction works will be controlled to ensure that effects during the building of the Scheme are also minimised.	No
CCS-E-3	Concerned about loss of SPA, SSSI and common land - asks that replacement land is comparable to allow conservation of flora and fauna.	The Scheme provides suitable areas of replacement land to compensate for the loss of Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and common land and includes proposals to enhance the SPA. The Environmental Statement covers these issues in more detail in Chapter 7.	No
CCS-E-4	Asks that noise pollution is addressed by installing a quiet road surface on M25 and A3.	A quiet road surface is proposed for the A3 but it is not feasible to introduce one on the M25 due to its concrete construction. Replacement noise barriers will be provided along the M25 and parts of the A3 near Junction 10.	No
CCS-E-5	Concerned about proximity of land being taken to Gothic Tower at Painshill Park.	Land take in proximity to the Gothic Tower has been minimised dramatically.	Yes
CCS-E-6	Concerned about impacts on trees with historical and horticultural significance at Painshill Park.	Land take in proximity to the Gothic Tower has been minimised dramatically.	Yes
CCS-E-7	Concerned about noise pollution at Painshill Park.	The effects of the Scheme on noise are being assessed and initial findings suggest that there will be little difference in noise levels but if there are suitable mitigation measures will be included. Please refer to Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.	No
CCS-E-8	Asks that the project respects and accommodates Painshill Park.	The effect of the Scheme on Painshill Park is considered and the scheme has been reviewed to minimise the effect on it.	Yes
CCS-E-9	They support RHS Wisley advocating a northbound slip road onto the A3 from Wisley Lane as it will help alleviate pollution.	Support for RHS Wisley is noted. Air quality assessment information can be found in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement. Direct access on to the A3 has been subject to review by Highways England's Chief Engineer and a statement made by the Roads Minister confirmed that direct access would not be permitted on safety grounds.	No
CCS-E-10	Concerned about impact on equestrians, cyclists and walkers during construction.	The contractor will put in place measures during the construction to limit as far as possible the disruption and disturbance to equestrians, cyclist and walkers. These will include diversions where necessary to maintain routes around the area.	No
EHPC-E-1	Make suggestions (for design team to look at) that would in their opinion limit impact on the environment.	Suggestions are welcomed and have been considered by the design team.	No
EPC-E-1	Support Ockham Parish Council on their points relating to protecting the green belt, SPA, wildlife, agriculture and leisure areas.	Support for Ockham parish Council noted.	No
OPC-E-1	Firmly believes all improvements to the interchange should be limited to the junction only and its immediate surrounds as it is concerned that additional	The scheme has been designed to reduce as far as possible the land take from designated areas and will include replacement and compensation for	Yes

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	works will: further eat into valuable Green Belt, the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, Ancient Woodland, and agricultural land and leisure areas; and further increase the already illegally high pollution levels in the area.	these losses. Amendments to the design have been made to reduce impacts wherever possible, particularly at the interchange itself.	
OPC-E-2	Strongly objects to the proposals for closing the existing Wisley Lane entrance to and from RHS Wisley and replacing it with a more easterly entrance fed by an A3 fly over and two way access from and to Ockham Junction - considers the proposal fundamentally flawed as the proposed two way "Wisley Lane access" would effectively sterilise yet another substantial area of land along its length between it and the A3, and (f) The two way access road would add unnecessary polluting miles to the journeys of those visiting RHS Wisley. The access road itself, including the bridge over the A3, would inevitably result in queuing traffic along its length particularly at peak times: the prevailing south west wind will then carry the pollution across Elm Corner and the SPA.	The Wisley Lane proposal was chosen as the least damaging and safest option for access to Wisley. Although it has a number of drawbacks it is the best of the feasible alternatives and is the safest in road safety terms.	No
OPC-E-3	Visitors to RHS Wisley from and/or returning to the south would need to drive through Ripley High Street (already a notorious and congested bottleneck) and along several miles from and to Burnt common, causing yet more traffic congestion, hold ups and pollution.	The appropriate route to the south via Junction 10 will be signed. Our calculations however do show a small rise in traffic through Ripley, over the baseline rise. This has been publicly stated and shared.	No
OPC-E-4	Queries the necessity for the proposed replacement Cockcrow bridge (from Pond Farm and the Birchmere Campsite) to provide for vehicular use, but in any event would ask that any replacement be a "green bridge" in order to facilitate a wildlife corridor.	The replacement Cockcrow bridge has to provide access for vehicles as the existing vehicle access to the land west of the A3 will be closed by the scheme. It is likely that the bridge will be developed as a 'green bridge' and Highways England are working on design options.	No
OPC-E-5	OPC would ask that any resurfacing of the A3 and M25 in the area be effected through the use of noise reducing tarmacadam, and that other bund and noise limiting measures be utilised wherever possible. The traffic and road surface noise currently can be heard from some miles away and is likely to increase as more and potentially faster traffic uses both roads.	The A3 will be surfaced with a low noise surface as part of the scheme but it is not possible to resurface the M25 in this way due to its concrete construction.	No
OSS-E-1	The proposed replacement land either side of Pointers Road is currently infested with rhododendron and unfit for recreational use and of poor wildlife value. What steps will be taken permanently to eradicate the infestation before it becomes vested as replacement land? Will these steps be taken at the expense of Highways England?	The replacement land will be subject to habitat enhancement and managed to make it suitable as common land or public open space at Highways England's expense as part of the scheme. This will include the removal of rhododendron but eradication cannot be guaranteed.	No
OSS-E-2	What steps will be taken to improve access to this land and the land at Foxwarren Park before vesting? Will this land be vested as replacement common land, or open space? It is important that each parcel of replacement land is clearly identified in the development consent order as one or the other.	Revised design means no land take at Foxwarren Park.	Yes
OSS-E-3	How will the replacement land at Hatchford End be tied in to existing land with public access on Ockham Common?	The area of replacement land at Hatchford End is contiguous with Ockham Common.	No
TGT-E-1	Allege that research into the historic designed landscape at Painshill, particularly within the Environmental Scoping Report (6.12.17) is factually incorrect, and wholly inadequate. (Mausoleum not collapsed; grotto restored; water wheel restored).	The Environmental Scoping Report reflects the information within the Historic Environment Record. The assessment of effects undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement is based on the current condition of these assets.	No
TGT-E-2	Allege that There is no mention of the Temple of Bacchus which is coming to the end of a £700,000 restoration scheme, or 6 of the 9 listed buildings within the landscape. The restored Five Arched Bridge, which had	The Environmental Scoping Report reflects the information within the Historic Environment Record. The assessment of effects undertaken as part	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	completely disappeared, also seems to have been missed during your survey visit.	of the Environmental Statement is based on the current condition of these assets.	
TGT-E-3	suggest a new, accurate survey showing the current condition of Painshill is commissioned. Until HE appreciates the current situation, the decision making process is fatally flawed, being based on incorrect facts which grossly underestimate the significance and importance of the site.	The Environmental Scoping Report reflects the information within the Historic Environment Record. The assessment of effects undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement is based on the current condition of these assets.	No
TGT-E-4	Suggest an up to date survey to address the current lack of Noise, Arboriculture, Cultural Heritage (Historic Environment) and Cumulative Impacts acknowledged in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), the very factors which most directly affect Painshill.	The Environmental Statement includes the necessary surveys and assessments to establish the effects of the scheme on Painshill Park. Note that the revised design reduces the impact on the Park.	Yes
TGT-E-5	The current scheme would result in loss of land within a Grade I landscape, an increase in noise pollution, damage to views especially from the Gothic Tower, possible damage to this building from vibration, not to mention the loss of ancient woodland, trees and wildlife habitat. We would hope that HE would then be able to consider a more sensitive solution that would have a less damaging effect upon the landscape at Painshill whilst improving traffic flow.	The design of the scheme at Painshill Park has been subject to further development to reduce impacts on the park and the revised scheme is assessed and reported on in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. This includes noise and vibration (Chapter 6). Only construction methods that avoid vibration effects on the Gothic Tower will be permitted.	Yes
RHA-E-1	State that Air Quality and emissions will be improved from road freight vehicles when solutions are found to ensure free flowing traffic. Congestion creates poor air quality.	Noted. Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement for Air Quality assessments.	No
RSPB-E-1	State For the purpose of this consultation we have limited our response to the environmental mitigation measures and the information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).	Noted.	No
RSPB-E-2	Say they appreciate that the design has sought to minimise land take from the SSSI/SPA and the ancient woodland affected by the scheme.	Noted.	No
RSPB-E-3	We consider that the PEIR appropriately identifies the study area for assessment of any significant adverse ecological effects on nature conservation resources.	Noted.	No
RSPB-E-4	concerned that the PEIR under values the landtake from the SPA (para 7.6.16). Whilst we acknowledge that the footprint of the Scheme does not currently include Annex I bird breeding territories this is because the habitat on the site is currently unsuitable. However, this is former lowland heathland and therefore any assessment must appropriately reflect the potential of these areas to be restored to heathland and support Annex I birds in the future. In addition the supporting and buffering function that this habitat currently offers is not appropriately recognised.	Further work has been undertaken in relation to the Special Protection Area which responds to these comments. This is described in detail in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal. We have also consulted with RSPB throughout our Habitats Regulations Appraisal process.	
RSPB-E-5	With reference to NMU facilities - We urge that changes to access and facilities are considered holistically in the context of the sensitivities of the surrounding habitat and particularly the vulnerability of the Annex 1 birds to recreational disturbance. The PEIR identifies the potential for indirect impacts (para 7.6.10) and it is essential that recreational disturbance is appropriately assessed as one of these impacts with the potential to have an adverse effect the qualifying SPA bird species.	The potential recreational disturbance to the SPA and the Annex 1 species is assessed in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal with changes to access being considered to minimise impacts wherever possible. The Habitats Regulations Appraisal rules out impacts due to the provision of additional paths and open land areas, therefore there is no increased recreational disturbance.	No
RSPB-E-6	We note that the details of the mitigation and compensation measures are yet to be finalised and the RSPB welcomes the continued opportunity to discuss these measures to ensure that they are appropriate. At the moment there is currently insufficient information on the potential mitigation and compensation measures to allow us to provide detailed comment.	We have liaised with RSPB and other stakeholders to develop the scheme and will continue to do so.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
RSPB-E-7	<p>It is understood from the PEIR that the Scheme will require 26ha of permanent land take, including 6.6ha from the SPA and 10.9ha from the SSSI. A further 32.8ha of temporary land take is anticipated, including 6.7ha from the SPA and 11.3ha from the SSSI. It was understood that a ratio of 1:3 was to be used for replacement land to account for the likelihood that the replacement habitat would not immediately be in suitable condition and to provide for greater certainty to ensure there would be no net loss. From the scheme layout plan it appears that Pond Farm (detailed comments on its suitability below) is the only area of replacement land that has been specifically identified as compensation for SPA habitat lost. The RSPB has significant concerns with this proposal, in addition this site is smaller than the area to be permanently lost and we question generally that sufficient replacement land has been identified to address permanent and temporary land take / habitat loss.</p>	<p>The proposals for replacement land and Special Protection Area compensation and enhancement have been significantly revised in consultation with stakeholders since the consultation and now provide a comprehensive package of measures which addresses the impacts on the SPA.</p> <p>A 1:1 ratio for replacement land versus permanent land take, and 3:1 for enhancement areas versus permanent + temporary land take has been agreed.</p>	No
RSPB-E-8	<p>Pond Farm is wholly unsuitable as replacement SPA habitat; there is no potential to restore heathland habitat and therefore no potential to support the Annex I bird species for which the SPA is designated. The site is very wet and has been in agricultural land use for an extensive period of time. We also question its value in terms of Common Land replacement given the wetness of the site; whilst its location would provide a logical spatial addition to the Common we do not think this function is supported by the site conditions. In addition Pond Farm currently facilitates the appropriate management of heathland habitat within the Surrey area of the SPA through grazing. Surrey Wildlife Trust has stated that any changes to Pond Farm would compromise their grazing operations, which has implications for the management and condition of the wider SPA. We therefore do not consider that the proposal to include Pond Farm as replacement land is appropriate and alternatives should be sought.</p>	<p>Pond Farm has been taken out of the replacement land package and alternative areas have been proposed and agreed.</p>	Yes
RSPB-E-9	<p>Regarding the provision of SPA compensation land, whilst it is preferable to provide this habitat as close to the area of loss, it is critical that any new habitat is appropriate to support the function of the SPA as a whole. Therefore, should suitable replacement land areas not be available adjacent to the Ockham and Wisley component of the SPA we encourage that a wider review of suitable areas which would effectively contribute to the SPA is undertaken.</p>	<p>The compensation land for Special Protection Area (SPA) lost will be selected on the basis of its suitability to satisfactorily replace the areas lost.</p>	No
RSPB-E-10	<p>The RSPB welcomes the desire by Highways England to better connect the heathland habitat which has been fragmented by the highways network. Identifying opportunities for increasing habitat connectivity, potentially through the provision of multi-functional "green" bridges, without increasing visitor numbers to less disturbed heathland sites supporting the Annex I species, is encouraged.</p>	<p>The project team is actively pursuing the provision of 'green' bridges within the scheme.</p>	Yes
RSPB-E-11	<p>We support measures aimed at better managing access on the SPA to direct users away from the most sensitive habitats for the Annex I birds within the SPA. Consequently, we have reservations regarding the proposed improvement of facilities within the SPA such as better surfacing / improved car parking as this is generally understood to have the potential to encourage recreational use. Any measures proposed would need to be rigorously assessed for potential displacement impacts upon the Annex I birds. There is currently insufficient information on these proposals to provide detailed comment.</p>	<p>The scheme does not include measures to improve car parking.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
RSPB-E-12	We note it is appropriately recognised that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and design revisions should aim to reduce any loss of this habitat further.	Noted.	No
RSPB-E-13	We welcome the habitat measures being proposed to restore heathland, encourage heathland regeneration and encourage a more diverse woodland structure. It is considered that there is substantial opportunity to improve habitat quality as part of this Scheme and it is hoped that this can be realised. However, in assessing the likely impacts of this scheme it is important that these potential benefits are kept separate from the evaluation of the likely impacts of the scheme upon the SPA. We note that the Stage 1 Environmental Study Report stated that incorporating biodiversity enhancement measures other than those required to ameliorate negative impacts will be considered, and the RSPB regard the delivery of enhancement an important goal. However, it is essential that the mitigation / compensation measures and the additional enhancement are clearly identified, as habitat management required to bring the SSSI/SPA to a favourable condition / favourable conservation status cannot be considered as mitigation. We are happy to discuss this issue further with Atkins and Highways England.	The scheme includes measures to compensate for the loss of part of Special Protection Areas as well as enhancement of the existing Special Protection Areas. Further details are contained in the Environmental Statement.	No
RSPB-E-14	We note that the HRA is currently being undertaken and is not part of this consultation, therefore we have not provided detailed comment at this stage. We do however, agree with the screening conclusion that significant effects on the SPA are likely and that further assessment will be required through an Appropriate Assessment. We would welcome continued engagement in this process. This assessment will need to particularly consider the impacts of direct land take / habitat loss, changes to noise, light intrusion and air pollution and potential for disturbance to the SPA features as a result of changes in access.	Comment noted, we have continued to engage with RSPB through the development of the Appropriate Assessment.	No
RSPB-E-15	We note that environmental impacts, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are being progressed and we would welcome continued inclusion in these discussions.	Noted.	No
Multiple ANON-5GEV- N428-3ANON-5GEV- N44E-JANON-5GEV- N45R-ZANON-5GEV- N4D5-JANON-5GEV- NEJ9-DANON-5GEV- NEP5-FANON-5GEV- NG89-WANON-5GEV- NG8T-RANON-5GEV- NGHU-9ANON-5GEV- NGRQ-FANON-5GEV- NGVG-9ANON-5GEV- NGHU-9ANON-5GEV- NGVG-9ANON-5GEV- N428-3ANON-5GEV- N44E-JANON-5GEV- N45R-ZANON-5GEV- NFQQ-DANON-5GEV- NFSU-K	Noise barriers/fencing should be provided along the length of the improved scheme.	Noise barriers will be included within the scheme where required to mitigate the effects of increased noise levels.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-N81V-4	Consider the extra fuel emissions caused by increasing journey lengths for this scheme.	The effect of the scheme on emissions has been assessed and considered in the development of proposals. Please see Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-N867-A	A dedicated horse path should be provided along the new stretch of Wisley Lane.	A new path for equestrians is included in the design for the new section of Wisley Lane.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHX-C	Replacement land needs to be provided for all green belt land taken.	There is no legal requirement to provide replacement Green Belt land and the Scheme will seek to minimise effects on the openness of the Green Belt. Replacement land will be provided for Common Land and public open space. Section 5 and S.6 of the Green Belt (London and Home Counties) Act 1938 apply to local authorities disposing of land in the Green Belt and do not apply to land within the Green Belt that is subject to compulsory acquisition by a third party promoter such as Highways England.	No
SPC-E-1	Send Parish Council is supportive of the RHS Wisley proposal and request Highways England consider these alternative options.	The project team has considered a number of proposals for access to RHS Wisley and the proposal is considered to provide a better solution and will be taken forward as part of the scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-N45R- ZANON-5GEV-N44R- YANON-5GEV-NFQQ- DANON-5GEV-NFSU-K	Support for the introduction of green bridges linking the SPA.	Noted. Funding has been secured to carry out a feasibility study for green bridge design.	Yes
MSS-E-1	The Society is concerned about the safety of milestones along the A3 - Atkins env report identifies these as 'low value' - the concern is that if the A3 is widened to 4 lanes then the milestones are at risk of being moved or lost for good.	Noted - we will ensure that these milestones are retained and reused when construction is complete wherever possible and saved in a museum if not.	No
MSS-E-2	The Society urges us to consider their [the milestones] safety, future and replacement after the project is finished as close to their original sites as possible. If this is not possible then they should be placed in a museum such as Surrey Heath	Noted - we will ensure that these milestones are retained and reused when construction is complete wherever possible and saved in a museum if not.	No
MSS-E-3	Society would like to know what is going to happen to the existing Milestones at TQ07856 and TQ 071581 along the southbound A3.	Noted - we will ensure that these milestones are retained and reused when construction is complete wherever possible and saved in a museum if not.	No
WCPC-E-1	We accept that the location is sensitive but the overall impression is that this minimalist solution in trying to avoid controversy has given insufficient weight to considerations of traffic flow and safety balanced by the development of alternative mitigation strategies.	The scheme as proposed achieves the traffic and safety objectives set out for the project whilst minimising the impact on the local environment.	No
WAG-E-1	Have concern on the huge environmental impact on the TBHSPA and Loss of SPA land and the integrity of the heathland and the fragile habitat it provides. Any land taken must be replaced at the correct formula and be contiguous to the existing SPA in order to allow the replacement habitat the best chance to establish in the shortest timescale. Compensatory common land/open space should be sufficiently close to users so that it can be used without resorting to the use of a car.	The scheme as proposed minimises the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) Special Protection Area (SPA) as far as possible. Land taken from the Special Protection Area will be located and compensated for at ratios that have been agreed with Statutory and non-Statutory Environmental Bodies. Similarly the common land and public open space land lost will be replaced at locations contiguous with existing areas to avoid the need for car journeys.	No
WAG-E-2	Have concern about Significant impact of increased traffic volume on air quality in the SPA - WAG's own AQ monitoring established that levels of pollution on the SPA are in excess of legal limits 30µg/m3. The loss of the tree-belt alongside the A3 will only exacerbate this situation meaning that more of the heathland habitat is affected. Furthermore, the scheme provides for all RHS traffic to access the Garden via a new bridge. This will	The effect of the scheme on nitrogen deposition and other pollutants has been considered in the development of the scheme and is fully reported in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement and Habitat Regulation Assessment, along with necessary mitigation measures.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	bring over 1.2myn cars within less than 100 meters of the SPA on the eastern side of the A3. The prevailing wind, coupled with the height of the bridge is likely to facilitate the dispersion of pollution to a wider area than today impacting both human health and heathland ecology. [this is effectively doubling the NO2 impact of these vehicles). The impact of all the additional nitrogen deposition will be harmful to the TBHSPA is also incapable of mitigation.		
WAG-E-3	Have concern about Impact of the proposals on heritage assets.	Noted, the avoidance or minimising of impacts on heritage assets has been a key issue in the development of the scheme. Please refer to Chapter 11 of the Environment Statement for details of assessments and recommendations.	No
WAG-E-4	Levels of pollution in Ripley High Street and Newark Lane are already close to permitted limits. In the SPA levels exceed the limit in a number of places. The additional volume of traffic using the SRN will negatively impact the SPA. The scheme proposals, including an additional 3.5myn vehicle miles from visitors to the RHS cannot, in WAG's opinion be mitigated. Further, the proposed new access to the RHS will bring 1.2myn cars closer to the eastern side of the SPA. The cumulative impact of the HE scheme appears to be incapable of mitigation.	The effect of the scheme on nitrogen deposition and other pollutants has been considered in the development of the scheme and is fully reported in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement along with necessary mitigation measures. It should be noted though that the annual average nitrogen dioxide concentrations measured in Ripley High Street and Newark Lane have been below the national objective in both 2016 and 2017, indicating relatively good air quality in this area.	No
WAG-E-5	the impact on the setting of the RHS, a Grade 2* listed garden will be drastically impacted by a new elevated overpass which will be visible to both visitors in Gardens and to all visitors as they approach.	The overbridge carrying the diverted Wisley Lane access is necessary to improve safety on this section of the A3. It will be similar in impact to the existing footbridge in that location albeit with vehicular traffic rather than pedestrians. The scheme has been developed to minimise tree loss (including along the A3 boundary of RHS Wisley) and hence reduce the visual impact of the proposals as far as possible. Planting on the bridge approaches will help to reduce impact further over time.	No
WAG-E-6	WAG has concerns that the impact of the scheme proposals on Painshill Park, a Grade 1 listed landscape garden has been underestimated. The impact on the listed buildings close to the A3 has not been properly taken into account, in terms of noise and vibration, including damage to weak foundations.	The design of the scheme at Painshill Park has been subject to further development to reduce impacts on the park and the revised scheme is assessed and reported on in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. This includes noise and vibration (Chapter 6). Only construction methods that avoid vibration effects on the Gothic Tower will be permitted.	Yes
WAG-E-7	WAG has concerns that the impact of the high-water table has not been properly been taken into account. In the past five years Bolder Mere lake has flooded onto the A3S on at least one occasion, resulting in a danger to road users and lengthy delays. Any widening of the A3 in this location will impact the water table and will need to be carefully managed. Old Lane and Elm Lane are frequently affected by localised flooding which would infer that the water table in this location is also very high. Stratford Brook passes under the new access to the RHS and there will therefore be a need to mitigate the pollution run off from this slip road in order to avoid river contamination particularly as there are abstraction licences in place downstream of this location.	The scheme takes account of the water table in the area and manages any effects. Flooding from Bolder Mere onto the A3 may have been caused by blockage of the outfall arrangements but will be considered in the detailed design. The scheme will include improved pollution prevention measures to avoid contaminated run off affecting water resources in the area.	No
WAG-E-8	Noise and light pollution from the A3 and M25 is intrusive for local residents. As the roads are widened, the loss of trees will exacerbate noise levels both for residents and for visitors to both the RHS and Painshill. Light pollution for local residents will become more intrusive.	We are aware of the noise and light pollution effects of the existing roads and have assessed the change in those effects with the scheme. We are proposing to retain vegetation around the M25 and A3 to maintain suitable screening levels and will also be replanting the areas affected by the construction of the works to enhance screening. The scheme includes noise barriers to replace the existing ones which would be removed and includes new barriers where justified by noise levels. The scheme will also include	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		the minimum lighting necessary for the safe operation of the roads and we are investigating the removal of lighting from some sections of the A3.	
WAG-E-9	<p>WAG suggests that the following is a minimum requirement for mitigation of any scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All SRN road surfaces must be replaced with noise reducing tarmac. - Bund/noise limiting measures must be taken wherever possible [i.e. where common land is not involved] - Minimum lighting levels to protect the SPA habitat - All exchange land to be designated SPA immediately. Title to all new and overdue exchange land to be assigned before completion of junction. 	<p>The A3 will be surfaced with a low noise surface as part of the scheme but it is not possible to resurface the M25 in this way due to its concrete construction. The scheme will include noise barriers where justified by the noise levels associated with the scheme and only include lighting necessary for the safe operation of the highway. Loss of Special Protection Area (SPA) land will be compensated for with replacement land that will be managed to benefit the Special Protection Area. Other replacement land acquired for the loss of common land and public open space will be managed primarily for public recreation but will also be managed to provide ecological benefits. The Development Consent Order will resolve outstanding title issues and put in place the replacement and compensation measures before the scheme is completed.</p>	No
WAG-E-10	WAG believes The environmental damage of the proposals is significant and unacceptable and incapable of mitigation.	<p>The scheme has been developed to minimise adverse impacts whilst achieving the reduction in congestion and improvements in safety which are the objectives of the scheme. The mitigation and compensation proposals associated with the scheme could lead to enhancements of the current environmental conditions.</p>	No
WGCB-E-1	<p>Extremely concerned about: Air quality AQ levels in Ripley are already at the legal limit. Any additional traffic will negatively impact pollution levels. AQ levels on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) are in excess of the legal limit. Any increase in the volume of traffic will impact the ecology and the integrity of the TBHSPA and have to be considered in the context of cumulative effect which has not been calculated and will not be able to be mitigated.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 5 of the ES for Air Quality assessments. Please note that the annual average nitrogen dioxide concentrations measured in Ripley were below the national objective in both 2016 and 2017, indicating relatively good air quality in this area.</p>	No
WGCB-E-2	<p>Extremely concerned about: Loss of SPA. The SPA is part of a habitats network. Any land taken must be replaced and immediately protected as SPA land in order to allow the replacement habitat the best chance to establish in the shortest timescale.</p>	<p>Concern noted and a Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) including the IROPI (“imperative reasons of overriding public interest”) case has been prepared to support the Development Consent Order application along with the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>We have also consulted with the RSPB throughout our Habitats Regulations Appraisal process.</p>	No
WGCB-E-3	<p>Extremely concerned about: impact on Painshill Park. significant concerns about the noise impact of the widened A3 on the Grade 1 listed landscape and a number of listed buildings within the park.</p>	<p>A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This is reported in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 6.</p>	No
WGCB-E-4	<p>Suggested requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> " All SRN road surfaces must be replaced with noise reducing tarmac. " Bund/noise limiting measures must be taken wherever possible [i.e. where common land is not involved] " Minimum lighting levels to protect the SPA habitat " All exchange land to be designated SPA immediately. Title to all new and overdue exchange land to be assigned before completion of junction. 	<p>The A3 will be surfaced with a low noise surface as part of the scheme but it is not possible to resurface the M25 in this way due to its concrete construction. The scheme will include noise barriers where justified by the noise levels associated with the scheme and only include lighting necessary for the safe operation of the highway. Loss of Special Protection Area (SPA) land will be compensated for with replacement land that will be managed to benefit the Special Protection Area. Other replacement land acquired for the loss of common land and public open space will be managed primarily for public recreation but will also be managed to provide ecological benefits. The Development Consent Order will resolve outstanding title issues and put in place the replacement and compensation measures before the scheme is completed.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
WGCB-E-5	Extremely concerned about Impact on RHS and surrounding TBHSPA The setting of this grade 2* listed garden will be drastically impacted by a new elevated overpass which will be visible to both visitors in Gardens and to all visitors as they approach. The new approach adds between 1.5myn and 2myn road miles to the distance travelled by visitors to RHS Wisley. The loss of direct A3 access is unacceptable on air quality grounds as the new approach road will bring an additional circa 1,000,000 vehicles to the east side of the A3 adjacent to the TBHSPA threatening heathland integrity [this is effectively doubling the NO2 impact of these vehicles).	Please refer to the Environmental Statement for assessment of all issues raised. Air quality, Chapter 5, Noise Chapter 6, People and Communities Chapter 13.	No
WT-E-1	The Woodland Trust strongly objects to the preferred improvement option on the grounds of direct loss and disturbance to several ancient woodlands within the vicinity of the proposal. The ancient woodlands at risk from this improvement scheme are as follows: Direct loss: - Unnamed Woodland at TQ09006022 - Unnamed Woodland at TQ09196036 - Hatchford Wood (Grid reference: TQ09175848) Indirect impacts: - Unnamed Woodland at TQ066577 - Brickfield Copse (Grid reference: TQ10075809) - Unnamed Woodland at TQ10025799 All of the above woodlands are designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory.	The scheme has been altered and amended to minimise the loss of ancient woodland wherever possible.	Yes
WT-E-2	The Trust stresses the NPPF (5/3/18): It states that "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable mitigation strategy exists.	The scheme has been altered and amended to minimise the loss of ancient woodland wherever possible.	Yes
WT-E-3	The preferred option for the improvement scheme will result in direct loss of three pockets of ancient woodland as outlined above, totalling around 1.0ha of woodland removal.	Efforts to minimise the loss of ancient woodland have reduced this figure.	Yes
WT-E-4	the unnamed woodland at TQ066577 will become completely surrounded by the proposed slip road. This will result in the long term impacts of isolation, increased noise and light pollution from traffic, as well as dust pollution during the constructional phases of the proposal. The woodland will also be subject to increased nitrogen oxide emissions from vehicles, which can change the character of woodland vegetation (in terms of species composition) through altering nutrient conditions.	In accordance with guidance from Highways England and Natural England, the approach to the air quality assessment includes assessing the effects of vehicle emissions on nationally and internationally designated ecological sites, which does not include ancient woodland. During construction, it is however, acknowledged that the ancient woodland could potentially be affected by dust emissions, and mitigation measures should be put in place to minimise any adverse effects during the construction period.	No
WT-E-5	Both Brickfield Copse and the unnamed Woodland at TQ10025799 border the M25. The Trust would request that protective screens are erected prior to and during construction of the road improvements, in order to protect the woodland from the aforementioned impacts of dust pollution. We would also request that the boundaries of the ancient woodlands are clearly identifiable to all workers, to reduce the risk of accidental damage.	If these areas fall within the area likely to be affected by construction dust emissions, then appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented to minimise adverse effects.	No
WT-E-6	The Woodland Trust objects to the proposed M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange improvements on the grounds of direct loss and damage to three ancient woodlands, and disturbance to a further three ancient woodlands. The Trust would consider the level of loss to facilitate this scheme unacceptable, and in direct contravention with Highways England's Biodiversity Action Plan of net gain.	The scheme has been altered and amended to minimise the loss of ancient woodland wherever possible.	Yes

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	What is the environmental impact of the temporary works?	The Environmental Statement assesses the environmental impact of the temporary works throughout the topic chapters.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGX3-Q	Improvement of habitats in replacement land to include better foliage for pollinating insects.	Noted. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 7.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGX3-Q	consider introducing litter signage in commons area where they are likely to be greater numbers of people.	Noted.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	Believe that there has been insufficient replacement land provided for - ratios need to be higher.	The ratio for replacement land is based on precedents from previous schemes.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Introduce noise fencing for the length of Painshill Park Garden's boundary.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise fencing is necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8Q-N	Ensure that the proposed Redhill Road bridge is two-way to improve visibility and safety.	This is no longer a vehicular bridge.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N43H- MANON-5GEV-N46X- 7ANON-5GEV-N43H- MANON-5GEV-N444- 1ANON-5GEV-N44R- YANON-5GEV-N461- ZANON-5GEV-N46X- 7ANON-5GEV-N486- 7ANON-5GEV-N48Y- AANON-5GEV-N48Z- BANON-5GEV-N4RE- GANON-5GEV-N4X4- 5ANON-5GEV-N4XN- YANON-5GEV-N8AZ- RANON-5GEV-N8U2- 4ANON-5GEV-NEC3- ZANON-5GEV-NEFE- NANON-5GEV-NEKC- RANON-5GEV-NERK- 7ANON-5GEV-NEXP- JANON-5GEV-NF39- QANON-5GEV-NF7W- SANON-5GEV-NF98- VANON-5GEV-NFYU- SANON-5GEV-NG4A- PANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Reduce land take and any impact on Painshill Park from the scheme.	A revised design has been proposed reducing land take from Painshill Park.	Yes
SG-E-1	Highlight that much of the research is factually incorrect.	Noted comment and scope of documents available for the desktop assessments. This has been addressed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 11.	No
SG-E-2	Concern that Painshill Park is listed as having limited public access.	Noted.	No
SG-E-2	Urge HE to uphold the NPPF requirement that harm to such heritage assets as pains hill park should be wholly exceptional.	Noted.	Yes

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
SG-E-3	Scoping report doesn't adequately address the Noise, Arboriculture, Cultural Heritage (Historic Environment) and Cumulative Impacts the scheme would have on Painshill Park.	The scoping assessment was based on the information available at the time of writing. A full assessment of each of these aspects is provided in the Environmental Statement, Chapters 6, 7 and 11.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGR3-H ANON-5GEV-NGVG-9 ANON-5GEV-N463-2 ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K	Noise reducing road surfacing should be used throughout the scheme.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise and suggests noise mitigation measures, such as noise reducing road surfacing, where necessary. The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise reducing tarmac and noise bunds are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVG-9 ANON-5GEV-N44E- JANON-5GEV-N463-2	Plant additional trees alongside A3 and M25 for noise reduction purposes.	Trees and shrubs will be planted as part of the future landscape proposals, where space and other conditions allow these may be planted along both the A3 & M25. Tree planting is generally not considered to reduce measured noise levels, although it can provide some masking noise in windy weather and can serve to separate the noise from views of the traffic generating it.	No
SGT-E-1	Low Noise surfacing throughout the scheme is to be encouraged.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise (Chapter 6) and suggests noise mitigation measures where necessary. Low noise surfacing is proposed on the A3 including slip roads and Junction 10. There is no intention within the scheme to resurface the M25.	No
WAG-E-1	Suggest that air quality impacts on the SPA are illegal (they have undertaken their own AQ analysis).	The approach to the air quality assessment of the effects on the Special Protection Area (SPA) has been undertaken in accordance with Highways England and Natural England. The results and the significance of any effect on the Special Protection Area, is reported in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
WAG-E-2	Replacement SPA and Common land should be contiguous and replaced at the correct formula.	Noted please refer to Appendix C of the Statement of Reasons (Common land and Open Space Report), then Planning Statement and Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement.	No
WAG-E-3 18691275	Concern that the Wisley Lane overbridge will ruin the setting of RHS Garden Wisley as it will be visible from the garden.	There is a bridge at that location already and it is screened by trees. We do not believe the bridge will be visible from RHS Wisley.	No
WAG-E-3	Concern that the listed properties in Painshill Park have not been properly taken into account when considering the listed buildings in the park.	Concern noted. Please refer to the Environmental Statement for full assessment.	No
WAG-E-4	Concern that the high water table in close proximity hasn't been taken into account, especially near Bolder Mere.	Geology and soil (LG 12/11/2018) Noted, please refer to Environmental Statement Chapter 8 and Chapter 10. The proposed ground investigation described within chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and the appendix document which summarised the scope of the investigation includes the installation of groundwater monitoring wells and monitoring work to identify groundwater levels. This will be carried out before construction works. High groundwater is expected to be localised therefore any works would not include large scale dewatering.	No
WAG-E-5	Noise mitigation measures should be used in all areas outside of common land.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise and suggests noise mitigation measures where necessary (Chapter 5).	No
WAG-E-6	Lighting levels should be reduced to minimise the impact on the SPA.	Lighting proposals for environmental consideration have been carried out in collaboration with the environment team to establish the appropriate mitigation for the scheme. The extent of light spill likely to affect any adjacent Special Protection Area (SPA), Site of Special Scientific Interest	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		(SSSI), Local Nature Reserve (LNR), Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) and ancient woodland has been minimised through careful selection of equipment and robust design. The use of an LED light source and good lighting design provide a reduction of the environmental impact of the proposed lighting.	
ANON-5GEV-N44E-J ANON-5GEV-NEJ9-D ANON-5GEV-NERK-7 ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z	These proposals will add to noise pollution - more action is needed to reduce impact.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise and suggests noise mitigation measures where necessary (Chapter 5).	No
ANON-5GEV-N45R-Z	Noise reduction barriers/Fencing should be provided between Ockham roundabout and Wisley Lane.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 5) has identified areas where noise reduction barriers/fencing are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Plant additional trees alongside A3 for Elm corner residents.	Trees and shrubs will be planted as part of the future landscape proposals, where space and other conditions allow these will be planted along both the A3 & M25, however this landscape planting scheme has yet to be finalised.	No
OSS-E-4	How will NMUs gain access to the common on the east side of Wisley Lane and to bridleway 8?	Bridleway 8 will intersect the Non-Motorised-User route just to the north of Wisley Lane, now that the Non-Motorised-User route is to run along the northern side of the A3 in this part of the scheme. There will, therefore, just be a simple T-junction layout between the bridleway and the Non-Motorised-User route (likely to be classified as a restricted byway)'.	No
OSS-E-5	Would like to see a link between the end of Pointers Road across the curved bridge to link to Claremount Bridge?	This link will be provided.	Yes
OSS-E-7	In whom will the replacement land be vested?	This depends on the manner in which land is acquired and is dependent on ongoing negotiations with landowners.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEJ9-D	Reduce speed limit to 50mph for noise reduction purposes.	Assuming this related to changing from 70mph to 50mph on the A3, the road traffic noise level reduction would be minimal only up to 2dB assuming that the traffic flow and composition is unchanged as well.	No
ANON-5GEV-NERK-7	Do not widen A245 on pollution grounds.	Widening of the A245 is required to improve flow and capacity. It's impact in air quality is assessed in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NERK-7	Do not take land from pains hill on pollution grounds.	The design has been revised to reduce the land take from Painshill Park.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z	Asks that the project respects and accommodates important Painshill Park.	The impact of the scheme on Painshill Park is assessed in the Environmental Statement throughout the topic chapters. Land take has been reduced at Painshill Park.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Provide information on Noise reducing fencing, lighting mitigation solutions for RHS Wisley lane Bridge.	No noise barriers are currently proposed for Wisley Lane bridge.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Land take - Replacement land should be contiguous with the SPA. It is not. It is wholly inadequate to purchase pockets of non-contiguous land which are unlikely to be maintained as heathland, therefore without the necessary wildlife corridors.	Replacement land is not a Special Protection Area (SPA) issue but is provided in exchange for losses from land with open public access; it will be contiguous with the existing areas of common land and open space. Substantial areas of SPA enhancement areas are also included and the package of measures has been agreed with and has the support of Natural England and Surrey Wildlife Trust.	No
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	Ancient Woodland - Despite the proposed scheme mainly avoiding designated ancient woodland, the RHS over bridge proposals nonetheless 'island' the ancient woodland, and will require removal of other ancient	There will be access for wildlife between these areas with the revised scheme.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	native trees in Elm Corner SNCI adjacent to SSSI and SPA designated land. If this option goes ahead, a wildlife corridor should be constructed under the bridge to link the ancient woodland to SPA designated land.		
ANON-5GEV-N4HZ-U	Air quality - all you've said is that implementation of measures to mitigate pollution levels will be undertaken but you have given no details of exactly how this will be done! How exactly are you going to mitigate the extra levels of NO2?	Air quality assessments and recommended mitigation measures are contained in the Environmental Statement, please see Chapter 5.	No
ANON-5GEV-N848-9	When visiting Wisley RHS the area adjacent to the A3 suffers from significant noise pollution and as a family we avoid visiting that part of the gardens. Could banking / sound absorbing fencing be used to reduce it?	A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. Noise mitigation will be provided where the scheme would result in a noticeable deterioration in noise levels. Please see Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-N85X-A	I am disappointed to see how few noise mitigation systems were planned for the A3 and M25. Rose Lane in Ripley appears to be exposed to circa 60dB of noise pollution from the A3 and the current plans show nothing to improve this.	The scheme's proposals do not extend south of the Ockham Park Junction and it is not within the remit of the scheme to manage noise levels outside of its study area.	No
ANON-5GEV-N86P-3	The proposed closure of direct access to some of the surrounding local amenities and properties cannot possibly be good for air quality (which your Environmental Information report states has already breached national air quality objectives in places) when you are proposing significant increases in journey lengths.	The air quality assessment uses data from the traffic model to estimate pollutant concentrations at receptors and determine the change with the scheme. In addition, emissions from road vehicles using the affected roads are estimated. The results of the assessment are found in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEJQ-5	Yes to the 'approach' towards mitigating adverse environmental impact - BUT there is always scope to do better, not to just pay 'lip service' to these significant assets but to improve a specification, take slightly less land, save more heathland and trees.	The scheme has been refined to reduce land take as far as is feasible and includes a package of environmental mitigation that will provide significant benefits for the local environment.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Land take:- I agree with the proviso that any Land Take from Painshill Park must be minimised and that a Secant type vertical concrete retaining wall be drilled before the earth bank is removed and after the earth bank is removed the vertical retaining wall be clad with wire baskets full of stone chippings/rocks to eliminate sound reflection. I request that you also use stone filled wire baskets against all your other proposed structures to prevent sound being reflected into otherwise quiet habitats. Stone filled baskets are significantly better at preventing escape of airborne sound as they also absorb sound whereas the timber fencing you have previously used only acts as a slight barrier and still allows the sound to be reflected back across the carriageway.	Thank you for your suggestion regarding the use of gabions. These will be considered along with other noise mitigation options during the detailed design stage.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B	From the PEIR "The effect on air quality will be examined once this information is available." (2.4.1) "At this stage, details of the mitigation and compensation measures that would combine to form the necessary mitigation have not yet been finalised." (4.1.3) If the above cannot be addressed to a satisfactory extent, the scheme should be stopped. The public cannot comment on whether mitigation methods are appropriate if these are not clearly presented. Currently this information is incomplete. Bolder Merewill border directly on the motorway which will look unpleasant and deter visitors. Water wildlife will be negatively affected. Wisley Park and Painshill Park will shrink.	The Preliminary Environmental Information Report provided information on the impact of the scheme from the assessment work undertaken to date and proposed mitigation measures to reduce the impact. It is not a record of the final environmental impact assessment of the scheme. That is the Environmental Statement which has been prepared and forms part of the documentation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the Development Consent Order.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NG4D-4	Still not happy about the amount of woodland damaged by this project. Surely the worksites that will be returned to their original owners can be sited where they will have no impact on the trees.	We have tried to minimise woodland loss as far as possible, but some loss is unavoidable with a scheme in this location where there are trees up to the edge of the highway boundary. Worksites and compounds have been located to avoid tree loss where possible but the need to have them close to the works limits the options for their siting.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG88-V	My general view is that the relative environmental impacts are exaggerated for the proposed schemes. Proposed scheme has traffic stop/start at the highest road level = noise generation and transmission which will in practice cause more disruption than freer flowing solutions.	The assessment of impacts is impartial and is not exaggerated or under estimated. The assessment indicates that the scheme would result in very limited change in noise levels.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W	Can you erect more noise reduction fencing, plant more trees and hedging, lower the carriageway of the A3 between Painshill and the M25 to create a slight cutting effect? Are you looking at some of the European standards and initiatives to see if they can be applied here?	The scheme includes new and replacement noise barriers along the M25 and A3. Trees and shrubs will be planted as part of the landscape proposals along both the A3 & M25. Unfortunately it is not feasible to lower the A3. The mitigation proposed will be in accordance with current Highways England standards.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGEP-1	For RHS Wisley, it would, indeed, be better if HE would put up some baffles to counter the noise pollution of the A3 that plagues the trails area of the garden. In Europe, there is a lot more regard for the noise pollution from highways, with acoustic fences provided to protect areas.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise reduction barriers/fencing are necessary in accordance with current Environmental Impact Assessment guidance. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGHZ-E	The air quality in Byfleet and Cobham and at the A245-Seven Hills Road junction will not improve if more queuing cars are a result of the scheme's implementation.	The scheme is intended to reduce congestion which will in turn reduce pollution levels.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGRQ-F	It's not good enough to suggest that present noise levels are tolerable, they're not. You need to do more than just use quiet tar. There should be noise barriers, esp. alongside the A3 northbound north side.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise reduction barriers/fencing are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented. The scheme includes noise barriers along the M25 and on parts of the A3.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVA-3	Any replacement land will take many years to replace the value of land being lost therefore additional measures should be taken to enhance existing protected areas. There is also no mention of light pollution which can be very significant for flora and fauna impacts.	Areas of replacement land are provided at a ratio of three provided for every one lost. The scheme also includes measures to enhance the existing protected areas. Light pollution has been considered in the assessment of the scheme and mitigation measures suggested where appropriate.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	I have not been able to ascertain from documents provided whether there is genuinely as much land for mitigation as that which is being lost (i.e. not just the land taken - but also that which will be blighted), the quality of this, or whether there are sufficient connections between these locations to properly maintain biodiversity in the area.	The scheme includes suitable replacement land for that which has been taken at ratios that have been agreed with environmental stakeholders. The areas have been selected to maintain and enhance connectivity between habitats.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	Finally, I note that temporary site construction facilities are being placed in environmentally sensitive areas (as far as I can see, particularly in a large block in the north west of the development). These could cause irreparable ecological damage so should be placed elsewhere.	The location and size of construction compounds has been reviewed to minimise their impact on the surrounding environment. However some of the compounds need to be close to the works so scope for locating them elsewhere is limited.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	For example, Wisley Airfield itself could be purchased and allowed to revert back to wild status to compensate for the significant environmental damage that this development will cause (subject to the advice to suitable independent environmental organisations) - both as a result of the direct removal of areas of wild land and of the significant blight of pollution, noise and dust on what remains.	The Wisley Airfield site is privately owned and is subject to extant planning permission in one area, and is also listed in the Local Plan as a site for housing growth and as such we cannot at this stage earmark it as an opportunity for replacement land.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	Land being put by as replacement for that which will be taken is clearly not adequate. It is not of the same type as that which is being taken (as stated	The land proposed as replacement or compensation for that which is lost has been carefully selected to provide appropriate mitigation for the effect of	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	in the detailed environmental documents) and it is also appears to be fragmented. Furthermore, some of the land being earmarked to replace that being lost is already itself under threat from imminent development e.g. adjacent to Wisley airfield.	the loss. All the areas proposed have been agreed with relevant environmental stakeholders. No parcels of land which are under threat have been proposed.	
ANON-5GEV-NGVG-9	Broadly content with the overall proposed approach, however, there is no mention of the semaphore tower at Chatley heath in the list of monuments. The plans appear to suggest that the new slip road from the M25 northbound to the A3 westbound will pass even closer to this than the M25 does at present. Are any mitigation plans being considered? The widened roads will presumably increase noise levels for visitors to all the sites but it is not clear to what extent environmental barriers and screening will be utilised.	The M25 to A3 slip road will be slightly closer to the Semaphore Tower but at some distance from it. The scheme includes all necessary mitigation for the impact of the scheme. The noise assessment being undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement has identified areas where noise reduction barriers/fencing are necessary and considers noise levels at Semaphore Tower. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F	As regards air pollution and noise pollution:- How will the results of mitigating these be publicised? What are "acceptable" targets? If such targets are not met, what budget is set aside for further work so that they are and in what time frame? It is not sufficient to have "Analysis of air quality effects and implementation of measures to mitigate pollutant levels ...". Actual whatever-it-takes measures must be budgeted for and put in place to make noise and air pollution levels BETTER THAN TODAY, and on an improving scale after the work is completed at least in line with government requirements.	The scheme includes necessary noise mitigation where justified by the noise changes attributable to the scheme or where the existing noise barriers will be lost to the widening. For air quality, mitigation measures are recommended where it is expected that the scheme will have an overall significant effect. If mitigation measures are proposed, then analysis of monitoring data post opening would usually be undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the measure. Where it can be seen that the levels of noise or air pollution are worse than predicted further mitigation will be considered by Highways England. In general, it is expected that air quality will improve as less polluting and electric vehicles are driven on roads.	No
WPI-E-1	Analysis on the required attenuation ponds for WIS-11 has been provided in Appendix B.	Noted with thanks.	No
WLT-E-1	Identified direct loss of ancient woodland at: TQ09006022 TQ09196036 Hatchford Wood (TQ02175848)	Noted with thanks. The Environmental Statement contains detail on impacted land, including Ancient Woodland.	No
WLT-E-2	Identified indirect impact of ancient woodland at: TQ066577 Brickfield Copse (TQ10075809) TQ10025799	Noted with thanks.	No
WLT-E-3	Identified in total approximately 1Ha of ancient woodland lost to the scheme.	Noted with thanks. With the revised scheme the amount of ancient woodland loss has been reduced.	No
WAG-E-7	All replacement land should be designated as SPA immediately.	Noted – Special Protection Area compensation land will be designated as Special Protection Area immediately.	No
WAG-E-8	Statement that they believe that the environmental impact of the scheme is significant, unacceptable, and incapable of mitigation.	Noted.	No
CCH-E-1	Important that issues of significant increases in light and air pollution on the SPA will have are addressed.	The significance of the effect on air quality within the Special Protection Area will be undertaken in accordance with best practice, following guidance from Highways England and Natural England. A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been produced to set out the assessment of effects on the Special Protection Area and whether changes in light pollution or air quality would lead to an adverse effect on the SPA.	No
CCH-E-2	Believe that the circuitous route to RHS Wisley will increase poor air quality in the area.	The proposed route to RHS Wisley with the scheme will slightly increase the journey for some travellers approaching or leaving RHS Wisley, which will lead to a general increase in pollutant emissions. However, the	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		significance of any effect on air quality involves examining changes in pollutant concentrations at receptors. The assessment takes into account changes in traffic with the scheme as well as any realignments to roads.	
HRA-E-1	Suggest that the new Wisley Access road be sufficiently wide to allow vehicles to park to enjoy the ancient woodland.	Noted.	No
ANON-5GEV-N486-7	For Painshill Park At the very least, the following mitigations must be incorporated in the scheme: 1. noise reducing surfaces (porous asphalt) on ALL 8 lanes, north and south, running past Painshill Park from the Painshill roundabout to Junction 10; 2. the proposed light-screening fence between the new Painshill properties access road and the A3 must be upgraded to a noise-cancelling barrier reflecting latest technology.	The current design of the scheme includes low noise road surfacing on the entire A3 between J10 and Painshill Park. Design changes also reduce the impacts of access arrangements to the properties adjacent to Painshill Park.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEC3-Z	Page 72 I cannot find in the report an assessment of the vibration and noise which will affect Painshill. How can this proposal be considered without this information. Page 156 the adverse impact on the Grade 2 Listed Gothic Tower at Painshill is surely more than 'moderate'. Page 159 ignores the effect of noise on the 18th century landscape and the visitors' appreciation of it. Page 182 I understand that the impact of the scheme on the users of Painshill has not yet been carried out. This should have been considered in depth before making a recommendation as Painshill which operates as a charitable Trust derives its revenue almost entirely from visitor income.	An assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 6.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEKC-R	I would consider the statement (p.156) on the adverse impact on the Grade 2 listed Gothic Tower as being more than 'moderate', particularly having seen the marked out boundary. The A3 would come within metres of the Tower and for this to not be a factor in the decision making process is wrong. The Environmental Information Report (p.159) also fails to take into account the effect of the impact of noise on the 18th Century landscape. There appears to be nothing in the report to indicate that an assessment has been made of the vibration and noise which would affect Painshill; it appears that this has yet to be done and it is inappropriate that a recommendation should be made without this information (p.72) Another detailed assessment that has not been carried out before the recommendation was made is Painshill's status as a Grade 1 Listed landscape - surely this should have been done long before any recommendations were made. I cannot agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor, especially given the proximity of the Gothic Tower.	An assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 6 In addition design changes to the bridge at Redhill Road will reduce the impact on the Gothic Tower.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Re:- 3.1.3 (Your say) Because the existing noise levels are high it is not expected that the Scheme would result in a significant change in noise:- By incorporating broken/crushed stone filled 1m cubed wire baskets, as I have suggested and detailed elsewhere in this reply, but this time to the whole length of the widened carriageways to say 2m above the carriageways and the surrounding ground levels, these will absorb a considerable amount of the sound and prevent nearly all sound hitting them from being reflected which if done contiguously will result in a significant sound reduction. In addition, if it is your intention to use central reservation concrete crash barriers these too need to be designed and finished with a porous crushed	Thank you for your suggestion regarding the use of gabions. These have been considered along with other noise mitigation options, although there is no promise that gabions will be selected as other environmental aspects also need to be considered (such as landscaping). Detailed noise assessments of the revised scheme have been undertaken and inform the noise mitigation measures that are included in the proposals.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>stone finish to again minimise the reflection of sound. The same treatment should also be given to all bridge supports and bridge facias and soffits. In using the suggested stone, due consideration should be given to is surface colour where perhaps a self-cleaning white stone may enhance the appearance of the road; and/or the use of different stone colours in different locations to add some contrast.</p>		
ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B	<p>As mentioned above, I read the PEIR and it was clearly stated in several places that the approach to mitigating environmental issues is far from being finalised. Again, here are a few examples of this lack of planning:"The effect on air quality will be examined once this information is available." (2.4.1)"At this stage, details of the mitigation and compensation measures that would combine to form the necessary mitigation have not yet been finalised." (4.1.3)The mitigation scheme appears to weaken but not eliminate the negative impact on wildlife. Looking at the map and surrounding area shows that it is not really possible to create large, uninterrupted woodland areas that compare to the areas lost through the scheme. Only small, speckled woodland areas can be created and that's not enough for rare bird species.Pollution levels already exceed the average objective and this will only get worse, since the widened motorway will attract more vehicles. The air quality problem is especially problematic for local schools, such as Feltonfleet school. It says "Based on the preliminary environmental assessment carried out so far it has been established that the Scheme has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the Ockham and Wisley Commons SSSI and three ancient woodlands." It says mitigation methods are currently not in place and are being "explored". Surely it should be tested as to whether this is even possible before deciding on going ahead with the scheme.</p>	<p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report provided information on the impact of the scheme from the assessment work undertaken to date. It is not a record of the final environmental impact assessment of the scheme. That is the Environmental Statement which has been prepared and forms part of the documentation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the Development Consent Order.</p>	No
	<p>The roads border on a Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and local nature reserve and many listed buildings (e.g. Painshill Gothic Tower) and parks. These areas are irreplaceable and must not be tempered with.</p> <p>As is states in the report, "the area around the junction is highly valued for its biodiversity with a large area to the south of the M25 forming part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which is an internationally protected site that supports threatened bird species." I can currently not see a satisfactory approach to mitigating the damage to this area.</p> <p>As it says, there is also the potential for harmful spillages of pollutants into the local environment if there are accidents on these roads. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Please refer to the Environmental Statement for full details on assessments across all these areas (Chapters 7, 9 and 11).</p> <p>A bespoke compensation package has been developed for the Special Protection Area under consultation with key stakeholders.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Assessment specifically refers to accidents and spills during operation.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NEXP-J	<p>There is no mention of the ancient woodland at Painshill (on page 98) parts of which will be taken by this scheme. This is real history being destroyed with numerous mentions in essays by notable writers of the 18th century.Painshill's status as a Grade 1 listed landscape is mentioned but a detailed assessment of the impact has not yet carried out (Page 152). This is yet to be submitted as part of the EIA. Surely this should have been done prior to making this recommendation.I do not agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor (page 156) given the proximity of the scheme to the Gothic Tower.I find it completely unacceptable that permanent setting impacts due to the operation of Scheme elements within</p>	Noted.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NF98-V	<p>the boundaries of a possible World Heritage site can be considered moderate (Page 159).</p> <p>Landscape 6.1.1 [Following the references to Wisley and Painshill] ...it is an attractive area which provides a rural setting for the M25 and A3 whilst the woodland helps to limit the visual impact of these roads and traffic on the local area.</p> <p>6.1.2 However, the losses will open up views of the widened roads and traffic leading to increases in visual impact.....will include proposals for the replacement of lost vegetation and new areas of planting to screen views of the road.</p> <p>These two paragraphs are utterly incongruous.</p> <p>In addition the historical and archival importance of Wisley and Painshill are demeaned in favour of "attractive". [Not even picturesque, beautiful or sublime?]</p> <p>There can never be replacement of lost trees of one hundred years or more. Any replanting or new planting would take many years to mature. By which time doubtless the new scheme will need remaking.</p>	Noted.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	<p>No suitably qualified ecologist was available at the Cobham open day to discuss these issues. Presumably if they worked for Atkins they would have a conflict of interests anyway - this work should be overseen by an independent body if it is to have any credibility. For environmental issues such as air quality, noise and ecological effects, information was only available in detailed documents in a number of volumes which extended to up to 300 or so pages. These were left on a table in the corner, and were not highlighted – I had to ask whether this information was available. Clearly this is not making the pros and cons of this development transparent. Furthermore, there was only one copy of each volume available – also discouraging scrutiny. Some of the material was also illegible as it was reproduced so small that it could not be read. I only read as much as I could - but the session ended before I could get through all I wanted. I cannot download the large document on my PC - and in any case, who has time to read through everything? It should have been summarised and (responsibly) interpreted and presented as part of the session. The analysis seems to be incomplete anyway as there was reference to habitat analyses that have yet to be done - so there is no complete view of the environmental consequences provided for residents to make a properly informed decisions. There was also reference to work that was to be done in 2017 - but either hadn't been or the results had not been included.</p> <p>There seem to be potentially catastrophic consequences for some ecosystems/species (I thought I saw figures showing significant % reductions in national populations of certain bird species in a document at the event I attended - though I cannot see these in the documents online). There also appears to be a potentially significant impact on surveyed bat populations. No information is available at all for other species e.g. badgers.</p> <p>A development that will wipe out a significant percentage of the UK occurrence of a species, or that impacts SSSIs, should not be allowed to go ahead unless there is a very clear case for it indeed - and this has clearly</p>	<p>Apologies, we endeavour to provide as much technical support as we can at the consultation events both in person and in print. This has been fed back to the team.</p> <p>Noted. A full cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken for the development proposals in the identified study area in line with the methodology in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	not been established for the reasons above. Finally, given the number of developments currently proposed in this area e.g. Terminal 5, Wisely Airfield, and additional housing developments along the A3 near Fairmile and in Oxshott, there should be some consideration of the CUMULATIVE environmental consequences on the location.		
ANON-5GEV-NG8T-R	Environmental bunds should be used to reduce noise impacts near to the A3 and M25.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise bunds are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
	Request that all new bridges across the M25 and A3 are suitable for horse riders.	The new bridges (Wisley Lane, M25 NMU, and Redhill Road) will be either dedicated Non-Motorised-User bridges or have segregated Non-Motorised-User alignments.	No
18689322 18687521 18687437 18687415 18687415	Extremely concerned about: Air quality AQ levels in Ripley are already at the legal limit. Any additional traffic will negatively impact pollution levels. AQ levels on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) are in excess of the legal limit. Any increase in the volume of traffic will impact the ecology and the integrity of the TBHSPA and have to be considered in the context of cumulative effect which has not been calculated and will not be able to be mitigated.	Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 for all assessments on air quality.	No
18687522 18690468 18691275 18681491 18687437	These proposals will add to noise pollution - more action is needed to reduce impact.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise and suggests noise mitigation measures where necessary (Chapter 6).	No
	Do not widen A245 on pollution grounds.	Widening of the A245 is required to improve flow and capacity. It's impact in air quality is assessed in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement.	No
18690468	Do not take land from pains hill on pollution grounds.	The design has been revised to reduce the land take from Painshill Park.	Yes
18687437	Asks that the project respects and accommodates important Painshill Park.	The impact of the scheme on Painshill Park is assessed in the Environmental Statement throughout the topic chapters. Land take has been reduced at Painshill Park.	Yes
18689337	Plant additional trees alongside A3 and M25 for noise reduction purposes.	Trees and shrubs will be planted as part of the future landscape proposals, where space and other conditions allow these will be planted along both the A3 & M25. Tree planting is generally not considered to reduce measured noise levels, although it can provide some masking noise in windy weather and can serve to separate the noise from views of the traffic generating it.	No
18687437 18687521 18687415	Extremely concerned about: Loss of SPA. The SPA is part of a habitats network. Any land taken must be replaced and immediately protected as SPA land in order to allow the replacement habitat the best chance to establish in the shortest timescale.	Concern noted and a Habitat Regulations Assessment including the IROPI ("imperative reasons of overriding public interest") case has been prepared to support the DCO application along with the Environmental Statement. The scheme has been developed to reduce as far as possible the loss of Special Protection Area. Compensation land has been included within the scheme and will be established as soon as works start on site.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
18687415 18687521 18692696	Extremely concerned about the negative Impact on RHS and or Painshill Park including Noise impacts, impacts on wildlife, heritage.	Please refer to the Environmental Statement for the full set of assessments undertaken to date.	No
18687437 18687521	Noise reducing road surfacing should be used throughout the scheme.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise and suggests noise mitigation measures, such as noise reducing road surfacing, where necessary (see Chapter 6). The noise assessment being undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement has identified areas where noise reducing tarmac and noise bunds are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
18687521 18689322 18687437	Suggested requirements " All SRN road surfaces must be replaced with noise reducing tarmac. " Bund/noise limiting measures must be taken wherever possible [i.e. where common land is not involved] " Minimum lighting levels to protect the SPA habitat " All exchange land to be designated SPA immediately. Title to all new and overdue exchange land to be assigned before completion of junction.	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 6) has identified areas where noise reducing tarmac and noise bunds are necessary. Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
18672091	Concern about the common land being taken and the impacts on wildlife.	Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) and 13 (People and communities).	No
18681491 18672400 18689638 18687437 18687415 18687415 18692699	The scheme has not captured the importance regarding the design in the vicinity of Painshill Park. Concerns about the negative impacts on of widening the A3 on Painshill park, Grade 1 listed landscape, listed buildings or surrounding wildlife. Your plans will have a severe adverse effect on this heritage site in terms of air and noise pollution, and traffic vibration very close to the Gothic Tower.	The scheme design has been amended to reduce the impact on Painshill Park.	Yes
18690511 18689670 18687423 18681491	Concerns around increased pollution / air quality from heavier traffic along the A3 and the longer route into RHS Wisley.	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise, light and air pollution and suggests mitigation measures where necessary (Chapters 4 and 5).	No
18689638 18682131 18690450	Concerns about noise, light and air pollution and impacts on local residents	An Environmental Statement has been prepared that assesses the impact of the scheme on noise, light and air pollution and suggests mitigation measures where necessary. (Chapters 4 and 5,).	No
18692706	what consideration for landscape protection is involved either generally or for Painshill and Wisley.	The scheme has been developed to limit the adverse effect on the landscape surrounding the junction as far as possible. The design of the scheme near RHS Wisley and Painshill has been reviewed and designed in detail to reduce the impacts on both of these properties.	No
RSP-D-1	Would like further clarity on how the NMU route designs are adaptable enough to avoid ground nesting birds during breeding season.	The proposed Public Rights of Way (PRoW) have been chosen to avoid crossing the main areas used by Special Protection Area bird species and/or to use tracks already used by Surrey Wildlife Trust for vehicle access to their properties. Other proposed tracks will be subject to management by Surrey Wildlife Trust, including closure during the nesting season if needed, as are the existing non-PRoW paths within the SPA.	No
RSP-D-2	Have reservations about improving the car parking in the SPA.	The car park by Ockham Bites is located outside of the Site of Specific Scientific Interest and Special Protection Area. It is located within the Ockham and Wisley Local Nature Reserve only.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-N44R-Y ANON-5GEV-NFQQ-D ANON-5GEV-NFSU-K	Provide green bridges over the A3 south of the M25 and on the M25 east of the A3 OR all bridges to be made green bridges to counterbalance habitat loss and encourage free movement for animals and insects.	Funding has been secured to investigate the potential for green bridges within this scheme.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NG89-W	Can you erect more noise reduction fencing, plant more trees and hedging, lower the carriageway of the A3 between Painshill and the M25 to create a slight cutting effect? Are you looking at some of the European standards and initiatives to see if they can be applied here?	The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement has identified areas where noise reduction fencing and other noise mitigation measures are necessary (Chapter 6). Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented. There is no plan to change the grade of the A3 in its entirety in order to reduce the impacts of moving excavated materials.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8P-M	Much more needs to be done to protect the surrounding communities (e.g. Downside) which already suffer higher than acceptable noise levels, and which will be impacted even more by these proposals - please include more noise reduction fencing.	Downside is outside of the scope of the scheme between junction 9 and 10 on the M25. The noise assessment undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement has identified areas where noise mitigation is necessary (Chapter 6). Where the noise modelling has not identified a need for noise mitigation, no noise mitigation measures will be implemented.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D	Proposals show potential 'upgrades' to the bridleways across the common land to the bridges 'upstream' and 'downstream' over the M25: welcomed if these can be reasonable all-weather surfaces, so that cyclists have quieter less polluted (albeit longer) alternatives to the route alongside the A3.	The scheme includes a hard surfaced route from Painshill to Ockham Park set back from the A3 for cyclists and pedestrians. All Public Right of Way (PRoW) proposals which are part of the scheme will be incorporated into the DCO schedules.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEUU-M ANON-5GEV-N4PD-D ANON-5GEV-NECM-T ANON-5GEV-NEUS-J ANON-5GEV-NEUU-M	The HE preferred option goes ahead it will significantly add to local traffic pollution due to RHS Wisley visitors being forced to travel further. There is no mention of the impact on public transport. Currently, there is access to RHS Wisley from the A3 by bus between Guildford and Kingston. There doesn't seem to be provision for bus lay-bys on the maps as shown in the consultation brochure. This would mean access to RHS Wisley will then only be possible by private vehicle or taxi which is a backward step.	The effect of RHS Wisley traffic following a slightly longer route will not add noticeably to local traffic pollution levels. The scheme has been developed since the consultation and now includes provision for bus lay-bys close to RHS Wisley. Further discussions are on-going with bus operators regarding access to RHS Wisley.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-N486-7	For Painshill Park, at the very least, the following mitigations must be incorporated in the scheme: 1. noise reducing surfaces (porous asphalt) on ALL 8 lanes, north and south, running past Painshill Park from the Painshill roundabout to Junction 10; 2. the proposed light-screening fence between the new Painshill properties access road and the A3 must be upgraded to a noise-cancelling barrier reflecting latest technology.	Low noise surfacing is proposed on the A3 and slip roads. A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This is provided in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEC3-Z	Page 72 I cannot find in the report an assessment of the vibration and noise which will affect Painshill. How can this proposal be considered without this information. Page 156 the adverse impact on the Grade 2 Listed Gothic Tower at Painshill is surely more than 'moderate'. Page 159 ignores the effect of noise on the 18th century landscape and the visitors' appreciation of it. Page 182 I understand that the impact of the scheme on the users of Painshill has not yet been carried out. This should have been considered in depth before making a recommendation as Painshill which operates as a charitable Trust derives its revenue almost entirely from visitor income.	The report referred to is the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. A full assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is provided in the Environmental Statement. The scheme has been revised since the PEIR was produced and the effects on Painshill Park have been reduced.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEKC-R	I would consider the statement (p.156) on the adverse impact on the Grade 2 listed Gothic Tower as being more than 'moderate', particularly having seen the marked out boundary. The A3 would come within metres of the Tower and for this to not be a factor in the decision making process is wrong. The Environmental Information Report (p.159) also fails to take into account the effect of the impact of noise on the 18th Century landscape.	The report referred to is a Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The scheme has been revised since the PEIR was produced and the effects on Painshill Park have been reduced. A full assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is being provided in the Environmental Statement.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>There appears to be nothing in the report to indicate that an assessment has been made of the vibration and noise which would affect Painshill; it appears that this has yet to be done and it is inappropriate that a recommendation should be made without this information (p.72)</p> <p>Another detailed assessment that has not been carried out before the recommendation was made is Painshill's status as a Grade 1 Listed landscape - surely this should have been done long before any recommendations were made.</p> <p>I cannot agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor , especially given the proximity of the Gothic Tower.</p>		
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	<p>Re:- 3.1.3 (Your say) Because the existing noise levels are high it is not expected that the Scheme would result in a significant change in noise:- By incorporating broken/crushed stone filled 1m cubed wire baskets, as I have suggested and detailed elsewhere in this reply, but this time to the whole length of the widened carriageways to say 2m above the carriageways and the surrounding ground levels, these will absorb a considerable amount of the sound and prevent nearly all sound hitting them from being reflected which if done contiguously will result in a significant sound reduction. In addition, if it is your intention to use central reservation concrete crash barriers these too need to be designed and finished with a porous crushed stone finish to again minimise the reflection of sound. The same treatment should also be given to all bridge supports and bridge facias and soffits. In using the suggested stone, due consideration should be given to its surface colour where perhaps a self-cleaning white stone may enhance the appearance of the road; and/or the use of different stone colours in different locations to add some contrast.</p>	<p>A full noise assessment has been undertaken to understand the effect of the scheme and identify any necessary mitigation. This is reported in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B	<p>As mentioned above, I read the PEIR and it was clearly stated in several places that the approach to mitigating environmental issues is far from being finalised. Again, here are a few examples of this lack of planning:</p> <p>"The effect on air quality will be examined once this information is available." (2.4.1)</p> <p>"At this stage, details of the mitigation and compensation measures that would combine to form the necessary mitigation have not yet been finalised." (4.1.3)</p> <p>The mitigation scheme appears to weaken but not eliminate the negative impact on wildlife. Looking at the map and surrounding area shows that it is not really possible to create large, uninterrupted woodland areas that compare to the areas lost through the scheme. Only small, speckled woodland areas can be created and that's not enough for rare bird species.</p> <p>Pollution levels already exceed the average objective and this will only get worse, since the widened motorway will attract more vehicles. The air quality problem is especially problematic for local schools, such as Feltonfleet school.</p> <p>It says "Based on the preliminary environmental assessment carried out so far it has been established that the Scheme has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the Ockham and Wisley Commons SSSI and three ancient woodlands." It says mitigation methods are currently not in place and are being "explored". Surely it should be tested as to whether this is even possible before deciding on going ahead with the scheme.</p>	<p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report provided information on the impact of the scheme from the assessment work undertaken to date. It is not a record of the final environmental impact assessment of the scheme. That is the Environmental Statement which forms part of the documentation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the Development Consent Order. The scheme has been further refined since the PEIR was produced and now includes a comprehensive mitigation and compensation package to mitigate adverse impacts.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>The roads border on a Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and local nature reserve and many listed buildings (e.g. Painshill Gothic Tower) and parks. These areas are irreplaceable and must not be tempered with.</p> <p>As is states in the report, "the area around the junction is highly valued for its biodiversity with a large area to the south of the M25 forming part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which is an internationally protected site that supports threatened bird species." I can currently not see a satisfactory approach to mitigating the damage to this area.</p> <p>As it says, there is also the potential for harmful spillages of pollutants into the local environment if there are accidents on these roads. How will this be mitigated?</p>		
ANON-5GEV-NEXP-J	<p>There is no mention of the ancient woodland at Painshill (on page 98) parts of which will be taken by this scheme. This is real history being destroyed with numerous mentions in essays by notable writers of the 18th century.Painshill's status as a Grade 1 listed landscape is mentioned but a detailed assessment of the impact has not yet carried out (Page 152). This is yet to be submitted as part of the EIA. Surely this should have been done prior to making this recommendation.I do not agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor (page 156) given the proximity of the scheme to the Gothic TowerI find it completely unacceptable that permanent setting impacts due to the operation of Scheme elements within the boundaries of a possible World Heritage site can be considered moderate (Page 159)</p>	<p>Noted. The scheme has been revised in the Painshill area and now has much reduced land take and effects on the ancient woodland and Gothic Tower. This is part of the iterative process of scheme development that has taken place since the consultation. The assessment of effects on Painshill Park are reported in the Environmental Statement for the scheme which forms part of the DCO application.</p>	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NF98-V	<p>Landscape 6.1.1 [Following the references to Wisley and Painshill] ...it is an attractive area which provides a rural setting for the M25 and A3 whilst the woodland helps to limit the visual impact of these roads and traffic on the local area.</p> <p>6.1.2 However, the losses will open up views of the widened roads and traffic leading to increases in visual impact.....will include proposals for the replacement of lost vegetation and new areas of planting to screen views of the road.</p> <p>These two paragraphs are utterly incongruous.</p> <p>In addition the historical and archival importance of Wisley and Painshill are demeaned in favour of "attractive". [Not even picturesque, beautiful or sublime?]</p> <p>There can never be replacement of lost trees of one hundred years or more. Any replanting or new planting would take many years to mature. By which time doubtless the new scheme will need remaking.</p>	<p>Noted. The description of the importance of RHS Wisley and Painshill Park are within the Cultural Heritage section of the report. The assessment of the effects on these places is reported in detail in the Environmental Statement for the scheme. The scheme itself has been revised to reduce impacts on both Painshill and RHS Wisley. Unfortunately a scheme in this location will require the loss of trees but this has been kept to a minimum and the scheme now includes a comprehensive package of tree planting measures and other environmental improvements to compensate and mitigate for the losses.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	<p>No suitably qualified ecologist was available at the Cobham open day to discuss these issues. Presumably if they worked for Atkins they would have a conflict of interests anyway - this work should be overseen by an independent body if it is to have any credibility.For environmental issues such as air quality, noise and ecological effects, information was only available in detailed documents in a number of volumes which extended to</p>	<p>Apologies, we endeavour to provide as much technical support as we can at the consultation events both in person and in print. We will feed this back to the team. The PEIR that was available at the events was also available on the HE website and is an objective report on the effects of the scheme as they were known at that time. Since then further surveys and other work has gone into the scheme to reduce effects and to assess those effects.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>up to 300 or so pages. These were left on a table in the corner, and were not highlighted – I had to ask whether this information was available. Clearly this is not making the pros and cons of this development transparent. Furthermore, there was only one copy of each volume available – also discouraging scrutiny. Some of the material was also illegible as it was reproduced so small that it could not be read. I only read as much as I could - but the session ended before I could get through all I wanted. I cannot download the large document on my PC - and in any case, who has time to read through everything? It should have been summarised and (responsibly) interpreted and presented as part of the session. The analysis seems to be incomplete anyway as there was reference to habitat analyses that have yet to be done - so there is no complete view of the environmental consequences provided for residents to make a properly informed decisions. There was also reference to work that was to be done in 2017 - but either hadn't been or the results had not been included. There seem to be potentially catastrophic consequences for some ecosystems/species (I thought I saw figures showing significant % reductions in national populations of certain bird species in a document at the event I attended - though I cannot see these in the documents online). There also appears to be a potentially significant impact on surveyed bat populations. No information is available at all for other species e.g. badgers. A development that will wipe out a significant percentage of the UK occurrence of a species, or that impacts SSSIs, should not be allowed to go ahead unless there is a very clear case for it indeed - and this has clearly not been established for the reasons above. Finally, given the number of developments currently proposed in this area e.g. Terminal 5, Wisley Airfield, and additional housing developments along the A3 near Fairmile and in Oxshott, there should be some consideration of the CUMULATIVE environmental consequences on the location.</p>	<p>The methodology for assessing the effects is comprehensive and the assessments are very detailed. This is necessary to fully understand the effects of the scheme and make informed decisions. The assessments are reported in the Environmental Statement which is accompanied by a Non-Technical Summary which will set out the effects of the scheme in easily understood language.</p> <p>A Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
<p>ANON-5GEV-N466-5 ANON-5GEV-N8P3-Z ANON-5GEV-NECN-U ANON-5GEV-NER8-M ANON-5GEV-NGHX-C</p>	<p>Reduce land take and impacts on RHS Wisley.</p>	<p>The scheme itself has been revised to reduce impacts on both Painshill and RHS Wisley. Unfortunately a scheme in this location will require the loss of trees but this has been kept to a minimum and the scheme now includes a comprehensive package of tree planting measures and other environmental improvements to compensate and mitigate for the losses.</p> <p>The assessment of the effects on RHS Wisley is reported in detail in the Environmental Statement for the scheme.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>ANON-5GEV-N4CS- FANON-5GEV-N89C- SANON-5GEV-NG4D- 4ANON-5GEV-NG88- VANON-5GEV-NG8G- BANON-5GEV-NG8U- SANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC-</p>	<p>Concerns over the environmental impact of the scheme.</p>	<p>The scheme has been developed to reduce as far as possible adverse effects and includes a comprehensive package of mitigation and compensation measures. The scheme has been further developed since the consultation to further reduce the impact on the environment. The effects will be reported in the Environmental Statement that will accompany the DCO application.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVC- 5ANON-5GEV-NGVF- 8ANON-5GEV-NGVF- 8ANON-5GEV-NGVF- 8ANON-5GEV-NGX3- QANON-5GEV-NGX3-Q			
ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B	<p>From the PEIR "The effect on air quality will be examined once this information is available." (2.4.1) "At this stage, details of the mitigation and compensation measures that would combine to form the necessary mitigation have not yet been finalised." (4.1.3) If the above cannot be addressed to a satisfactory extent, the scheme should be stopped. The public cannot comment on whether mitigation methods are appropriate if these are not clearly presented. Currently this information is incomplete. Bolder Mere will border directly on the motorway which will look unpleasant and deter visitors. Water wildlife will be negatively affected. Wisley Park and Painshill Park will shrink.</p>	<p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report provided information on the impact effect of the scheme from the design and assessment work undertaken to that date and proposed mitigation measures to reduce the impact. As the title of the document indicates it is not a record of the final environmental impact assessment of the scheme. That is the Environmental Statement which forms part of the documentation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the Development Consent Order and which will be available for the public to read. The scheme minimises the extent of widening into Bolder Mere as far as possible and the current lake margin will be recreated after construction is complete. Land take from Painshill Park and RHS Wisley has been reduced as far as practicable.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVM-F	<p>As regards air pollution and noise pollution:- How will the results of mitigating these be publicised? What are "acceptable" targets? If such targets are not met, what budget is set aside for further work so that they are and in what time frame? It is not sufficient to have "Analysis of air quality effects and implementation of measures to mitigate pollutant levels ...". Actual whatever-it-takes measures must be budgeted for and put in place to make noise and air pollution levels BETTER THAN TODAY, and on an improving scale after the work is completed at least in line with government requirements.</p>	<p>The scheme includes necessary noise mitigation where justified by the noise changes attributable to the scheme or where the existing noise barriers will be lost to the widening. For air quality, mitigation measures are recommended where it is expected that the scheme will have an overall significant effect. If mitigation measures are proposed, then analysis of monitoring data post opening would usually be undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the measure. Where it can be seen that the levels of noise or air pollution are worse than predicted further mitigation will be considered by Highways England. In general, it is expected that air quality will improve as less polluting and electric vehicles are driven on roads.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVK-D	<p>Proposals show potential 'upgrades' to the bridleways across the common land to the bridges 'upstream' and 'downstream' over the M25: welcomed if these can be reasonable all-weather surfaces, so that cyclists have quieter less polluted (albeit longer) alternatives to the route alongside the A3.</p>	<p>The scheme includes a hard surfaced route from Painshill to Ockham Park set back from the A3 for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NEC3-Z	<p>Page 72 I cannot find in the report an assessment of the vibration and noise which will affect Painshill. How can this proposal be considered without this information. Page 156 the adverse impact on the Grade 2 Listed Gothic Tower at Painshill is surely more than 'moderate'. Page 159 ignores the effect of noise on the 18th century landscape and the visitors' appreciation of it. Page 182 I understand that the impact of the scheme on the users of Painshill has not yet been carried out. This should have been considered in depth before making a recommendation as Painshill which operates as a charitable Trust derives its revenue almost entirely from visitor income.</p>	<p>The report referred to was the Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. A full assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is provided in the Environmental Statement. The scheme has been revised since the PEIR was produced and the effects on Painshill Park have been reduced.</p>	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEKC-R	<p>I would consider the statement (p.156) on the adverse impact on the Grade 2 listed Gothic Tower as being more than 'moderate', particularly having seen the marked out boundary. The A3 would come within metres of the Tower and for this to not be a factor in the decision making process is wrong.</p>	<p>The report referred to was a Preliminary Environmental Information Report detailing the information available at the time. The scheme has been revised since the PEIR was produced and the effects on Painshill Park have been reduced. A full assessment of the impacts of noise and vibration at</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>The Environmental Information Report (p.159) also fails to take into account the effect of the impact of noise on the 18th Century landscape. There appears to be nothing in the report to indicate that an assessment has been made of the vibration and noise which would affect Painshill; it appears that this has yet to be done and it is inappropriate that a recommendation should be made without this information (p.72) Another detailed assessment that has not been carried out before the recommendation was made is Painshill's status as a Grade 1 Listed landscape - surely this should have been done long before any recommendations were made. I cannot agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor , especially given the proximity of the Gothic Tower.</p>	<p>Painshill Park and the Gothic Tower is provided in the Environmental Statement.</p>	
ANON-5GEV-NEPQ-B	<p>As mentioned above, I read the PEIR and it was clearly stated in several places that the approach to mitigating environmental issues is far from being finalised. Again, here are a few examples of this lack of planning:"The effect on air quality will be examined once this information is available." (2.4.1)"At this stage, details of the mitigation and compensation measures that would combine to form the necessary mitigation have not yet been finalised." (4.1.3)The mitigation scheme appears to weaken but not eliminate the negative impact on wildlife. Looking at the map and surrounding area shows that it is not really possible to create large, uninterrupted woodland areas that compare to the areas lost through the scheme. Only small, speckled woodland areas can be created and that's not enough for rare bird species.Pollution levels already exceed the average objective and this will only get worse, since the widened motorway will attract more vehicles. The air quality problem is especially problematic for local schools, such as Feltonfleet school. It says "Based on the preliminary environmental assessment carried out so far it has been established that the Scheme has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the Ockham and Wisley Commons SSSI and three ancient woodlands." It says mitigation methods are currently not in place and are being "explored". Surely it should be tested as to whether this is even possible before deciding on going ahead with the scheme. The roads border on a Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and local nature reserve and many listed buildings (e.g. Painshill Gothic Tower) and parks. These areas are irreplaceable and must not be tempered with.As is states in the report, "the area around the junction is highly valued for its biodiversity with a large area to the south of the M25 forming part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which is an internationally protected site that supports threatened bird species." I can currently not see a satisfactory approach to mitigating the damage to this area.As it says, there is also the potential for harmful spillages of pollutants into the local environment if there are accidents on these roads. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report provided information on the impact of the scheme from the assessment work undertaken to date. It is not a record of the final environmental impact assessment of the scheme. That is the Environmental Statement which forms part of the documentation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the Development Consent Order. The scheme has been further refined since the PEIR was produced and now includes a comprehensive mitigation and compensation package to mitigate adverse impacts.</p>	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEXP-J	<p>There is no mention of the ancient woodland at Painshill (on page 98) parts of which will be taken by this scheme. This is real history being destroyed with numerous mentions in essays by notable writers of the 18th century.</p> <p>Painshill's status as a Grade 1 listed landscape is mentioned but a detailed assessment of the impact has not yet carried out (Page 152). This is yet to be submitted as part of the EIA. Surely this should have been done prior to making this recommendation.</p>	<p>Noted The scheme has been revised in the Painshill area and now has much reduced land take and effects on the ancient woodland and Gothic Tower. This is part of the iterative process of scheme development that has taken place since the consultation. The assessment of effects on Painshill Park is reported in the Environmental Statement for the scheme which forms part of the DCO application.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>I do not agree that the construction impacts on Painshill can be classed as minor (page 156) given the proximity of the scheme to the Gothic Tower.</p> <p>I find it completely unacceptable that permanent setting impacts due to the operation of Scheme elements within the boundaries of a possible World Heritage site can be considered moderate (Page 159).</p>		
ANON-5GEV-NF98-V	<p>Landscape6.1.1 [Following the references to Wisley and Painshill] ...it is an attractive area which provides a rural setting for the M25 and A3 whilst the woodland helps to limit the visual impact of these roads and traffic on the local area.6.1.2 However, the losses will open up views of the widened roads and traffic leading to increases in visual impact..... will include proposals for the replacement of lost vegetation and new areas of planting to screen views of the road.These two paragraphs are utterly incongruous.In addition the historical and archival importance of Wisley and Painshill are demeaned in favour of "attractive". [Not even picturesque, beautiful or sublime?]There can never be replacement of lost trees of one hundred years or more.Any replanting or new planting would take many years to mature. By which time doubtless the new scheme will need remaking.</p>	<p>The description of the importance of RHS Wisley and Painshill Park are within the Cultural Heritage section of the ES, Chapter 11. The assessment of the effects on these places is reported in detail in the Environmental Statement for the scheme. The scheme itself has been revised to reduce impacts on both Painshill and RHS Wisley. Unfortunately a scheme in this location will require the loss of trees but this has been kept to a minimum and the scheme now includes a comprehensive package of tree planting measures and other environmental improvements to compensate and mitigate for the losses.</p>	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	<p>No suitably qualified ecologist was available at the Cobham open day to discuss these issues. Presumably if they worked for Atkins they would have a conflict of interests anyway - this work should be overseen by an independent body if it is to have any credibility.</p> <p>For environmental issues such as air quality, noise and ecological effects, information was only available in detailed documents in a number of volumes which extended to up to 300 or so pages. These were left on a table in the corner, and were not highlighted – I had to ask whether this information was available. Clearly this is not making the pros and cons of this development transparent.</p> <p>Furthermore, there was only one copy of each volume available – also discouraging scrutiny. Some of the material was also illegible as it was reproduced so small that it could not be read. I only read as much as I could - but the session ended before I could get through all I wanted. I cannot download the large document n my PC - and in any case, who has time to read through everything? It should have been summarised and (responsibly) interpreted and presented as part of the session.</p> <p>The analysis seems to be incomplete anyway as there was reference to habitat analyses that have yet to be done - so there is no complete view of the environmental consequences provided for residents to make a properly informed decisions. There was also reference to work that was to be done in 2017 - but either hadn't been or the results had not been included.</p> <p>There seem to be potentially catastrophic consequences for some ecosystems/species (I thought I saw figures showing significant % reductions in national populations of certain bird species in a document at the event I attended - though I cannot see these in the documents online). There also appears to be a potentially significant impact on surveyed bat populations. No information is available at all for other species e.g. badgers.</p> <p>A development that will wipe out a significant percentage of the UK</p>	<p>Apologies, we endeavour to provide as much technical support as we can at the consultation events both in person and in print. We will feed this back to the team. The PEIR that was available at the events was also available on the HE website and is an objective report on the effects of the scheme as they were known at that time. Since then further surveys and other work has gone into the scheme to reduce effects and to assess those effects. The methodology for assessing the effects is comprehensive and the assessments are very detailed. This is necessary to fully understand the effects of the scheme and make informed decisions. The assessments are reported in the Environmental Statement which is accompanied by a Non-Technical Summary which sets out the effects of the scheme in easily understood language.</p> <p>A Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
	<p>occurrence of a species, or that impacts SSSIs, should not be allowed to go ahead unless there is a very clear case for it indeed - and this has clearly not been established for the reasons above.</p> <p>Finally, given the number of developments currently proposed in this area e.g. Terminal 5, Wisley Airfield, and additional housing developments along the A3 near Fairmile and in Oxshott, there should be some consideration of the CUMULATIVE environmental consequences on the location.</p>		

Table I.1.4 Stakeholder specific issues

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
GT-St-1	Express disappointment at not being notified of the consultation - as they believe they are a statutory consultee.	We have investigated the status of The Garden Trust and they are not listed as a Statutory Consultee for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).	No
ANON-5GEV-NGNK-5	I did not attend because I didn't know anything about it. Apart from Wisley sending me a petition to sign, that was the first I knew about Highways England's intentions. I was horrified to read what you intended to do with ancient trees. I don't think you are considering all the alternatives. You should listen to Wisley.	We are in ongoing discussion with RHS Wisley about land take arrangements, but they are planned to be minimal.	No

Table I.1.5 Traffic and economic modelling

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
CCH-M-1	Concern about the knock on effects of additional traffic on the local road network.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	No
CCH-M-2	Do not believe that traffic will go to Wisley Lane via A3 route but will use Ripley instead.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the wider local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
EHP-M-1	Concern about the future capacity of Ockham Park roundabout.	For the purposes of the assessment a development at Wisley Airfield has been included as it is considered more than likely to go ahead (as it is in the Local Plan). To deal with the traffic flow at Ockham Park Junction generated by the development, mitigation as proposed by the developers has been included within the Do Minimum model. Subsequent additional traffic redistributed from Wisley Lane as a result of the J10 scheme has meant that the design proposes further improvements to the Ockham Park Junction to again mitigate for the impact. The J10 design leads to an improvement in operation at the junction compared to the Do Minimum.	No
EHP-M-2	Concern that the scheme will generate significant additional congestion through Ripley.	Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak. Highways England will be working hard to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and will work to ensure that the same number of lanes will be open during construction. However, it is likely there will be narrower lanes and speed restrictions during the construction of the scheme. The development of this scheme will improve congestion at the junction in the longer term. The A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. In comparison to the level of growth generated by developments in the area, the increases due solely to the scheme are minimal.	No
EHP-M-1	Question the cost benefit ration of the scheme - in particular whether an improved safety record is worth the expenditure.	The estimated benefit-cost ratio (BCR) at Preliminary Design stage (PCF3) is 2.22 suggesting a High Value for Money. The scheme is forecast to save 595 accidents over 60 years generating an accident benefit of £44m Present Value.	No
HPC-M-1	Make Painshill traffic lights peak only	This is an existing fully signalised junction that operates under signal control at all times. Improvements shall be made to the current method of control by upgrading to an adaptive system of control which will reduce delays whilst still providing safe control in the off peak conditions.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NG8U-S ANON-5GEV-N466-5	Does the short widening on the A245 towards Seven Hills Road have a negative impact on the surround local highway network.	Capacity at the Seven Hills Junction is constrained. The amount of growth resulting from the scheme is limited. The impact of the scheme on the surrounding local road network is therefore limited. Overall junction performance is improved in the DS models. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Package report (HE551522-ATK-GEN-XX-RP-TR-000002). Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGXD-8	Growth impacts should take into account specific developments further afield in the Guildford Local plan, i.e. Gosden.	All development within Guildford's draft local plan is included within the development assumptions including Gosden Hill	No
ANON-5GEV-NGXB-6	Future proof the scheme by widening the A3 to 5 lanes	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TD22 calculations show that even with growth to 2037, 5 lanes would not be necessary. The cost of widening to five lanes would also far exceed the available budget.	No
ANON-5GEV-N8D2-K	What impact does widening of the A245 have on the downstream flows after Seven Hills Road junction?	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-N46X-7	Concern that 2 through lanes on the A3 is not sufficient.	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TD22 calculations show that even with growth to 2037, three lanes on the A3 through the junction would not be necessary. The cost of widening to three lanes through the junction would exceed the available budget.	No
ANON-5GEV-N466-5	concerned about queues from the A245 / Seven hills junction to Byfleet / Brooklands estate.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4RE-G	Evidence / reassurance of consideration of Seven Hills road / A245 upgrade to deal with rush hour traffic.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEJW-B ANON-5GEV-NERN-A	Improve Traffic light Phasing at pains hill roundabout for smooth traffic flow.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP5-F	Scheme will worsen Existing bottleneck for north bound traffic at A245 Seven hills junction, affecting flow and cause queues up to A3 junction.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	
ANON-5GEV-NERN-A	Improve traffic light Phasing at M25 J10.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEUA-Z	no need to widen A3 - negating traffic lights will reduce congestion.	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TD22 calculations show that four lanes are already required for the level of traffic using the road. Widening the A3 not only has traffic benefits but also safety benefits.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4JR-N	Suggestion that there should be 2 lanes diverging from M25 to A3 to ease traffic / flow and remove the queuing back from M25 past Cobham Services.	The current design is for a two lane diverge from the M25 clockwise. This turns into one lane for the free-flow left and two lanes for the right-turn. The modelling shows this is a sufficient arrangement and capacity for the design year. The design provides a lane drop from M25 in accordance with the traffic modelling results with the assumption that Through Junction Running will be incorporated to the scheme.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVU-Q	Do not introduce through junction running on the M25 as this will cause more accidents.	As well as designing highway schemes to the latest standards, Highways England follows a strict safety governance process on its major project schemes, to ensure that any safety risks are assessed and evaluated and suitable control measures put in place to keep users (and workers) safe. The Atkins design team has had access to Highways England technical experts to advise on specific aspects of the project as the design has developed. The scheme has been presented to the Operations Technical Leadership Group which challenges the operational concept and has to be satisfied that any risks have been identified and mitigated, and that the scheme can be operated safely. Challenging safety targets are set and each scheme is subject to a detailed six-month operational monitoring period upon opening, with a longer three year monitoring period to assess scheme performance. Independent road safety audits are also carried out at key stages of the project.	No
OPC-M-1	Concern about moving congestion, environmental and air quality issues onto the rural side roads.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVF-8	There is not enough discussion about this proposals substantial reduction of traffic delays and air pollution caused by stationary traffic. The statistics regarding time saved when negotiating the improved junction do not appear to be aligned to the real gains that will be achieved.	Delays, including stationary traffic, are the underlying basic principle of user benefits and as such are captured in the economic appraisal of the scheme. Air quality assessments take into account speeds on roads in the with and without scheme scenarios.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEUU-M	The HE preferred option goes ahead it will significantly add to local traffic pollution due to RHS Wisley visitors being forced to travel further. There is no mention of the impact on public transport. Currently, there is access to RHS Wisley from the A3 by bus between Guildford and Kingston. There doesn't seem to be provision for bus lay-byes on the maps as shown in the consultation brochure. This would mean access to RHS Wisley will then only be possible by private vehicle or taxi which is a backward step.	We have engaged with Surrey County Council, the bus route owner, to discuss service impacts and opportunities to improve this by adding a link direct to RHS Wisley. Proposals are to provide a bus route and bus stop to RHS Wisley. Discussions have been started with Surrey County Council as the bus routes operator and a decision will be made by Surrey County Council at a later date.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-N4XN-Y	Possibly none, but I feel that Highways England should be aware that Ripley really has a great problem with through traffic, especially during rush hour, and any measures that alleviate this problem (and air pollution) would be greatly appreciated.	Noted. Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today’s traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	When this proposal was being discussed with residents in 2017 we were informed that the estimates for housing requirements were being revised as the government method for calculating them was not fit for purpose. Given that this proposal seems to have been in progress since well before 2017, how have changes to these assumptions been taken into account in calculating traffic volumes – and what are these revised assumptions? Also, what assumptions have been made about Heathrow? Both could materially change projections on which this project is based.	Modelling undertaken has used the standard Department for Transport (DfT) processes for determining growth assumptions. Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford have specific sites (from Local plans) constrained to the Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPRO), all other areas have TEMPRO growth assumption.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGVC-5	The total cumulative impact of all significant proposed developments in this area on environment and quality of life in the area have not been addressed. Negative impacts of increased traffic volumes, pollution, and environmental destruction have been considered apparently in isolation of the impact of other developments in the area e.g. Terminal 5, Wisley Airfield, and additional housing developments along the A3 near Fairmile and in Oxshott.	The total cumulative impact of all local developments (and background growth from further afield) on traffic and environment has been addressed as is the standard protocol for transport models following the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance.	No
ANON-5GEV-N4CS-F	Do not believe the scheme will improve safety as speeds around free flowing elements will be higher.	The free-flow left-turns are all single lanes with no conflicting movements. The scheme reduces the amount of queuing vehicles on the approaches to the junctions. Front to rear shunts, weaving and conflicting traffic movements account for the majority of collisions at the junction. Free-flowing movements at the junction will therefore reduce the number of collisions recorded at the junction.	No
RHA-M-1	do not believe enough thought and consideration has been given to housing growth proposals and the impact that this is going to have on this junction. A housing development for more than 2000 houses and associated facilities on Wisley Airfield has recently been sent to Secretary of State by the Planning Inspector for a decision. There is little or no public transport in the area which means car dependency will be high adding to an already congested area.	All development assumptions provided by Elmbridge, Woking and Guildford have been included. No increase in growth has been made for Heathrow's plans in line with advice provided by the DfT.	No
TFL-M-1	Were non-road based options considered? E.g. demand management.	Yes, please refer to the TAR https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/he/m25-junction-10-a3-wisley-interchange-improvement/supporting_documents/Stage%201%20Technical%20Appraisal%20Report%20V1.5a%20%20M25J10A3.pdf	No
WCP-M-3	Believe that based on the journey time saving data based in the SAR savings will be negligible by 2037 and therefore the scheme does not meet its objectives.	The journey time savings compared to the Do Minimum shown are for 2037.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
WCP-M-4	Suggest that without sufficient improvement to junction 10 people will use the A247 as a rat run when the M25 is congested.	This is correct and as such is a consideration for the scheme.	No
WCP-M-5	<p>As the current situation is already unacceptable the figures provided suggest that the option proposed will provide negligible benefit by 2037 in the crucial AM2 period just when children are making their way to school through the village. E.g. table 6.1 in the Scheme Assessment Report suggests delays in 2022 will amount to 357 vehicles hours. Your modelling suggests the delays under the chosen option will be 346 hours in 2027, a reduction of only 4%. With the 55 annual traffic growth, you suggest from current levels to 2022 we can expect no relief from the scheme towards the end of the period. The scheme is therefore unlikely to meet its objectives in this important respect.</p> <p>The journey time savings compared to the Do Minimum shown are for 2037.</p>	The scheme has been designed in the context of a 15-year lifespan, and in that respect the traffic modelling undertaken shows that the junction will continue to operate within capacity until at least that point. Furthermore, the chosen scheme is intended to be better performing than the existing layout in comparable future years, which is again achieved by this design. The scheme can therefore be shown to meet its objectives.	No
WAG-M-1	Concern regarding Ockham Park roundabout being able to cater for the additional traffic. Additional traffic/congestion using Ockham in the inter-peak.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the SRN. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	Yes
WAG-M-2	Concern about the validity of the traffic modelling. Use of data from Motion RHS application, based on Wisley Properties TA.	The traffic model has been validated to WebTAG guidelines. Development trips have been derived from Transport Assessments provided for RHS and Wisley Airfield.	No
WAG-M-3	Concern about additional queuing at Old Lane as a result of the free flow left turn on the roundabout.	Scheme design has been improved to remove this issue. The geometry for the entrance to Old Lane is improved along with removing the HGV parking to increase visibility. Exiting old lane has been converted from a standard priority junction to a running lane which merges with the on-slip over a longer distance.	Yes
WAG-M-4	Concern re the closure of Wisley Lane leading to drivers redirecting through Ripley in the AM peak.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
WAG-M-5	Concern about capacity on Seven Hills Road/Byfleet Road.	Capacity at the Seven Hills Junction is constrained. The amount of growth resulting from the scheme is limited. The impact of the scheme on the surrounding local road network is therefore limited. Overall junction performance is improved in the DS models. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
WAG-M-2	Suggestion that we have used deficient modelling from the Wisley Airfield development (via RHS Wisley) - See letter for more detail.	The traffic model has been validated to WebTAG guidelines. Development trips have been derived from Transport Assessments provided for RHS and Wisley Airfield.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
WAG-M-2	Concern that closure of and alternative route for Wisley Lane will lead to increased congestion on the local road network.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
WAG-S-2	Concern about the additional traffic generated at Newark Lane and Ripley High Street.	Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today’s traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak.	No
18691283 18691286 18691004	Concern re the closure of Wisley Lane leading to drivers redirecting through Ripley and Local Roads.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
1869128318690450	Concern that closing direct access to Wisley Lane will result in greater pressures on the M25 J10.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak. The free-flow design of the M25/A3 junction itself means that less traffic will use the roundabout, so the routing of vehicles via the junction will not add greater pressures.	No
18691275	Scheme will worsen Existing bottleneck for north bound traffic at A245 Seven hills junction, affecting flow and cause queues up to A3 junction.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
18687521 18691275 18687415	Concern about capacity on Seven Hills Road/Byfleet Road.	Capacity at the Seven Hills Junction is constrained. The amount of growth resulting from the scheme is limited. The impact of the scheme on the surrounding local road network is therefore limited. Overall junction performance is improved in the Do Something models. The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
18687525 18691004 18692706	Scheme appears to move congestion from one place to another.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow.	No
18687525 18691004	No consideration of Guildford Borough Local plan/ 4 way junction. Traffic going south from Ockham roundabout travel will short-cut through Ripley to Burnt common - not travel north to junction 10 and turn around to go south.	South facing slips are not within the scope of this project.	No
18687525 18691004 18687521	Scheme appears to move congestion from the SRN to LRN. Is this the case?	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions.	No
18687521 18689344 18689352 18687493 18687437 18687522 18687493 18687423 18692696 18691286	Concern that the scheme will generate significant additional congestion through Ripley.	Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak. Highways England will be working hard to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and will work to ensure that the same number of lanes will be open during construction. However, it is likely there will be narrower lanes and speed restrictions during the construction of the scheme. The development of this scheme will improve congestion at the junction in the longer term. The A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. In comparison to the level of growth generated by developments in the area, the increases due solely to the scheme are minimal.	No
18672400	concerned about Impacts from the proposed Wisley Airfield development.	The development has not been granted planning permission, however the background growth data has been built into our modelling, and the scheme works with this growth.	No
18681822	The solution for the A245 is silly. No more bandwidth for traffic on the Byfleet or Seven Hills roads - just more waiting space. This will worsen local journey times. The traffic model apparently says all that is needed is retiming of the traffic lights - if the model really says this then please disregard all its conclusions as it cannot have been calibrated.	The operation of the A245/Seven Hills junction is covered in detail within the PCF3 Traffic Forecasting Report. Highways England have worked with Surrey County Council to determine the best way of improving the signals. Widening to three full lanes in each direction between Seven Hills and Painshill will improve operation.	No
18687437 18689315 18687415	Concerns about traffic re-routing through Ripley and the significant impacts on Ockham Park roundabout as almost every vehicle going to Wisley Gardens will travel round this roundabouts in one direction or the other.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
18692699 18689352		in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	
18687484	HE have over looked issues to do with traffic in the local villages and access to the RHS.	The access to Wisley Lane has been carefully considered. With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
18687437	concerned about the increase of traffic Impacting on RHS Wisley.	We have engaged extensively with RHS Wisley in order to develop the new access arrangements. This land take will have no impact on the operations of the Garden and we are working with the RHS to ensure that the designs will complement the re-designed car park that forms part of their masterplan improvements. Under our proposals, there are some trees at risk on RHS Wisley's land. These trees are located outside of the payline of RHS Wisley and are not protected by any tree preservation orders.	No
18687423 18687437 18692696 18691286 18690450	Concerned about increased traffic impact on Newark lane due to closure of Wisley Lane.	Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today's traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak.	No
18687415	Local road users will face delays at the Ockham Park Roundabout which will have a number of traffic lights - the priority is likely to be to avoid traffic backup on to the A3.	The extra capacity added by widening the A3 to four lanes (from three) means this is not a consequence of the scheme.	No
18692699 18692706	The proposals merely push even greater traffic problems on to Ripley and Guildford.	With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley,	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
		and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	
18692699	Believe that the traffic increase from the proposed developments at wisely airfield will increase Local traffic and strategic traffic.	An intended aim of the scheme is to attract traffic to the Strategic Road Network. Across a wide area the scheme supports this aim by reducing vehicle kilometres travelled on the Local Road Network. In the immediate vicinity of the scheme there will be some increases in flow however, there is mitigation in the form of signal and junction improvements at Seven Hills Road, Painshill and Ockham junctions. With no mitigation it is likely that trips to/from Wisley Lane from the south will travel via Ripley. However, the A3 will be the signed route for Wisley Lane. Our traffic forecasting has modelled the impacts on local villages, and in particular the impacts on Ripley. This scheme will result in less traffic on the local road network during the AM peak. Traffic through Ripley is forecast to increase as a result of background growth however, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction will change by -2% in the 2037 AM peak and +2% in the 2037 PM peak.	No
18692696	Opening Redhill road will alleviate traffic from A3/M25 heading towards Byfleet backing up on to the A3.	There are no plans to re-open Redhill Road.	No
18691283 18687521 18689344 18687522 18687493 18687437 18689352 18690450	Concern about the additional traffic generated through Ripley and local roads.	Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today’s traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak.	No
ANON-5GEV-NG8G-B	What about the petrol station proposed between J10 and Painshill? How will this impact traffic?	The former San Domenico restaurant site has a pending planning application (Planning Ref. 2017/0524) to demolish the main building and provide for a new petrol filling station. It is proposed to use the site as a construction compound and the site will be handed back to the landowners without direct access to the A3 due to the operational scheme and construction of a new Local Access Road. Access will be from the A245, Seven Hills Road and the new Local Access Road. It is therefore considered it won't impact on the traffic on the A3 should it be implemented. This Development Land has been assessed in Chapter 13 of the People and Communities chapter.	

Table I.1.6 Planning

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
CCH-P-1	Need to take into account the Guildford draft Local Plan.	The Planning Statement includes an assessment of the Scheme against the relevant Guildford Borough Council Submission Local Plan (December 2017) and any subsequent updates.	No
ANON-5GEV-NGJZ-G	Concern about the impact on properties surrounding Seven Hills Road junction as it will bring the road closer to their property.	The effects on these properties has been assessed in the Chapter 13 People and Communities in the Environmental Statement (Private dwellings). No significant adverse amenity effects are anticipated.	No
ANON-5GEV-N444-1	Need to consider is potential impacts on the archery club can be avoided.	Due to design changes, the Archery Club is no longer affected.	Yes
RSP-P-1	Don't believe that enough thought has been given to housing growth.	The Traffic model includes housing (and other development) sites in Woking, Elmbridge, Guildford that meet the agreed threshold - from Local Plans and in discussion with the boroughs. All other areas have growth assumptions.	No
ANON-5GEV-N466-5	does the proposed Wisley Lane access account for new housing on Wisley Airfield / proposed industrial composter.	The development does take into account the potential for development on the former Wisley Airfield site in the Cumulative Effects Assessment and the Traffic Model.	No
18687493	Concern that Wisley Lane direct access will generate significant additional congestion through Ripley and make Ripley and Wisley village less attractive to visitors.	Additional congestion in Ripley and Wisley has been assessed in Chapter 13 (Driver Stress) and in the Transport Assessment. With regard to the impact on Ripley, This scheme will result in less traffic on the wider local road network during the AM peak. Our updated PCF stage 3 modelling started by looking at what happens with no scheme – in this scenario traffic in the AM peak increased from 1,800 vehicles an hour today to 2,400 vehicles in 2037. (2037 is the “design life” of the scheme which is what we work to, which is 15 years after the scheme opens. This is a 36% increase on today’s traffic. When we modelled the traffic through Ripley with the proposed scheme, the improvements made to the Old Lane egress onto the A3 as part of the scheme will divert considerable southbound traffic from local developments away from Ripley, and the level of traffic through Newark Lane junction is predicted to reduce by -2% in the 2037 same AM peak. These figures encompass all arms of the Newark Lane junction – i.e. Rose Lane and the high street as well. With regards to Newark Lane itself, today the junction sees 400 vehicles in the AM peak, and in 2037 if we “do nothing” this will fall to 270 vehicles. However, with the scheme, this falls further to 250 vehicles in the AM peak. The modelling shows that fewer people will choose to use Newark Lane as the main route through the village becomes more congested. As that option increases in journey time and ability to access/egress Newark Lane then the numbers drop accordingly.	No
18687493	Concern that Wisley Lane direct access will decrease number of visitors to RHS Wisley.	It is not considered that the proposed new Wisley Lane will decrease visitor numbers for RHS Wisley. Effects on RHS Wisley have been considered in the People and Communities ES Chapter 13.	No
18682131	Compensation for residents affected by pollution and construction works.	Compensation claims and arrangements will be addressed at a later stage in the project with the affected land owners or parties.	No
18692699	does the proposed Wisley Lane access account for new housing on Wisley Airfield / proposed industrial composter.	The development does take into account the potential for development on the former Wisley Airfield site in the Cumulative Effects Assessment and the Traffic Model.	No

Table I.1.7 Safety

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
ANON-5GEV-NECB-F	Removal of hard shoulder on M25 poses safety risk.	Conversion of the hard shoulder to a permanent running lane has been carried out on many smart motorway schemes across the network. Early results from monitoring these schemes has been encouraging. Two years of operations on M25 J5-7 has seen the collision rate significantly reduced with the scheme meeting its safety objectives.	No
ANON-5GEV-NEP4-E	Proposed access to properties southbound between pains hill and j10 - concerned about single-track curved bridge. Unsafe to reverse safely on a single track road and also in poor weather conditions, steep access gradients.	Access arrangements have now been revised, with vehicular access from the slip road. Discussions with the residents and affected landowners are being undertaken as part of a targeted consultation exercise.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NEKC-R ANON-5GEV-NGX1-N	Include average speed cameras (on A3).	Assessment of collisions has shown that most are concentrated around junctions and slip roads and have been as a result of congestion-related 'shunts' or lane changing incidents. Exceeding the speed limit has been recorded in police reports as a primary contributory factor in only 2 of 313 personal injury collisions over a five-year period. Average speed camera sites are generally considered more effective over a longer distance and can be used at sites where a significant number of collisions are scattered along a length of road and for major road works enforcement.	No
ANON-5GEV-NFB5-2 18689660	Use money budgeted for scheme to instead mend dangerous potholes and road surfaces.	(Assuming this is referring to local roads.) Highways England are responsible for maintaining the strategic network of motorway and major 'A' roads where defects are prioritised on safety grounds.	No
OPC-Sa-1	Concern over congestion, delay and safety at Ockham Park Roundabout.	The proposed alterations to the highway layout and traffic signals at the Ockham Park Junction have been modelled using the microsimulation tool S-Paramics. In 2037 the scheme is anticipated to result in an increase of flow of between 8% and 13% at peak times. In the morning peak average delay per vehicle is predicted to reduce by between 40 and 110 seconds, whilst in the PM peak average delay is anticipated to increase by up to 12 seconds. LINSIG junction modelling of the Ockham Park Junction anticipates that the scheme will allow the junction to operate within practical capacity at all times - an improvement on the without scheme scenario where the junction would operate beyond practical capacity in all peak periods.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NGUQ-J	What arrangements are there for improving the A245/Seven Hills Road junction to reduce incidents?	At this stage there are no plans to make any changes to the road layout at this location.	No
WCP-Sa-1	Concern about accident levels. Concern about whether the improvement delivers accident reduction.	One of the key drivers for this scheme is to improve safety, and the scheme proposed has defined safety gains. Safety is a key priority for Highways England and this project is following a strict safety governance regime. This involves input from safety specialists and stakeholders. A comprehensive safety plan has been drawn up and targets have been set to reduce collisions on the scheme. The scheme is forecast to save 595 accidents over 60 years generating an accident benefit of £44m Present Value.	No
WHP-Sa-1	Concern over road safety during construction.	Both a Construction Environment Management Plan and a Traffic Management Plan will be put in place prior to the start of works, with the full cooperation of local stakeholders including emergency services. TM is subject to safety assessments. Incident management plans and detailed local operating agreement will be formulated. Other measures such as CCTV coverage, free recovery and speed compliance and enforcement measures will be included.	No

Unique ID	Consultation response summary/topic area	Highways England summary response	Change to the scheme?
WAG-Sa-1	Concern about the access and egress of Old Lane Concern about the Elm Lane Junction with Old Lane at an already known accident hotspot. Concern about the Old Lane junction safety with the new BOAT link.	At Old Lane a re-modelled junction is being provided with improved deceleration and acceleration lanes to allow safer merging and diverging. Accident statistics do not show this area as a hotspot.	Yes
WAG-Sa-2	Ockham roundabout design - concerns about the speed of traffic entering the roundabout, and the track of the Wisley lane access.	The design for Ockham Park Junction has been revised to include full signalisation. As such this will regulate speed as vehicles approach the roundabout and enter on to it.	Yes
WAG-Sa-3	Concern about the merge/weave from Southbound visitors to RHS Wisley having to cross two lanes.	A dedicated access road from Ockham roundabout will avoid the difficulties and conflicts that are currently experienced when joining or leaving the A3. This location has seen a large number of personal injury collisions over the past 5 years. This is a key improvement for the scheme and will improve safety.	Yes
WAG-Sa-4	Concern regarding approach speed of Ockham Park users travelling A3 southbound.	A dedicated access road from Ockham roundabout will avoid the difficulties and conflicts that are currently experienced when joining or leaving the A3. This location has seen a large number of personal injury collisions over the past 5 years. This is a key improvement for the scheme and will improve safety.	Yes
WAG-SA-1	Concern that the new Cockcrow Bridge will make Old Lane less safe - not specific as to how though.	The new Cockcrow Bridge does not impact on the safety performance of the A3 or access / egress from Old Lane, a further safety assessment will also be carried out at a later stage of the project.	Yes
18687437 18687521 18687415 18691286	Concern about the access and egress of Old Lane Concern about the Elm Lane Junction with Old Lane at an already known accident hotspot. Concern about the Old Lane junction safety with the new BOAT link.	At Old Lane a re-modelled junction is being provided with improved deceleration and acceleration lanes to allow safer merging and diverging. Accident statistics do not show this area as a hotspot.	Yes
18687415 18691275 18691286	Safety concerns with new wisley lane access adjoining Ockham roundabout considering speed of vehicles entering the roundabout from the slip road and the said increase in traffic.	A dedicated access road from Ockham roundabout will avoid the difficulties and conflicts that are currently experienced when joining or leaving the A3. This location has seen a large number of personal injury collisions over the past five years. This is a key improvement for the scheme and will improve safety.	No
18691275	Concern about the merge/weave from Southbound visitors to RHS Wisley having to cross two lanes.	A dedicated access road from Ockham roundabout will avoid the difficulties and conflicts that are currently experienced when joining or leaving the A3. This location has seen a large number of personal injury collisions over the past five years. This is a key improvement for the scheme and will improve safety.	Yes
ANON-5GEV-NG8R-P ANON-5GEV-NGUQ-J ANON-5GEV-NGVU-Q	General safety concerns.	As well as designing highway schemes to the latest standards, Highways England follows a strict safety governance process on its major project schemes, to ensure that any safety risks are assessed and evaluated and suitable control measures put in place to keep users (and workers) safe. The Atkins design team has had access to Highways England technical experts to advise on specific aspects of the project as the design has developed. The scheme has been presented to the Operations Technical Leadership Group which challenges the operational concept and has to be satisfied that any risks have been identified and mitigated, and that the scheme can be operated safely. Challenging safety targets are set and each scheme is subject to a detailed six-month operational monitoring period upon opening, with a longer three year monitoring period to assess scheme performance. Independent road safety audits are also carried out at key stages of the project.	No

Table I.1.8 Construction

Unique ID	Issue/query summary	Response	Design changes resulting? Y/N?
ANON-5GEV-N463-2	<p>A site on the former Wisley Airfield is identified in the plans as a work site during the construction phase, using old Elm Lane and the current access from the A3. The selected site is unnecessarily adjacent to a number of residential receptors which will also be affected by noise and views of HGVs and other large machinery used within the construction site.</p> <p>There is a vast area of alternative space on the airfield where this site could be located, which would significantly decrease loss of amenity during the construction phase. Please revisit this aspect of the plans and relocate the site farther from residential properties.</p>	<p>The Wisley Airfield site has been identified as a location for the storage of topsoil for the duration of construction. HGV traffic forecasts will be included in the outline Construction Environment Management Plan, which will be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>	No
WLT-S-2	<p>Request that protective screens are erected prior to and during construction to protect the woodland from the impacts of dust pollution.</p>	<p>The contractor will be required to implement dust control measures as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Details of this will be developed in later stages of the project but this request will be noted for future action.</p>	No

© Crown copyright (2017).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/
write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**,
or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ
Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363