

**Property Consultants** 

Unit 2, Paris, Parklands,
Railton Road, Guildford, GU2 9JX

T 01483 238389
E david.moody@brutonknowles.co.uk
W brutonknowles.co.uk
Offices.across the UK

4<sup>th</sup> November 2019

National Infrastructure Planning Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS16NP

Dear Sirs,

Written representation on behalf of Mrs Agnes Patricia Engelen in response to the Rule 6 Letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> October 2019.

Site: Court Close Farm, Portsmouth Road (A3), Cobham, Surrey KT11 1EN

I have set out below a series of points discussed with my client regarding the proposed temporary and permanent rights and acquisitions as a result of the proposed M25 JCT 10/A3 Wisley Interchange Improvement.

Over many months and numerous meetings with the Acquiring Authorities' representatives we have noted numerous changes to the proposals which affect our land.

In March of this year, representatives of the Highways England met with us to discuss the latest plans (design fix 3.1), where, concerns were raised about the planned works that would impact the land and its associated use.

Key concerns are as follows:

- Details to be provided for provisions of a new fence to be installed and maintained by Highways England along the newly proposed highway boundary.
- We require full details for the road width and proposed construction methodology for land to be
   used temporarily and rights to be acquired permanently identified on the Land Plans Regulation
   5(2)(i); Sheet 7 of 31.

A gas pipe needs to be diverted through my land and an easement will be required to document this. I need to know what width this will be, as the plans look to have this wider than may be required. Additionally, the diverted pipe route is also identified as a permanent right of access. I need to know whether this relates to the gas pipe only or whether there are any further rights being sought for gantry maintenance. No details have been provided to date as to the what this will consist of (width, material construction & maintenance responsibilities). I do not want a fully constructed road/track to break up the field and would prefer a means of construction that could accommodate a grass finish (with appropriate sub-layer). Neither do I want to be responsible for the future maintenance of any access which is only required as a direct result of this scheme.

• The proposal requires multiple tree removal of specimens which line the boundary with the A3.

Three rows of trees appear to be affected, significantly reducing the aesthetic value together with













increases in noise and pollution. I need clear details identifying which trees are to be removed and a replacement tree schedule will need to be agreed.

A detailed maintenance programme for any replacement trees will need to be agreed. The specimens being removed are mature and will not be replaceable like for like.

- The proposal includes a series of amendments to my existing drive layout. The construction details for this and the specification will need to be provided for agreement. As part of this, there appears to be a turning head included at the bottom of the drive, which had not been mentioned in any prior discussions and to my mind is not necessary. I would anticipate that the requirement to rely ained access rights would be limited. And therefore, the need for further impact on the price of the process.
- I have a number of bee hives located within the trees that need to be removed. With declining numbers nationally, it is essential that the project's environmental advisors engage with me at the earliest opportunity to ensure adequate provisions are included in the proposal for their relocation.
- Similar to our neighbours (Heyswood Guide Campsite), I am interested in receiving details on how the suggested security barriers and gates will work. I currently have direct access in to my own land from the A3. Post scheme, I will need to rely on agreed rights of access from the Cobham Junction slip road on the A3 through to my property. Whilst this in itself, wouldn't appear to be overly complex as an idea, the reality is from clear. A recent meeting with my neighbour (the Guides) has highlighted some significant concerns over how suitable this arrangement will be. I cannot see how the Guides will be able to fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities whilst having to allow ad-hoc access to those wanting or needing to get to my property.

I currently have eight lodgers, and whilst they are vetted for the purpose of renting a room or unit at Court Close Farm, we are concerned that exposing the Guides site to any additional risks in enabling this kind of access is unacceptable.

My, self and my lodgers aside, the people who may legitimately want access to my property appears to be numerous but by no means limited to:

Family & Friends (my own and my lodgers)
Emergency Services
Postal workers
Delivery drivers
Gardner
Oil deliveries
Cesspit/sewage contractors
Utility company personnel

It is unfeasible to think that all access requirements can be monitored and managed sufficiently. Whilst the proposal is a far cry from being full public access, it must provide suitable access without becoming a further burden on myself and the Guides.



I will be putting the questions above to the acquiring authority, as there remains many questions to be answered to satisfy myself that our concerns are being taken seriously.

Yours sincerely



**David Moody MInstRE**Associate

By email: M25Junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk