

# M25 junction 10/ A3 Wisley Interchange

PINS reference TR010030

## JOINT COUNCIL LOCAL IMPACT REPORT

December 2019

Submitted by Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council  
and Elmbridge Borough Council



## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction and Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 2 Scheme description .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 3 Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 4 Characteristics of the local area.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 5 Policy context .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Chapter 6 Local growth and development .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Chapter 7 Local transport issues.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Chapter 8 Impact on land.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Chapter 9 Assessment of local impact.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## Chapter 1 Introduction and Terms of Reference

- 1.1 This Local Impact Report (LIR) has been jointly prepared by the three host local authorities, Surrey County Council (SCC), Guildford Borough Council (GBC) and Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) – the “Joint Councils”. This submission forms part of the local authorities’ response to the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange improvement scheme. Unless otherwise stated, the comments in this report reflect the views of the Joint Councils. Relevant and Written Representations have been separately prepared and individually submitted, and where necessary have been referenced in this LIR. Comments made are without prejudice in relation to any individual issues of the Joint Councils, who may raise these in their Statement of Common Ground or other representations.
- 1.2 All three authorities are host authorities under the Planning Act 2008. SCC is the relevant Local Highway Authority, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, and the Lead Local Flood Authority and EBC and GBC are Local Planning Authorities. Additionally, the Joint Councils have a number of other statutory responsibilities relating to the scheme, including public rights of way, and environmental health. The entirety of the red line boundary for the scheme falls within the administrative area of the Joint Councils. Surrey County Council and Elmbridge Borough Council are also land owners in relation to the scheme.
- 1.3 The Joint Councils have had regard to the purpose of LIRs as set out in s60(3) of the Planning Act (as amended), DCLG’s “Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent” and the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note One “Local Impact Reports”, in preparing this LIR.
- 1.4 The Joint Councils have actively engaged with Highways England during the pre-application period, both jointly and independently and have responded to all previous consultations with comments and concerns. The Joint Councils are disappointed that negotiations for a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) were not successful with Highways England, as it has meant limited capacity and ability to fully assess the submitted Development Consent Order (DCO) within the timeframes available. The situation is particularly disappointing as Highways England had previously shared a draft PPA Legal document and schedule with the Joint Authorities and made a financial offer that was subsequently withdrawn. Despite this, considerable local authority time and resources have been invested in providing constructive and challenging input to the design with the aim of developing a scheme that would benefit both the Strategic and the Local Road Network and has the least impact on the host authorities and their communities. We feel that this is an important point as it will affect other Highways England DCO’s that involve Local/Host Authorities.
- 1.5 Highways England has addressed some concerns through the process to date and the extent of agreement reached with Highways England will be set out in the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) currently being produced. Inevitably a number of points in this LIR are repeated from the Local Authorities’ respective Relevant/Written Representations. However, given the importance afforded to the LIR in the Planning Act, the Joint Councils are keen to restate key issues within this submission.
- 1.6 The Joint Councils support the principle of the scheme, however a number of substantive issues still need to be resolved to ensure that the scheme and associated powers are acceptable. The primary purpose of this LIR is therefore to evidence the key issues for the Joint Councils and their respective communities and to constructively identify where further information and proposals are needed, both to ensure proposals are consistent with policy

and to ensure that the adverse local impacts of the DCO scheme are adequately mitigated. The Joint Councils will continue to engage positively with Highways England during the examination process.

## Chapter 2 Scheme description

2.1 The M25 J10/A3 Wisley interchange is located at the eastern edge of the borough of Guildford, close to the boroughs of Elmbridge and Woking. Works to the Local Road Network proposed through the DCO are located within both GBC and EBC and therefore SCC is the sole highway authority for the scheme. This LIR relies on the applicant's full description of the scheme as set out in the DCO submission documentation. The summarised scheme components can be detailed as follows:

- Providing an elongated and widened roundabout at M25 junction 10 to provide more capacity
- Providing four dedicated free-flow slip roads to enable all left-turning traffic using junction 10 to bypass the traffic lights
- Amending and extending the M25 and A3 slip roads at junction 10 to cater for the increased rates of traffic flow through the junction
- Widening the A3 from three to four lanes in each direction, on both sides of junction 10 between the Painshill junction to the north and Ockham Park junction to the south, to increase capacity and meet the latest design and safety standards
- Widening the A245 Byfleet Road to the west of the A3 Painshill junction, to provide three lanes in each direction and increase the capacity of the road to accommodate traffic joining and leaving the A3, including two free-flow left turn lanes at Painshill junction<sup>1</sup>
- Amending local road and private accesses from the A3 to improve safety
- Improving routes for non-motorised users (NMUs) such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders
- Providing an extra lane on the existing hard shoulder of the M25 through junction 10 as advance works for the junction 10-16 SMART motorway project.

2.2 One of Highway England's stated key objectives for the scheme is to ***"Minimise impacts on the surrounding Local Road Network"*** and the Joint Councils are focused on ensuring that the development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the affected local area or in additional maintenance or management liabilities for local authorities. Therefore the majority of the unresolved issues for the Joint Councils focus on the impact on the Local Road Network, financial implications for the host authorities, environmental impacts and impacts during construction.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Joint Councils note the Applicant's submission AS-023 requesting a change to the scheme (Change 3). This removes part of the proposed improvement to the A245 eastbound between the junction with Seven Hills Road and the Painshill interchange.

## Chapter 3 Executive Summary

3.1 This Executive Summary sets out the key areas of concern for the Joint Councils by theme taking into account the information submitted in the Relevant and Written Representations. The LIR assesses the impact of these issues on the local area and sets out mitigation or amendments to the DCO required.

### 3.2 Impact on the Local Road Network (LRN)

- **Transport Assessment concerns** – There remain concerns on specific elements of the Transport Assessment Report that the Joint Councils require to be clarified. There are particular concerns around the traffic modelling outputs/interpretation for the area in and around Ripley. The Joint Councils also require receipt of additional modelling in respect of south facing slip roads at the Ockham Roundabout that has been requested throughout scheme development. This is required to understand the impact that they could make on the Local Road Network.
- **LRN areas affected by the scheme** – There are specific areas where the Joint Councils do not feel that Highways England has met the scheme objective to *“Minimise impacts on the surrounding Local Road Network”*. In particular this relates to Ripley, Bridge End, Martyr’s Green. Where appropriate the Joint Councils have set out the mitigation required to comply with the scheme objective.
- **Loss of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) parking laybys** – The Joint Councils are concerned at the loss of HGV parking laybys that will result from the scheme and which have not been adequately addressed.
- **Drainage & Structures** – There are specific concerns around adoption, commuted sums and maintenance access.
- **Request for Variable Message signs** - To improve interaction between Strategic Route Network (SRN) and the LRN
- **Queries around how the wider community will be engaged on the final scheme upon DCO completion** – This is a specific query given the scheme changes that have occurred post statutory consultation
- **Inclusion of Protective Provisions for Local Highway Authorities** - either in the main DCO or a commitment given by Highways England to enter into a separate binding agreement

### 3.3 Impact on Non-Motorised Users (NMU), Public Transport and Public Rights of Way (PROW)

- **That the proposed parallel NMU route should be maintained by Highways England** - this is a replacement for the current NMU route adjacent to the A3 and the current legal right to cycle on the A3 which Highways England are removing under the proposed scheme
- **Requests relating to the surface treatment of the NMU routes**
- **The need for further measures/funding to compensate for removal of the A3 bus stops including within Ripley**

### 3.4 Impact on Road Safety

- **Speed Limits** – SCC agreed with the proposals except for Elm Lane. SCC welcomes the proposed change to DCO submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (Change 6 of AS-023) that amends the speed limit to 20mph on Elm Lane.

- **Road Safety Audit (RSA)** – SCC considers the current RSA to be too limited as it does not cover all of the affected LRN
- **Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's)** – that all TRO's required as part of the scheme (e.g. speed limits, banned movements) are advertised and made by Highways England

### **3.5 Impact on Surrey County Council's financial position**

- **Adoption of new/proposed scheme components** – there are elements of the scheme that SCC is not prepared to adopt.
- **Commuted Sums** – Highways England has not, to date, committed to provide commuted sums (via a separate agreement) to cover the maintenance burden that would fall on SCC for additional infrastructure that Highways England are proposing to pass to SCC to maintain without the associated funding.
- **Funding to cover County Council costs** – Highways England has not followed through with their initial offer to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to meet SCC's staff costs in respect of input to the development of the scheme
- **s106 agreements**- SCC were disappointed to learn at the Issue Specific Hearing on the DCO that Highways England stated that they do not intend to enter into any s106 agreements with SCC and would seek that this position is revised to address SCC's concerns set out in its Relevant/Written Representations and LIR.

### **3.6 Impact on Land Interests**

- Concerns around SCC's retained land which is adversely impacted / blighted.
- Ockham Bites car park and premises.
- Discussions are ongoing between Highways England and SCC around historic exchange land from the original M25 (1979 & 1982 CPOs).

### **3.7 Impact on Landscape, Environment and Biodiversity**

- **Draft Special Protection Area (SPA) Management, Landscape & Ecology Management and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plans** - until these Plans are finalised, SCC cannot confirm its agreement
- **Specific concerns to be addressed regarding the Green Bridge** – including whether the bridge is included as mitigation and queries to be addressed around management and maintenance and commuted sum payments

### **3.8 Impact on Lead Local Flood Authority**

- **Suggested Protective Provisions for Watercourses/Drainage Authorities have been submitted** – the Joint Councils await agreement on wording

### **3.9 Impact on Minerals and Waste Planning Authority**

- **Outstanding queries around waste and material assumptions used** – these include queries on distribution of material consumption and waste generation, source of construction materials, materials and waste capacity assumptions, facilities to deal with excavated hazardous waste

### **3.10 Impacts during construction**

- **Concerns around impacts to the LRN during construction** – these include fatigue on the existing LRN as a result of traffic diversions with no Highways England commitment to providing funding to mitigate these impacts and maintenance burden.
- **SCC operates the South East Permit Scheme (“SEPS”)**, which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. SCC requires that Highways England’s works be subject to SEPS to ensure clear coordination of the works during construction.
- **Inclusion of Protective Provisions for Local Highway Authorities** - either in the main DCO or a commitment given by Highways England to enter into a separate binding agreement

## Chapter 4 Characteristics of the local area

4.1 This section does not seek to repeat the content of the Environmental Statement, but is used to highlight a number of key local characteristics that have informed our assessment of impact within this document. Comments relate to the relevant topics assessed within the Environmental Statement.

### **4.2 Air quality**

- 4.2.1 EBC does not operate a Continuous Monitoring Station (CMS) within the air quality study area or the Scheme. The closest CMS to the study area which measures NO<sub>2</sub> are located at roadside sites in Weybridge and Hampton Court.
- 4.2.2 There is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Cobham, location High Street from junction of Hogshill Lane to Church Street, although near to the Scheme it is not located within the Scheme. There are concerns this may be negatively impacted during the construction and operational phases as well as the long-term use of the new road network. There are five NO<sub>2</sub> in this location; two NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring tubes within the AQMA and three in the near vicinity. Another NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring tube is to the south by M25 Bridge, Pointers Lane.
- 4.2.3 Esher High Street AQMA has been identified in the Environmental Statement as potentially being affected by the Scheme, as it is within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN). This is one of EBC's most affected AQMA's and as so, there are concerns about the long-term impact in this location.
- 4.2.4 There are also concerns relating to the village of Ripley (within GBC's administrative area) and those properties in close vicinity to the Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street (B2215). The proposals appear to result in increased traffic movements along this route both in the peak and non-peak hours and has the potential increase noise, vibration, air quality and general disturbance to people and businesses in the properties on this route.
- 4.2.5 These matters are very closely linked, but not indistinguishable, to the potential highway impacts identified. Accordingly, it is very likely that a highway and environmental enhancement scheme agreed to address the impacts on the local highway network would also mitigate the impact on these environmental impacts.
- 4.2.6 Air quality issues are being dealt with by the respective borough and the latest position on discussions is set out within the relevant Statements of Common Ground.

### **4.3 Noise and vibration**

Noise and vibration issues are being dealt with by the respective borough and the latest position on discussions will be set out within the relevant Statements of Common Ground.

### **4.4 Biodiversity**

- 4.4.1 Ockham and Wisley Commons are owned by SCC and form part of the countryside estate that is managed through a partnership with the Countryside Management department of Surrey Wildlife Trust. This arrangement has been in place since 2002. As financial pressures for SCC have increased, the partnership has been working to ensure a financially self-sustaining estate, with a focus on long term sustainable management. Comments made in



relation to commuted sums for ongoing maintenance should be viewed in this context. As Highways England have verbally stated many times that they/the scheme would provide funding to cover the additional “green”/environmental/landscape works.

- 4.4.2 The most important areas for wildlife conservation remaining in Surrey have been identified through the Surrey Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) Policy Statement, each including a variety of habitats and providing for an ‘ecosystem approach’ to nature conservation across and beyond the county. The area of historic commons from Ockham in the south to the outskirts of Weybridge in the north is identified as BOA TBH06: Wisley, Ockham and Walton Heaths. BOAs are recognised as those areas where targeted maintenance, restoration and creation of priority habitats will have the greatest impact in improving connectivity and reducing habitat fragmentation.
- 4.4.3 **Special Protection Area and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace** - As recognised, much of the area around the M25 J10/A3 Wisley interchange is covered by international and national ecological designations including the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The inclusion of SPA land and provision of replacement land within the scheme has additional specific implications for the Local Planning Authorities in the area.
- 4.4.4 In March 2005, the government designated areas of heathland across Surrey, Hampshire and Berkshire as the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) under the EC Birds Directive. The SPA is a network of internationally important heathland supporting rare birds such as the Dartford Warbler, Woodlark and Nightjar. Local authorities have a legal requirement to prevent harm to the SPA, by ensuring that new development does not have an adverse impact on the area. Natural England advises that recreational use of the heaths arising from new housing developments up to five kilometres from the SPA will create disturbance to the rare bird populations. As a result, housing development within five kilometres of a SPA (seven kilometres for sites of over 50 homes) must provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs). This is the name given to open space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation by providing alternative open space to divert visitors from the SPA. This is either provided on the site of housing development or financial contributions are required to fund the provision and/or management of a SANG. This mitigation strategy has been developed with Natural England and signed up to by all impacted local authorities in order that development is able to progress within these areas. See also paragraph 4.4.7.
- 4.4.5 Both EBC and GBC have planning documents prepared in consultation with Natural England setting out the approach taken for planning applications that fall within the zone of impact of the SPA. Further information is available in the GBC TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy 2017 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the EBC 2012 Developer Contribution SPD. An updated EBC Development Contribution SPD will be available for consultation in January 2020. The documents provide detail on the avoidance strategy for the borough, including SPA tariffs which vary by size of dwelling and also the location of strategic SANG sites.
- 4.4.6 A core principle of the approach to avoid significant effects on the SPA is the existence of three buffer zones around the SPA:

- The exclusion zone between zero and 400 metres from the SPA boundary
  - The zone of influence between 400 metres and five kilometres from the SPA boundary
  - The five to seven kilometre zone between five and seven kilometres from the SPA boundary
- 4.4.7 Within the exclusion zone there is a presumption against net new residential development. Where net new residential development is proposed within the zone of influence, avoidance measures must be provided in the form of SANG and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Residential development of over 50 net new dwellings that falls between five and seven kilometres from the SPA may be required to provide avoidance and mitigation measures, assessed on a case-by-case basis.
- 4.4.8 Natural England has confirmed their acceptance of the proposed replacement land and the designations that this land will be given. The Local Planning Authorities have also assessed the impact of the replacement land and its designation on their SANG zones and raise no concerns about the impact this will have on housing delivery.
- 4.4.9 **Management and monitoring** – The Joint Councils have had collaborative discussions with Highways England on the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) and discussions continue. Confirmation of the approval process and timescales for the finalisation of these documents is now required. The detail of land management agreements and associated commuted sum payments remain to be finalised.
- 4.4.10 The Joint Councils consider that the compensation and enhancement measures are appropriate to the Thames Basins Heath SPA. Through ongoing discussion a number of amendments relating to management and monitoring provisions have been requested, including an extended monitoring period for the translocation of woodland soils, a request for replacement badger sett monitoring and an earlier commencement for detailed botanical monitoring.
- 4.4.11 **Toad tunnels** - Old Lane is a county registered Toad Crossing and the Joint Councils welcome the proposed change of 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (Change 2 of AS-023) to the submitted DCO which would incorporate two toad tunnels at this location.
- 4.4.12 **The Green Bridge** - The Joint Councils note Change 1 of the proposed DCO changes of November 4<sup>th</sup> 2019 (AS-023) in respect of the green bridge and welcome the increase in width to 25 metres in order for the bridge to function as a wildlife corridor. The bridge is integral to the scheme in linking the new heathland areas and features in the SPA Management and Monitoring Plan at objective one “establish and maintain Cockrow green bridge, providing a wildlife corridor across the new structure which is linked to areas of new heathland creation”. There needs to be detailed monitoring to allow the bridge to prove its ability to link habitats for species and mapping potential connectivity. The Joint Councils ask whether this element of the scheme is now no longer reliant on funding through Designated Funds. Concerns around maintenance responsibilities for the “green” element and the associated funding to undertake maintenance remain. SCC consider that if the green bridge is an essential scheme element, maintenance should be dealt with in the same manner as other compensatory mitigation for “green”/environmental/landscape elements.

#### 4.5 **Road drainage and water environment**

- 4.5.1 SCC has statutory responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authority and as such have provided the provisions it would wish to see in the Protective Provisions Part 4 for the “Protection of Surrey County Council in respect of Ordinary Watercourses”. Discussions are ongoing around these provisions. SCC would like to see and approve any enhancements proposed to watercourses as the Consenting Authority. SCC also expect to see details of pollution control in relation to surface water drainage within the DCO.
- 4.5.2 As Lead Local Flood Authority, SCC produces a “wetspot” database which records the location of reported, recurring flood incidents which are unlikely to be solved through business as usual activities. Each wetspot is assessed and scored to reflect the severity of the flood risk. The higher the score, the higher the flood risk. Factors assessed include:
- Risk to safety
  - Property flooding
  - Disruption to critical services
  - Social and economic impacts
  - Length and frequency of flooding
- 4.5.3 There are a number of highway wetspots that will be affected by the scheme and SCC require that specific flooding issues are addressed by the scheme in these locations. Any increased run off caused by the scheme in these locations is a concern for SCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- A245 West bound dual carriageway off Painshill roundabout (high risk wetspot)
  - Areas by M25 and Junction 10 roundabout
  - Between the A3 and Wisley Airfield
  - By Ockham roundabout/Stratford Brook (high risk wetspot)
- 4.5.4 The Joint Councils note that a new drainage pond is proposed for pollution control at Manor Pond, which is welcomed to improve the drainage in this area. As this pond is within the DCO red line boundary we would ask for clarity on maintenance responsibilities for this new facility. Clarity is required on ownership of the land the pond will be on and detail around what will be connected into it. Should it be proposed that SCC take on the future maintenance of this pond we would wish to see details of the specific elements proposed to be adopted (for example outfall structures, pond construction, design details/capacity and interaction with the existing drainage system) along with a suitable agreed commuted sum to cover future maintenance before SCC can agree to any adoption.
- 4.5.5 For any assets to be adopted by SCC the land acquired should be adequate to accommodate suitable access for future inspection, maintenance and reconstruction of the asset and be agreed with SCC to meet our requirements.

We note that an access road to the pond is provided but would ask:

- (i) that this arrangement should have a Road Safety Audit (RSA) which is provided to SCC, with the relevant section of the RSA indicated, to show how vehicles can safely access this pond from the A245 to avoid such risks as rear shunts

- (ii) is the access road to be gated and if so would the location of this gate allow safe access/egress off of the highway e.g. whilst parked to open the locked gate and avoid such issues as fly tipping?
- (iii) can details be provided as to how safety and security of this pond will be provided along with any measures for screening/fencing and improvement for habitats?
- (iv) does the proposed footpath link into existing footpath in this area?

#### 4.6 **Landscape and visual**

- 4.6.1 The Landscape and Visual Assessment identifies significant effects during construction and/or operation for a number of landscape and visual receptors. There remains a concern regarding the absence from the methodology of a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) model. ZTV analysis is a typical best practice for EIA Development. As the scheme involves extensive felling of surrounding woodland, this assessment is particularly relevant. Similarly it would be reasonable and proportionate that photomontages are produced for a selection of key viewpoints representative of affected receptors.
- 4.6.2 The Joint Councils will be seeking further assurances that the visual impact of the temporary works, such as construction compounds, will be minimised during their use and that these will be fully restored on completion. This must be secured by binding and enforceable conditions or obligations.

#### 4.7 **Cultural Heritage**

SCC officers have met with Highways England, who have confirmed that a programme of archaeological investigation will be carried out in advance of construction in order that appropriate mitigation measures are identified and designed. SCC has not yet seen the detail of a written scheme for the investigation and mitigation of areas of archaeological interest and request confirmation of the timescales for finalisation of this material.

#### 4.8 **Materials and Waste**

- 4.8.1 SCC is both the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) and the Minerals Planning Authority (MPA). The Surrey Waste Local Plan sets out how and where different types of waste will be managed in Surrey in the future. On Friday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2019, SCC submitted the Submission Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 – 2033 to the Planning Inspectorate for public examination. The Plan was examined in public in September 2019. The DCO must make reference to this plan, which contains the latest Waste Needs Assessment.
- 4.8.2 SCC notes that the applicant will develop a CEMP. It is recommended that the CEMP has regard to the principles of sustainable construction and waste management and takes account of the approach set out in Policy CW1 – ‘Waste Minimisation’ of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09) and in proposed Policy 4 – ‘Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development’ of the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033.
- 4.8.3 The Materials and Waste section of the Environmental Statement prompts a number of queries for SCC as the WPA. On the study area for construction materials, sales are considered at a regional or national level. This means that material could be obtained within either of these geographic scales. SCC would question how realistic it is that material will be

obtained at either a national or regional level, as heavy material (particularly aggregate) is difficult to transport over long distances. The transport implications of obtaining material at these geographic scales should be fully understood and assessed. It is important that, *as the methodology of the impact assessment is to assess the impact of material being sourced at a national or regional level, it is realistic and likely that material will actually be obtained at a national or regional level, rather than sourced locally within Surrey.*

- 4.8.4 It has been assumed that material consumption and waste generation will be distributed equally across the scheme's construction period. Again, SCC ask how likely this distribution is. Could it be better informed by a Construction Plan containing phases?
- 4.8.5 Contaminated land is not considered to be hazardous waste and further information could perhaps be provided as to why it is not considered to be a waste material (referring to the CL:AIRE Definition of waste). Further detail should also be provided regarding the capacity of facilities to deal with excavated hazardous waste. The applicant should ensure that only sites with the necessary Environment Agency permits and extant Planning Permission for the activity proposed should be utilised.
- 4.8.6 The assessment refers to the topsoil material which is to be reused, or managed at composting facilities. More detail should be provided regarding the available capacity at facilities for this material. The applicant should ensure that only sites with the necessary Environment Agency permits and extant Planning Permission for the activity proposed should be utilised.

#### 4.9 **People and communities**

- 4.9.1 **Conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian travellers** - The area surrounding the interchange is designated as Common Land and/or Access land and is well used by the public. There are several Public Rights of Way and footpaths of local importance in the vicinity of the M25 J10/A3 Wisley Interchange, some of which cross or interact with the scheme. Discussions with Highways England on Rights of Way issues have generally been productive and overall proposals within the DCO will represent access improvements upon completion.
- 4.9.2 The re-provision of the NMU parallel to the A3 is an integral part of the scheme. The Joint Councils consider it to be both a replacement for the existing facility and an essential scheme component as cyclists will no longer be able to legally use the A3 between Ockham and Painshill. The scheme proposes provide a new NMU routes between Ockham Roundabout and Painshill and removes the current at grade crossings at junction 10, banning cycling on the A3 between Ockham Roundabout and removing the existing cycle route alongside the A3 (where the A3 is being widened). SCC do not wish to adopt this NMU route as SCC view this new NMU as a replacement of the existing facilities operated/maintained by Highways England set out in this paragraph.
- 4.9.3 To date construction details, including gradients, of new and altered PROWs have not been shown. It is essential that SCC is consulted on these. The specification of the A3 NMU route is particularly important and should incorporate split provision for cyclists on a sealed/smooth surface and equestrians on an unsealed rough stone surface.
- 4.9.4 **The Economy** - The A245 corridor is an important route economically as it provides access from the A3 to the Brooklands Business Park. This is the largest business park in the Upper

M3 area and is Elmbridge's principal strategic employment area, providing in the region of 9000 jobs. The area is home to approximately 250 businesses ranging from high quality offices at The Heights, housing the likes of Sony and Proctor & Gamble through to large format warehousing and distribution centres on the Brooklands Industrial Estate. It is also the location of tourism destinations of Brooklands Museum and Mercedes-Benz World.

- 4.9.5 The local authorities are focused on improving connectivity and accessibility to support future growth and ensure the retention of world class high value businesses. Congestion and access to the business park are major concerns for the businesses in the area. The 2016 Elmbridge Local Plan Strategic Options consultation reinforced how the A245 Portsmouth Road, west of A3 Painshill is a route under significant strain and this bottleneck results in congestion in the Brooklands area.
- 4.9.6 Schemes are already underway to improve access to the Brooklands Business Park. The Brooklands Business Park Accessibility Project is a scheme to improve accessibility between the business park, Weybridge railway station and Weybridge town centre. The scheme, developed in partnership between SCC and EBC and Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP), has been prioritised for over £2million of EM3 LEP funding and is aimed at improving travel choice and sustainable transport accessibility.
- 4.9.7 An application has also been submitted for Highways England designated funds for feasibility work for a complimentary package of non-motorised user improvements in areas surrounding the M25 junction. This was successful, however due to funding availability these complimentary schemes are currently on hold but it is hoped that an application can be re-submitted in due course to further build on NMU improvements within the DCO. The package comprises four schemes:
1. A high quality cycle route between West Byfleet station and RHS Wisley
  2. Upgraded provision for walking and cycling between Cobham and the Painshill junction
  3. A high quality cycle route on the A245 between the junctions with the Seven Hills Road and Chertsey Road, building on the improved NMU provision to be included as part of the DCO
  4. Controlled crossing at Ockham Park junction and high quality pedestrian and cycle provision from the junction into Ripley via B2215
- 4.9.8 However, much more is needed to address accessibility issues in this area, particularly on the A245. As well as providing necessary mitigation for the A245/Seven Hills junction under the DCO, the Joint Councils recognise that the proposal to change the operation of the junction could benefit traffic in the area particularly traffic to and from the Brooklands Business Park area. The number of signal stages at the junction will be reduced from 4 to 3 to increase the amount of green time, thereby improving the efficiency of the junction. SCC therefore supports the proposed operational changes but has posed a number of queries and requests relating to the junction that are detailed in chapter 7 of this LIR to maximise opportunities and mitigate the Junction 10 scheme impacts at this location.
- 4.9.9 **Impact on local organisations** - As landowner and landlord of Painshill Park, EBC is aware that Painshill Park is directly impacted by the removal of a second point of access which it currently benefits from.
- 4.9.10 Comments have been made relating to emergency access as a result of the proposed reduction in access points. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have visited Painshill Park and

have concluded that the likelihood of fire and the risk to life is low therefore the need for access should be commensurate with that.

- 4.9.11 The service confirm that a standard fire appliance can gain access to the Gothic Tower using the internal access route across the Park. This route is considerably longer than the route from the access gate on the A3 to the Gothic Tower. Due to the topography of the site around the Gothic Tower deployment of aerial appliances for high level firefighting is not possible. So the question of access for these vehicles via the A3 gate is not a relevant consideration. The Gothic Tower does not present a sleeping risk and has fire detection fitted so the risk to life from fire is low.
- 4.9.12 The Joint Councils notes that the proposed development would likely increase the 'miles travelled' distance for many of the visitors to RHS Wisley who travel to the site by private car and make comment on the traffic impacts in chapter 7. RHS Wisley is a nationally significant visitor attraction and its future development and success is important locally. Accordingly, the Joint Councils sympathise with the view of the RHS, that the proposals will increase travel times to and from the gardens. As highway authority, SCC accepts that this must be balanced against the highway safety and capacity improvements which would also be of benefit to the county. The Joint Councils would therefore expect to see demonstrated that the proper consideration of the additional travel miles has been properly assessed in terms of its environmental impact and any economic impact on the gardens, and the Borough, has been duly considered and appropriate mitigation provided.

#### 4.10 **Health**

- 4.10.1 The Joint Councils recognise that during the construction and operational phases of the Scheme, there is the potential for likely adverse impact on the communities living around the Scheme. Mitigation measures and best practice must be secured through the CEMP, with the needs of the community in mind.

#### 4.11 **Climate**

- 4.11.1 The Joint Councils have declared a climate emergency in recognition of the issues facing our planet. The Government requires that all greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to net zero by 2050 and local authorities are currently reviewing how they can contribute to help ensure that this low carbon future is achieved. It is recognised that although this is a large scale highway scheme, proposals do also support sustainable travel routes. The Joint Councils are committed to ensuring that proposals encourage and meet the needs of non- motorised users. A number of improvements are also required to ensure that the scheme isn't detrimental to public transport users.

## Chapter 5 Policy context

- 5.1 The following key local policy documents are particularly important in providing the context for the Joint Councils' position on a number of issues. This is not a definitive list of all guidance and documentation that has informed the LIR.
- 5.2 **National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)** - was published in December 2014 and sets out Government policy relating to the delivery of Nationally Significant Infrastructure (road and rail network) Projects (NSIPS). It reflects the importance given to maintaining well connected and high performing networks with sufficient capacity to meet long term needs and support economic growth, including at a local level. Requirements are set out to ensure that schemes are appropriately mitigated to avoid environmental and social impacts.
- 5.3 **National Planning Policy Framework** - The National Planning Policy Framework does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects. Such projects should be determined in accordance with the decision making framework set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the relevant national policy statement. However, the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework will still be a relevant consideration in the determination of this application for a Development Consent Order.
- 5.4 **Regional Policy** - Both boroughs are located within the Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership (LEP) area. The LEP aims to drive economic growth over a region covering most of Surrey and Hampshire by working with key partners (including local authorities), businesses and central government. The LEP published its Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) in 2018. Within the document Guildford is recognised as one of the area's growth towns, an area in which activities to stimulate growth are being focused. Both Elmbridge and Guildford are referenced as having important digital and creative sector specialisms.

Making improvements to connectivity is identified as a priority in the SEP, with congestion in Guildford specifically referenced as a barrier to growth. One of the three priorities for the EM3 area listed under the connectivity theme is to "create new capacity on the A3 around Guildford where congestion affects the economic performance and profile of this important growth town".

### 5.5 County policy – highways and transport

[Surrey Transport Plan LTP3 2011-2026](#), strategies including:

- [Air Quality](#)
- [Climate Change](#)
- [Congestion](#)
- [Cycling](#)
- [Freight](#)
- [Passenger Transport Information Strategy](#)
- [Rights of Way Improvement Plan](#)

• [Elmbridge Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme](#)  
[SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide](#)



**Surrey Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 (LTP3)** - sets out strategies to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within the county. The plan comprises a number of distinct strategies to assist in achieving these aims, as listed below. The strategies are key components of the LTP3 and are used to inform the development of forward programmes for delivery of schemes on the ground.

- **LTP Air Quality Strategy 2016** – covers the effect of the road network on air quality and aims to improve quality in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) on the county road network. Accompanying objectives include “to consider air quality impacts when identifying and assessing transport measures in Surrey”.
- **LTP Climate Change Strategy 2011** – The aim of the strategy is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from transport in Surrey and manage climate risks posed to transport infrastructure and transport services. Objectives include: increasing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes, maintaining public transport patronage, encouraging efficient driving and managing traffic flows.
- **LTP Surrey Congestion Strategy 2014** - The objectives of the Surrey Congestion strategy are to improve the reliability of journeys, reduce delays for all transport modes on key routes and at congestion hotspots and to improve the provision of journey planning information. The strategy recognises the importance of working in partnership with other organisations such as Highways England in order to address congestion related to the motorways and trunk road that pass through the county.
- Building on this, a **Congestion Programme** was developed which sets out a strategic programme of major road schemes for the Local Road Network to support economic competitiveness and growth. It summarises the main transport challenges county wide and references Guildford town centre, the A3 both through Guildford and between Ripley and M25 junction 10 and the A245 west of A3 Painshill junction as being the most severely congested junctions and corridors within the county.
- **LTP Surrey Cycling Strategy 2014 -2026** - The Cycling strategy sets out approaches to make cycling in Surrey safer for all, including improving infrastructure for cycling by developing high quality, joined up cycle routes and separating cyclists from motorised traffic on busy roads where feasible.
- **LTP Surrey Freight strategy 2011** – Due to Surrey’s location, a large number of Heavy Good Vehicles (HGVs) pass through the county. By providing a toolkit of preferred measures, the aim of the Freight Strategy is to assist in the effective transportation of goods whilst minimising the adverse impact of larger goods vehicles on Surrey’s environment and its residents. This includes reducing the negative impact of HGVs on road safety (in urban areas) and reducing incidences of lorries diverting along unsuitable lower category roads.
- **Passenger Transport Information Strategy 2014** – includes aims to ensure access to comprehensive, up to date and easily accessible journey planning information. This in part relies on the development of passenger infrastructure and information and recognises the importance of partnership working and support through developer funding to achieve.

- **Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2014** - considers the status of the network, the needs of its users and investigates how the network could be improved to reflect changing patterns of use. Key objectives of the plan include improving connectivity of rights of way and reducing severance, improving quality of the network and improving accessibility to the wider countryside.
- **Elmbridge Local Transport Strategy, 2014 and Forward Programme, 2018** - The strategy and forward programme forms part of the LTP3. The objectives of the strategy are to reduce the reliance on the private car in Elmbridge by providing more attractive sustainable travel choices, to improve air quality especially in those areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and to manage local bottlenecks and traffic congestion within the borough. The strategy identifies the areas within the borough with transport-related congestion issues including the A3 Painshill Junction, A3 Painshill to M25, M25 junction 9-10 and A245 Byfleet Road/B365 Seven Hills Road. It also identifies safety issues on the A244 corridor (junction with Seven Hills Road). The strategy and 2018 forward programme lists the A245 route corridor as a priority transport area and identifies the need for pedestrian and cycle improvements along the corridor.

**SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide, updated 2016** - The SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide sets out how SCC considers highways and transportation matters for development proposals in Surrey and includes detail/guidance on Planning and Highway agreements.

#### **County policy – other**

**The Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and submission version Surrey Waste Local Plan, January 2019** - sets out how and where different types of waste will be managed in Surrey in the future. It also sets out the planning policy framework for the development of waste management facilities and is used in determining planning applications.

**The Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011** – this sets out how the County Council can meet its requirements for minerals in the most sustainable way. It also sets out the framework and policies within which future planning applications for mineral development will be considered. It is supplemented by the **Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates DPD**, the **Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD** and the **Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**.

**Surrey Flood Risk Management Strategy 2017-2032**- As Lead Local Flood Authority SCC is responsible for publishing a Flood Risk Management Strategy setting out how the risk of flooding is to be managed across the county. It includes objectives to establish and implement best practice on integrating flood risk reduction into all feasible SCC capital highway schemes.

#### **5.6 Borough policy**

- **Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011**
- **Elmbridge Development Management Plan, 2015**
- **Elmbridge Borough Council Developer Contribution SPD, 2012**
- **Guildford Local Plan 2019 - 2034**
- **GBC TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy 2017 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

- **Guildford Local Transport Strategy, 2017** – highlights how congestion on the SRN frequently spreads to the LRN and vice versa. Improvements to the SRN are listed as a specific priority. The strategy includes a programme of schemes, including those to tackle historic infrastructure deficit and mitigate principal transport impacts of future proposed planned growth.

## 5.7 Elmbridge Local Plan

The 2011 Core Strategy is currently the statutory development plan for the borough. Together with national planning policy and guidance, the strategy is the principal planning document for the borough, setting out the vision, spatial strategy and core policies for shaping future development in the borough up to 2026.

- 5.7.1 The Core Strategy identifies the main challenge for the area as delivering additional development and infrastructure which provides benefits across the Borough to a changing population, in a way that does not compromise peoples' quality of life or have a detrimental impact on the environment.
- 5.7.2 Focusing on the road network, the Core Strategy references that as a consequence of the relative affluence of the area, Elmbridge has a high level of car ownership. The high levels of car use are known to result in traffic congestion and pollution, particularly in peak-periods and on key routes into and out of the borough.
- 5.7.3 Core Strategy Policies of relevance to the DCO application includes:

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implication</b>
CS4 Weybridge CS5 Hersham; CS10 Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D'Abernon and Downside	Requires the Council to work in partnership with service providers, to ensure that access to and within areas is improved for pedestrians and cyclists, public transport users and those with impaired mobility. Measures will be promoted to tackle traffic congestion and air pollution
CS13 Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	As set out in section 4.4 of this report, the policy outlines the Council's approach to new development and the need to consider that the integrity of the SPA is maintained.
CS14 Green Infrastructure	States that the Council will protect, enhance and manage a diverse network of accessible multi-function green infrastructure including Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG).
CS15 Biodiversity	Outlines the Council's objective of seeking to avoid the loss and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity across the region and the objectives of the Surrey Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).
CS25 Travel and Accessibility	States that the Council will promote improvements to sustainable travel, and accessibility to services through a variety of means. This includes protecting existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways; delivering new cycling and walking schemes; and supporting development that increases permeability and connectivity within and outside the urban areas. The policy continues to state that transport infrastructure will be improved by working in partnership with SCC. This includes supporting the development of a regional transport network and promoting schemes that will help deliver the objectives of the most recent Local Transport Plan. In regards to improving the

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implication</b>
	environmental impact of traffic, the policy requires the Council to seek mitigation for the detrimental environmental effects caused by transport, particularly in regards to HGVs, through a variety of measures, which may include greening the roadside and parking environment, improving air quality, noise reduction measures and traffic calming.
CS26 Flooding	States that in order to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the borough, development must be located, designed and laid out to ensure that it is safe; the risk from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere; and that the residual risks are managed.

5.7.4 Alongside the Core Strategy, the 2015 Development Management Plan contains more detailed policies that all planning applications are assessed against. Policies of relevance to the DCO application include:

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implication</b>
DM5 Pollution	Point (a) of the policy relating to noise, odour and light states that all development that may result in noise or odour emissions or light pollution will be expected to incorporate appropriate attenuation measures to mitigate the effect on existing and future residents. Point (c) relating to air quality states that proposals falling within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and/or where the Council considers that air quality objectives are likely to be prejudiced, applicants will be expected to submit a detailed specialist report which sets out the impact of the proposed development would have upon air quality. The policy continues that planning permission will not be granted for proposals where there is a significant adverse impact upon the status of the AQMA or where air quality may be harmful. Point (d) relating to water quality requires development proposals to be designed and/or located to prevent or limit the input of pollutants into water bodies and groundwater.
DM6 Landscape and trees	Seeks to ensure that development proposals should be designed to include an integral scheme of landscape, tree protection and/or planting that, amongst other requirements, reflects, conserves or enhances the existing landscape; contributes to biodiversity; encourages adaption to climate change; and includes proposals for the successful implementation, maintenance and management of landscape and tree planting schemes.
DM12 – Heritage	States that planning permission will be granted for developments that protect, conserve and enhance the borough’s historic environment. In regard to parks and gardens of special historic interest including landscape features and buildings, and their setting, the policy states that they will be protected, and their sensitive restoration encouraged. Any proposed development within or conspicuous from a historic park or garden will be permitted provided that it does not detract from the asset.

Policy	Implication
DM21 – Nature conservation and biodiversity	Supporting the implementation of Core Strategy Policies CS13 and CS15, point (a) states that all new development will be expected to preserve, manage and where possible enhance existing habitats, protected species and biodiversity features. Point (d) states that development affecting national sites of biodiversity importance will not be permitted if it will have an adverse effect, directly or indirectly, individually or in combination, on the site or its features. In exceptional circumstances, proposals that have an adverse effect on national sites may be permitted if the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm. If a development is approved under these circumstances, appropriate avoidance, mitigation and compensation will be sought wherever possible.

5.7.5 The implementation of the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan are supported by a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). Of particular relevance to the DCO are the Developer Contributions SPD (2012) and Flood Risk SPD (2016).

5.7.6 The Developer Contributions SPD set out the contributions required from new development towards infrastructure, affordable housing and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA through the use of both planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Flood Risk SPD aims to ensure that where possible development is directed to areas of lowest flood risk and seeks to ensure that where development does take place in areas of risk of flooding that it is safe; does not increase flood risk elsewhere; and where possible reduces risk overall.

## 5.8 Guildford Local Plan

5.8.1 The Local Plan was adopted in April 2019 and sets out the vision for the borough and the approach to development up to 2034. The plan references the significant, recurrent traffic congestion experienced during peak hours on the A3 trunk road through the urban area of Guildford and queuing that extends between the Ripley junction and the A3/M25 Wisley interchange junction. The three Department for Transport Road Investment Strategy (RIS) schemes for the A3 Guildford and the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange are detailed within the document:

- Road period 1 (2015/16 to 2019/20). Upgrading the M25 between junction 10 (A3) and junction 16 (M40)
- Road period 1 (2015/16 to 2019/20). M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange
- Road period 2 (2020/21 to 2045/25). A3 Guildford – improving the A3 in Guildford from the A320 to the Hogs Back junction with the A31, with associated safety improvements.

5.8.2 The plan highlights that the delivery of the three RIS schemes is required to help address the peak hour congestion that occurs on the Strategic Road Network and also crucially in order to be able to accommodate future planned growth both outside and within the borough. The delivery of housing in the later stages of the plan period is dependent upon major improvement to the A3 through Guildford. The plan is therefore predicated on the delivery of the three Road Investment Strategy schemes. Given the importance placed on their delivery, the plan includes the specific Policy ID2: “Supporting the Department for Transport’s Road Investment Strategy”.

Policy	Implication
PS5 Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	The policy outlines the Council's approach to protection of the SPA.
D2 Climate change, Sustainable design, Construction and Energy	Sets out environmental objectives for using natural resources prudently, minimising waste, mitigating and adapting to climate change and moving to a low carbon economy
D3 Historic Environment	Outlines the Council's approach to ensuring that the historic environment is conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to its significance
CS15 Biodiversity	Outlines the Council's objective of seeking to avoid the loss and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity across the region and the objectives of the Surrey Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).
ID1 Infrastructure and Delivery	Sets out the Council's approach to ensuring timely provision of suitable, adequate infrastructure to support the delivery of the Local Plan. This includes the use of phasing, planning conditions/obligations and Grampian conditions.
ID2 Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"	This sets out GBC's commitment to working with Highways England to facilitate improvements and also the requirement for promoters of sites close to the A3 and M25 and strategic sites to work closely with Highways England to ensure layout and access arrangements are consistent with the schemes.
ID4 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Sets out that the Council will maintain, conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs). The policy reiterates that permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.

## Chapter 6 Local growth and development

- 6.1 EBC is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan that will set out the development strategy for the borough up to 2035. The new Local Plan will include the vision for the borough; objectives; detailed strategic policies, including allocations and designations; and development management policies.
- 6.2 As part of the preparation of the Plan, EBC completed a second Regulation 18 consultation in September 2019. The focus of the consultation was to seek views on five potential growth strategies for how the Council could seek to meet the Government’s indicative housing target for Elmbridge of 623 homes per year (9,345 new homes over a 15 year period), as calculated by the Standard Methodology.
- 6.3 The five potential growth strategies would all include intensification or optimisation of sites within the existing urban areas. In addition, subject to the consideration and demonstration of exceptional circumstances, three of the options considered the release of land within the Green Belt at varying scales. Each of the options was mapped in terms of potential development sites however, a Draft Plan setting out the growth strategy for Borough including which sites are proposed for allocation, will not be published until September – October 2020. This will be EBC’s Regulation 19 Draft Plan.
- 6.4 The GBC Local Plan includes a number of allocations proposed around the DCO site, the closest being the former Wisley Airfield Site. This site allocation proposes approximately 2,000 homes, employment, retail, community uses and a primary and secondary school.
- 6.5 This site was the subject of a planning application and subsequent appeal (App 15/P/00012) with a public local inquiry in 2017 prior to the Local Plan Hearings and the adoption of the Plan which helped identify the infrastructure required to make the site acceptable to Surrey County Council (SCC) and Guildford Borough Council (GBC) from a highways and transport perspective.
- 6.6 Prior to the Appeal, the Appellant entered into a s106 Agreement with SCC and GBC to deliver the Burnt Common north facing slip roads as part of the proposals. This was seen as the most effective measure to deal with traffic and environmental impact issues on B2215 within Ripley.
- 6.7 Indeed, the Secretary of State (SoS) agreed with the Inspector that the local road network would not be subjected to unacceptable harm from the Appeal proposal in the accompanying letter to the Appeal Decision at paragraphs 23-25:
- 6.8 **“Strategic road network (SRN)**
- 23. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector’s analysis at IR20.52– 20.58 and agrees with his conclusion (IR20.59) that the proposed development would have a severe impact on the northbound section of the SRN between the Ockham Interchange and J10 of the M25 and this would be harmful to highway safety and contrary to advice in the Framework. He further notes that Highways England has maintained their objection. The Secretary of State, like the Inspector, gives this objection substantial weight against the proposal.*
- 6.9 **The local road network**

24. For the reasons given at IR20.60–20.69, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that, overall, the proposal would not be likely to result in unacceptable harm to the local road network subject to the implementation of the off-site works which would be provided in accordance with the s.106 Agreement (IR20.70).

#### **6.10 Transport sustainability**

25. For the reasons given at IR 20.71–20.80, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector’s conclusion at IR20.81 that, overall, the proposals go a long way towards making the location more sustainable, as sought in paragraph 17 of the Framework. However, he agrees with the Inspector that the proposal would not be in full accord with emerging Policy A35 of the eLP as it would fail to provide the required cycling improvements, and he gives limited weight to that. The Secretary of State also gives limited weight to the concerns of Surrey County Council (SCC) that the appeal site is not a suitable location for an all-through school to serve the wider community (IR20.81).”

6.11 However, the SoS agreed with the Inspector that in the absence of major improvements to the northbound section of the A3 between the Ockham Interchange and J10 of the M25, the proposed development at the former Wisley Airfield site would have a severe impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network. The Inspector also concluded that the cycling improvements needed to be modified to make the site sustainable and this is covered in more detail elsewhere in the submission in relation to Old Lane and Ockham Lane impacts from the proposed DCO.

6.12 Within the Inspector’s Report, the following paragraphs are of relevance to the DCO process:

*“20.64 At the northern end of Old Lane there would be a traffic restriction to prevent traffic travelling south from the A3 to Ockham Lane and beyond; the restriction would occur at the Pond car park. This would decrease the volume of traffic entering Old Lane from the A3 and so make exiting onto the A3 easier and safer, increasing the capacity of this junction. Both SCC and HE are satisfied with the proposed arrangements.*

6.13 *20.65 The proposals do not now involve any changes in Ripley High Street. The infrastructure requirements for eLP Policy A35 seek interventions at its junctions with Newark Lane and Rose Lane. However, these interventions are not now proposed as the north facing slip roads at Burnt Common would reduce traffic through Ripley to the extent that the conditions in 2031, even with the appeal scheme, other committed developments and traffic growth would be only slightly worse than now and better than they would be without the slip roads.*

6.14 *20.76 Policy A35 also requires an off-site cycle network to key destinations including the above mentioned railway stations, Ripley and Byfleet. The proposals do not make provision for a route to these stations as the roads are not of sufficient width. This rather demonstrates the fact that the roads are not conducive to cycling and while this mode would still be an option I consider that only experienced and confident cyclists would use them.*

6.15 *20.77 The route to Ripley has a number of challenges for cyclists, not least crossing the Ockham Interchange via a series of traffic lights which would enable cyclists to access and leave a dedicated route around the centre of the roundabout. I do not consider that this would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist as required by eLP Policy A35. The route to Byfleet is largely already in place and only relatively minor alterations are proposed. The ramps over the A3 and low bridge under the M25 do not make the route ideal but it would*



*provide a sustainable alternative to the motor car. The financial contribution towards cycling in the area could provide benefits for existing and future residents but the absence of detail means that this carries little weight.”*

- 6.16 At the Local Plan examination the Local Plan Inspector also commented on the former Wisley Airfield allocation and the Burnt Common slip roads as mitigation for impacts on Ripley High Street in his report dated 27 March 2019:

*“184. Turning to transport impacts, the site is well located in relation to the strategic road network. It would be accessed via all modes of transport from the A3 Ockham roundabout and Old Lane. The M25 Junction 10 RIS scheme is due to start in 2020/21, with completion in 2022/23; housing delivery is due to commence on the site in 2022/23, timed to coordinate with the RIS scheme. The allocation would support a number of mitigation measures on local roads and would fund the provision of two new slip roads at the junction of the A3 with the A247 Clandon Road at Burnt Common to mitigate traffic impacts on Ripley.*

- 6.17 *185. Highways England had objected to the scheme refused on appeal in June 2018. However, in the agreed position statement of 11 June 2018 between Highways England and the site owners, Highways England stated that subject to certain terms set out in the statement, it was expected to withdraw its objection. One of those terms was the potential for a financial contribution in lieu of highway capacity improvements by the developer. The position statement also indicated that the Burnt Common slip roads could be secured by a Grampian condition. This evidence indicates that the concerns expressed by the Inspector and Secretary of State about the impact of the appeal scheme on the strategic road network are capable of resolution in the context of the Plan allocation.*

- 6.18 *186. Policy A35 requires the developer to provide in perpetuity extended and/or new bus services to serve the site and Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford and Cobham. It also requires the provision of an off-site cycle network to those stations and to Ripley and Byfleet. These requirements would assist in mitigating the traffic impact of the development.”*

- 6.19 The Inspector also commented on how the M25 J10/A3 RIS scheme subject to this DCO would unlock housing sites and referred again to the benefits of the Burnt Common north facing slip roads in mitigating impacts in Ripley from the Local Plan proposed housing growth.

*“208. Turning to transport issues arising from all these sites, the first point is that A43 and A58 are close to the site allocated by Policy A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from the A3. The purpose of these slip roads has previously been discussed in relation to Issue 8 and would mitigate the effect on Ripley from A35 Former Wisley airfield, but they would also benefit allocations A43 and A58 by providing excellent access to the strategic road network from the site allocations. In addition, substantial housing delivery from the development would be likely to coincide with the completion of the M25 J10/A3 RIS scheme in 2022/23.*

- 6.20 *210. Thirdly, the constrictions on the A247 southbound towards West Clandon are recognised, but MM41 and MM42 add requirements to A43 and A58 respectively which require the developments to make necessary and proportionate contributions towards an off-site walking network to the centre of Send, the Burnt Common warehouse site and to Clandon railway station, which is not far to the south; and towards mitigation schemes to*

*address the impacts on communities and the environment in Send, West Clandon and Ripley. Connected with this, as referred to above under the Spatial Strategy, MM48 adds a new scheme to the schedule, A247 Clandon Road/The Street (West Clandon) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.”*

6.21 In summary, the Local Plan has the following policies and requirements that are relevant to the DCO:

- Policy A35 – Former Wisley Airfield Ockham (page 219);
- Policy A42 – Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common (page 237);
- Infrastructure Schedule - SRN2, SRN4, SRN7, SRN8 (page 300), LRN7 (Page 302) and AM3 (page 306)

## Chapter 7 Local transport issues

- 7.1 **Modelling** – The Joint Councils accept that the modelling adequately reflects the impacts on the Strategic Road Network but consider that there are general issues with the modelling on the Local Road Network. In particular, there remain concerns on specific elements of the Transport Assessment Report that the Joint Councils require to be clarified. There are particular concerns around the modelling findings for the area in and around Ripley.
- 7.1.1 A particular example are the figures shown in table 7.9 showing the increased trips in/around Ripley and pressure that will be placed on that part of the Local Road Network, how trips are shown on Newark Lane which seem to be counter-intuitive:
- if trips are diverting from Wisley Lane and with Newark Lane being a potential alternative route, why are trips reducing rather than increasing?,
  - why trips currently using Newark Lane and Wisley Lane would re-route either via M25 J11 or the A245 (as stated in the conclusions to this section in 7.5.23).
  - why is there a reduction in Level of Service for the right turn into Rose Lane in the Do Something scenarios, as shown in Figure 7.6.
  - why there is a reduction in flow in the B2215 High Street (n) in 2037 between the Do Minimum and Do Something in the AM peak (see Table 7.9);
  - why the results of the microsimulation modelling indicate journey time savings with the scheme in all the time periods modelled (see Table 7.11);
  - why the Level of Service for the right turn from the B2215 High Street into Rose Lane improves significantly between the Do Minimum and Do Something;
  - the above should be seen in the context that this junction does not validate well within the modelling work for the DCO scheme as set out in Tables C-8 and C-9 of 7.4 of the Transport Assessment Report.
- 7.1.2 In addition to these questions there is the potential impact of RHS Wisley Gardens trips in the PM peak and off-peak. SCC note that the Transport Assessment report recognises that all Southbound Wisley RHS Wisley Gardens trips will head through Ripley village.
- 7.1.3 SCC are also concerned regarding the projected increase of trips along Old Lane (and via Ockham Lane) and would request the rationale for this.
- 7.1.4 In respect of the potential impacts on the Local Road Network, in particular in and around Ripley, SCC continue to request that Highways England provide the modelling/evidence in respect of south facing slip roads at the Ockham Roundabout to demonstrate whether these would have a positive impact overall on the Local Road Network and not to the detriment of other communities served by the Local Road Network.
- 7.1.5 Highways England have previously stated that the proposed scheme does not require these slip roads and have made it clear that they will not provide south facing slip roads at Ockham Roundabout. Even though, however, it has been requested by SCC, Highways England have not to date provided a detailed technical/feasibility assessment for each separate component below (including traffic, environmental and cost impacts at each location and on the surrounding communities) setting out the basis for their decision:

- (a) a northbound off slip at Ockham Roundabout
- (b) a southbound on slip at Ockham Roundabout
- (c) retaining a left turn out of Wisley Lane onto the A3
- (d) to assess (a) to (c) above with north facing slips at the Burntcommon junction (as proposed in the Guildford Local Plan)

7.1.6 This information was also requested of Highways England via SCC's Leaders letter to Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP at that time. Highways England had responded that they had previously considered the Ockham Park roundabout northbound and southbound slip roads but this was together and along with the realigned Wisley Lane when it was proposed to be on the **west side** of the A3 **not** considering the slip roads **individually** as set out above and with the current proposed realigned Wisley Lane access on the **east side** of the A3.

7.1.7 As such SCC consider this information is still to be provided by Highways England.

## 7.2 **Local Road Network (LRN) areas are affected by the scheme**

As local highway authority, the following local road network areas are affected by the scheme and a commentary is provided as to whether SCC believe that the proposed scheme has met its objective as regards the Local Road Network and where appropriate the mitigation SCC wish to see in place to comply with this objective:

1. B2215/Ripley High Street/Newark Lane
2. Realigned Wisley Lane
3. Ockham Roundabout
4. Old Lane
5. Ockham Lane (Bridge End)
6. Elm Lane
7. Painshill junction and A245/Seven Hills Road junction

**7.2.1 B2215/Ripley High Street/Newark Lane and realigned Wisley Lane** - SCC is very concerned about the negative impacts the scheme will have on Ripley due to increased traffic, where the scheme will result in the re-routing of vehicles through Ripley that are accessing Wisley Lane from south of M25 junction 10.

Highways England's Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment Report states that, *"as a result of the closing the existing A3/Wisley lane junction and realigning it to the Ockham Roundabout all trips to/from Wisley Lane to/from the A3 south are expected to travel via Ripley"*.

7.2.1.1 It goes on to state that *"the closure of the direct Wisley Lane access to the A3 means southbound trips from Wisley Lane are choosing to travel via the new link road into the Ockham Park roundabout and then through Ripley, thereby avoiding the need to U-turn at M25 junction 10. This results in a large journey time improvement compared to either the existing journey via Ripley, as well as the probable 'signed' route via M25 junction 10 in the Do Something scenario. The scheme results in all trips routeing via Ripley as this route becomes the fastest option"* (para's 7.8.5, 7.8.6, 7.8.12 and 7.8.14 and Figure 7.11 of Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment). Highways England, however, state (in para 7.5.3) that the assessment has not considered any mitigation in Ripley to manage changes in traffic flow resulting from the scheme.

7.2.1.2 SCC's view remains that there will be more traffic using the B2215 through Ripley from/to the south to RHS Wisley Gardens to avoid having to make the lengthy U turn around the

M25 junction 10 to head towards Guildford. In addition, SCC would ask if Highways England have sought the views of the emergency services (Police, Fire & Rescue, Ambulance) regarding their response times as a result of these changes.

- 7.2.1.3 As can be seen from the Guildford Local Plan section, there is a long-term solution to the traffic and environmental issues in Ripley High Street from the Local Plan growth through the provision of the Burnt Common slip roads. At the time of preparing the Local Plan the J10 M25/A3 improvement scheme had not been sufficiently developed by Highways England to model the specific impacts of the scheme. The Surrey County Council Strategic Highway Assessment Report modelled the scheme as being a free-flowing junction as described at the time in the RIS1 wording and Wisley Lane was assumed to still be accessed from A3 as it currently is.
- 7.2.1.4 Both SCC and GBC are concerned about the time period between the J10 M25/DCO scheme opening and the Burnt Common north facing slip roads being constructed and opened to traffic in relation to B2215 Ripley High Street. The Councils are also concerned about the long-term impacts of RHS Wisley traffic using B2215 to access Wisley Lane to/from the south as it has been demonstrated that using this route would be significantly less journey distance and time and with an increased reliance on satellite navigation technology to direct drivers to destinations it is likely that traffic to/from the south would be diverted onto B2215 through Ripley as part of a visit to RHS Wisley. In addition, a lot of visitors to the site have previously visited and will be familiar with the access arrangements and are more likely to use more local quicker routes to the site.
- 7.2.1.5 An example of this potential for increased traffic through B2215 Ripley High Street can be easily measured by using information presented in the Motion Transport Assessment (TA) dated May 2016 that accompanied planning application 16-P-01080 which was granted planning consent.
- 7.2.1.6 Figure 7.1 of the Motion TA shows that 23% of visitor traffic currently arrives and departs from A3 (south). Paragraphs 3.49, 3.50 and 3.51 (page 13) advises that 85% of visitors are RHS Wisley members, and that 94% of visitors arrive by car. The average occupancy of vehicles arriving at the site is 2.25 people per vehicle.
- 7.2.1.7 As a result of this at 1.4m visitors a year, the site is likely to generate 584,889 customer vehicles per annum (1.4m x 0.94 divided by 2.25).
- 7.2.1.8 As can be seen above, 85% of visitors are members and are likely to visit the site more than once. It is reasonable to assume that returning visitors are likely to know more local routes to visit the site and rely less on highway signage to access the site.
- 7.2.1.9 It is accepted through evidence provided by Highways England that once the DCO scheme is in place leaving and joining the A3 south of Ripley at the Burnt Common slip roads and using B2215 Ripley High Street to access Ockham roundabout will result in a significantly reduced journey time and distance compared to staying on the A3 and using J10 M25 to 'u' turn to access RHS Wisley via the Ockham slip roads.
- 7.2.1.10 As a worst case, this could result in 23% of visitors to RHS Wisley diverting onto B2215 Ripley High Street from A3 south. The number of additional vehicles through Ripley High Street can be calculated using Table 5.5 (page 21) of the Motion TA for April and applying 23% to the numbers as follows:

Time Period	Vehicle Trips – 1.4 Million Visitors per year (23% of customers additional through B2215 Ripley)					
	Wednesday		Saturday		Sunday	
	Additional Flows	Additional vehicles per minute	Additional Flows	Additional vehicles per minute	Additional Flows	Additional vehicles per minute
09:00-10:00	40	0.7	59	1.0	77	1.3
10:00-11:00	170	2.8	114	1.9	144	2.4
11:00-12:00	159	2.7	124	2.1	181	3.0
12:00-13:00	149	2.5	125	2.1	190	3.2
13:00-14:00	152	2.5	125	2.1	188	3.1
14:00-15:00	169	2.8	155	2.6	202	3.4
15:00-16:00	160	2.7	143	2.4	164	2.7
16:00-17:00	120	2.0	139	2.3	154	2.6
17:00-18:00	64	1.1	126	2.1	129	2.2
18:00-19:00	33	0.6	71	1.2	58	1.0
<b>09:00-19:00</b>	<b>1216</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1181</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1487</b>	<b>2.1</b>

**Table 1 – Potential additional vehicles through B2215 Ripley High Street from RHS Wisley Traffic once the DCO scheme is in place**

7.2.1.11 It can be seen from the above that the potential increases in traffic flows from RHS Wisley visitors alone (excluding staff) could be as high as 1200-1500 vehicles per day on B2215 through Ripley and at times would represent an additional vehicle every 20 seconds.

7.2.1.12 To put the above impacts in perspective, as previously discussed, The Secretary of State (Appeal into planning application 15-P-00012) accepted that the local impacts of the Wisley Airfield development on B2215 Ripley High Street would be adequately addressed through the provision of the Burnt Common north facing slip roads which would need to be implemented at 1,000 homes. The wording for the provision of the slip roads is set out in the s106 Agreement (clauses 4.10 to 4.12 page 33) between Wisley Property Investments Limited, Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council and this is available at:

[http://www2.guildford.gov.uk/publicaccess/files/925B43CF8B0EF3325CA050B6948F3A59/pdf/15\\_P\\_00012-ID123\\_SECTION\\_106\\_AGREEMENT\\_BETWEEN\\_GBC\\_SCC\\_AND\\_APPELLANT-1102469.pdf](http://www2.guildford.gov.uk/publicaccess/files/925B43CF8B0EF3325CA050B6948F3A59/pdf/15_P_00012-ID123_SECTION_106_AGREEMENT_BETWEEN_GBC_SCC_AND_APPELLANT-1102469.pdf)

7.2.1.13 The additional traffic flows from 1000 dwellings on Ripley High Street can be roughly calculated by use of the transport evidence (Appendix N of WSP's Appendices to their Proof of Evidence using Figures 9 and 10) provided by WSP for the Appellant for the appeal in relation to Wisley Airfield. During the AM peak, the average proportion of development traffic to/from Wisley Airfield on B2215 Ripley High Street west and east of the crossroads was 15.2% of the total. During the PM peak, at the same locations the average proportion was 14.2%. The average of the two peaks is 14.7%. WSP's Appendices to proof of evidence are available at:

[http://www2.guildford.gov.uk/publicaccess/files/2DE511AE0FDFA69AA1A9A09F93F3896F/pdf/15\\_P\\_00012-PROOF\\_OF\\_EVIDENCE\\_OF\\_COLIN\\_MCKAY\\_APPELLANT\\_APPENDICES-1071421.pdf](http://www2.guildford.gov.uk/publicaccess/files/2DE511AE0FDFA69AA1A9A09F93F3896F/pdf/15_P_00012-PROOF_OF_EVIDENCE_OF_COLIN_MCKAY_APPELLANT_APPENDICES-1071421.pdf)

7.2.1.14 Applying a typical daily traffic flow of 5 vehicles per residential unit to the average proportion of vehicles using B2215 Ripley High Street would result in an AADT of 735 vehicles for 1,000 dwellings (5000 x 14.7%).

7.2.1.15 It can be seen that the trigger point for the provision of the Burnt Common slip roads for the Wisley Airfield development which was agreed at the Appeal is lower than the potential additional vehicles through B2215 Ripley High Street from RHS Wisley Traffic once the DCO scheme is in place.

#### **Uncertainty in Traffic Flows Modelled**

7.2.1.12 **Uncertainty in traffic flows modelled** - The Highways England Traffic Forecasting Report has only recently been submitted on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (REP1-010). It has at Appendix C (pages 62-76) a summary of the model link flows. A detailed review of the traffic flows show that many links which are parallel routes to the B2215 Ripley High Street have zero traffic flows particularly in the Base 2015 and Do Minimum 2022 scenarios. This shows how poorly validated the strategic model is with respect to local traffic flows on routes adjacent to Ripley High Street and potentially how traffic switches between these routes.

7.2.1.13 For example for the Annual Average Daily Totals:

- Old Lane has zero flows in Base 2015 (northbound) and Do-Minimum 2022 (northbound);
- Guileshill Lane has zero flows in Base 2015 (westbound), Do-Minimum 2022 and Do something 2022 (westbound), Do-Minimum 2037 (eastbound) and Do-something 2037 (eastbound);
- Hungry Hill Lane has zero flows in Base 2015 and Do-Minimum 2022;
- Ockham Lane has zero flows in Base 2015 (eastbound) and Do-Minimum 2022 (eastbound);
- Wisley Lane has zero flows in Base 2015 (northbound) and Do-Minimum 2022 (northbound).

7.2.1.14 The Councils are concerned about these zero or low flows during the base periods and how in the Do-Something scenarios there are significant increases in traffic flows on these lanes which are unsuitable to suffer these levels of increases in traffic flows. There are a number of reasons why the Councils are concerned about these increases in traffic flows one such example is how sustainable access to Wisley Airfield (Policy A35) can be achieved with such high increases in flows.

7.2.1.15 This is a requirement (Requirement 6) of Policy A35 of the Guildford Local Plan which states the following:

*“(6) An off site cycle network to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet to be provided with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist.”*

7.2.1.16 In particular, it can be seen that in the Do-Something scenarios there is a significant increase in traffic using Old Lane to travel south on the A3 as the junction improvements at Old Lane/A3 on-slip from J10 will significantly increase the capacity of this junction from a give-way to a merge arrangement. Longer distance traffic re-routing onto Old Lane is not welcomed by the Councils and would work against the objectives of Requirement 6 of Policy A35.

7.2.1.17 Providing facilities for the average cyclist is likely to require Old Lane, Ockham Lane, Ockham Road North and B2215 Ripley High Street to have traffic flows reduced from existing traffic levels let alone the higher flows predicted in the Do-Something Scenario. This could only be achieved by the implementation of traffic management measures along these lanes to reduce vehicle numbers and speeds to enable the off-site cycling facilities to be provided that would enable average cyclists to use them.

7.2.1.18 The implications of this reduction of flows on the adjacent parallel lanes to Ripley High Street is that more traffic would inevitably be using B2215 Ripley High Street as this would be the only local alternative to access the A3 south. The need to reduce traffic flows on the lanes around Wisley Airfield is not modelled by Highways England despite this being a consequence of the A35 Policy requirements and therefore the implications for B2215 Ripley High Street is unknown and raises uncertainty about the Do-Something scenario and the scale of traffic using B2215 Ripley High Street.

7.2.1.19 This is a further reason why the Councils consider that a mitigation scheme for B2215 Ripley High Street is required as part of the DCO scheme.

7.2.1.20 In addition to the above, the Joint Councils have requested the following to address concerns in Ripley, in priority order:

- 1 That Highways England confirm in writing its support and progress to conclusion the Approval in Principle (AIP) that was submitted by Wisley Property Investments Limited (WPIL) for north facing slips at the Burntcommon junction. The current A3 congestion as stated in paragraph 6.2.3 of Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment report is one of the reasons why the Burntcommon Slip roads, proposed as part of the Guildford Local Plan wider development strategy are needed.

The Burntcommon slip roads are allocated in the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Local Plan (allocation A42) as they have the ability to reassign Woking related traffic heading to/from A3 out of Ripley and can provide mitigation for the Wisley Airfield development as allocated in the GBC Local Plan (allocation A35). In addition, GBC have control over the land that would be required for the Burntcommon slip roads.

As part of the Planning Appeal submitted by WPIL for the Wisley Airfield development there was an “Agreed Statement on Progress” (dated 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018) between the developer and Highways England to seek to demonstrate that the proposed north-facing A3 Burntcommon slips can be provided safely and with demonstrable benefit to the economy.



The developer has provided Highways England with substantiation regarding safety, economics and the benefits the Burntcommon slip roads would have towards mitigating negative impacts that the M25 junction 10 scheme would bring about in Ripley village.

Highways England asked the developer to carry out additional work on the effects of the development on the A3 mainline once improved to 4 lanes by the M25 junction 10 scheme and that Highways England would require 2-3 months (from 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018) to finalise their assessment of information provided and to reach a final position on the Burntcommon slip roads. It is understood that Highways England have since been considering the accommodation of Local Plan growth as part of the Junction 10 DCO. As such SCC would ask that Highways England, whilst accepting that the Appeal has since been dismissed, confirm their approval in principal (AIP) for the Burntcommon slip roads so that the Local Plan Allocation A35 can be delivered.

The AIP for the Burntcommon slip roads provided at the same timescale of the DCO would give SCC and GBC the ability to properly plan for the DCO impacts alongside those of the GBC Local Plan and external growth. However, this does not overcome the concerns around Ripley in relation to the DCO in isolation.

- 2 As set out in para 2.2.5 SCC would ask that Highways England provide the modelling/evidence in respect of south facing slip roads at the Ockham Roundabout to demonstrate whether these would have a positive impact overall on the Local Road Network and not to the detriment of other communities served by the Local Road Network.

SCC recognise that this is not currently included in the DCO red line boundary or supporting DCO technical information; SCC, however wish to understand if both or one of these slip roads e.g. the northbound off slip at Ockham Interchange could provide the required mitigation to the impacts on the Local Road Network including Ripley.

- 3 That Highways England agree as part of the DCO to fund a comprehensive mitigation package in Ripley via a s106 agreement as a result of additional traffic including heavy goods vehicles on the B2215, including but not limited to consideration of:
  - Speed reduction and anti-severance measures on B2215 between A247 and B2039.
  - Road resurfacing/carriageway reconstruction along the B2215 Ripley High Street and Newark Lane.
  - Junction Improvements at the B2215 High Street/Newark Lane/Rose junction.
  - Cycling facilities throughout the length of the B2215. To include Village gateways at either end of the built up area on the B2215 and cycle lanes on Portsmouth Road. This should include a segregated cycle lane and narrowing the carriageway.
  - Upgrade bus stops/shelters to an agreed form/high quality with real time passenger information is provided.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> This request is set out in more detail under the Public Transport section at 7.6, but given the location it is also referenced here in relation to Ripley

- Other measures to be identified to mitigate the impact of additional traffic travelling through Ripley as a result of the M25 Junction 10 scheme.

The total cost of the above is £2.4m, comprising £1.65m construction cost estimate plus 10% risk, 15% contingency, 15% fees (design and supervision). The requested elements are mitigation against severance due to unbalanced flows on particular arms in additional directions. This severance is predominantly an inter-peak issue for Ripley justifying the mitigation measures set out above. There is additional traffic in the interpeak due to rerouting due to M25 Junction 10 making these routes more attractive to use and the RHS Wisley traffic. The Burnt Common Slip road is the longer term solution for Ripley, required as development comes forward.

Highway England's TA shows that journey times are quicker going through Ripley than the U turn and the speed reduction measures proposed above are therefore also intended to slow traffic speeds through the village of Ripley to encourage more RHS Ripley and general Wisley Lane traffic to use Highway England's signed 'u' turn route through the M25 J10 roundabout.

**7.2.2 Ockham Roundabout** - SCC note that the signalisation of this junction will result in its operation within capacity albeit minor delays during the evening peak as set out in 7.6 and 7.10 of Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment Report.

**7.2.2.1** SCC remain concerned that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not included this proposed junction changes to demonstrate that this proposal can be delivered safely e.g. with the additional entrance and exit arm onto the roundabout.

**7.2.2.2** SCC would want the proposed traffic signals control of this junction to be owned, maintained and operated by Highways England but that Highways England agree a Collaborative Traffic Management (CTM) approach as is currently being discussed between Highways England and SCC in other areas.

**7.2.3 Realigned Wisley Lane** - SCC note that the realigned Wisley Lane contains a straight section of road with a proposed speed limit of 40mph leading into a 30mph speed limit over the bridge. Following consultation with Surrey Police SCC are content that the realigned Wisley Lane would have a 40mph speed limit from its junction with the Ockham Roundabout and then a 30 mph speed limit before the first bend onto the bridge over the A3 and onwards into Wisley Village. The lower 30mph limit will encourage slower speeds into the first bend and over the summit of the bridge and past the entrance and exit junctions to Wisley Gardens. It would also provide continuity with the existing 30mph speed limit further to the north within Wisley Village. Slower speeds would reduce the risk of collision and improve the routes for non-motorised road users. To encourage compliance with the 30 mph speed limit it is requested that an enhanced 30 mph speed limit gateway should be installed to highlight the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph. The provision of the section of 40mph limit could be reviewed if any new junction is added to the realigned Wisley Lane (for example to access the Wisley Airfield development), as the junction would be likely to have a speed reducing effect, and lower speeds would be desirable through the junction to reduce the risk of collision involving turning traffic.

**7.2.3.1** Again SCC have yet to see Highways England's offer in terms of commuted sums to cover the additional maintenance burden this will place on SCC. Until this is provided SCC cannot agree to adopt this component.

**7.2.4 Old Lane** – As set out above, it is intended that Old Lane become an important non-motorised user route between the proposed new settlement at Wisley Airfield and Effingham Junction station, so any increase in vehicular traffic south of the airfield should be avoided. The Wisley Airfield planning application determined to SCC’s satisfaction that the best way to mitigate impacts on Old Lane would be for the southbound Old Lane to be closed south of the proposed access road to Wisley Airfield. We understand this has not been modelled as part of the DCO process despite Highways England being aware of this proposal.

7.2.4.2 Old Lane is likely to be one of the cycling routes from the Wisley Airfield development (Policy A35) to serve Effingham Junction railway station. This is a requirement (Requirement 6) of Policy A35 of the Guildford Local Plan which states the following:

*“(6) An off site cycle network to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet to be provided with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist.”*

7.2.4.3 Providing facilities for the average cyclist is likely to require Old Lane to have traffic flows reduced from existing traffic levels let alone the higher flows predicted in the Do-Something Scenarios. The Highways England Traffic Forecasting Report which has only recently been submitted on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (REP1-010) has at Appendix C (pages 62-76) a summary of the model link flows and the Council notes that in the Do-Something 2037 scenario traffic flows increase northbound on Old Lane by between 55% and 5000% and southbound between 19% and 31%.

7.2.4.4 This is clearly unacceptable and in conflict with the delivery of Wisley Airfield Policy A35. In reality Some of these flows are likely to use B2215 Ripley High Street as an alternative to access A3 south.

**7.2.5 Ockham Lane (Bridge End)** - The “Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Noise and vibration” at paragraph 6.8.45 advises that Ockham Lane will experience an additional 441 vehicles compared to without the Scheme. This is a significant increase which SCC is concerned about. The Guildford Local Plan proposes mitigation to Ockham Lane as part of Policy A35: Former Wisley airfield, Ockham through the provision of Requirement (2) “A through vehicular link is required between the A3 Ockham interchange and Old Lane”. Once the provision of the link is obtained, traffic management would be required on Ockham Lane to downgrade its current level of usage and encourage traffic to use the through vehicular link through the Wisley Airfield site.

7.2.5.1 SCC is concerned that the Guildford Local Plan Policy A35 Requirement (2) (the through vehicular link) has not been modelled in the assessment despite the fact that the site allocation has been assessed in terms of the increased development traffic flows. Modelling Requirement (2), which Highways England was aware of at the time of developing the transport evidence base for the DCO, would likely significantly reduce the amount of traffic using Ockham Lane, Old Lane and indeed the Old Lane junction with A3 which experiences a significant increase in traffic flows. This could also have implications for Ripley High Street as more traffic could continue to use this route in the Do-Something scenario.

**7.2.6 Elm Lane** - SCC would also ask that the levels/gradient/land availability of Elm Lane and the realigned Wisley Lane be designed such that a potential future connection between the two is possible should this be potentially required as part of the Wisley Airfield development. SCC County Council note on the A3 northbound off slip at Painshill the design change to reduce from two lanes to "Tiger Tail" facilities, with two lanes on the off slip, one jet lane heading to the A245 Woking bound, and one straight ahead onto the roundabout. SCC would ask if this has been analysed in Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment report and a Road Safety Audit assessment produced to demonstrate that this would improve the 'Do Minimum' situation in terms of traffic flow and road safety.

7.2.7.1 SCC note the design change to signalise the pedestrian crossing at the A3 southbound on slip from Painshill junction roundabout. SCC's position on this is that Highways England should own/maintain this signal crossing and agree a Collaborative Traffic Management (CTM) approach with SCC.

7.2.7.2 SCC note the proposed jet lane at the Painshill interchange from the northbound A3 to the A245 Byfleet Road will remove the gating effect of the existing signals apart from when the pedestrian signals are activated/called at the top of the slip road, and this means that the first junction encountered by vehicles making this movement will be on SCC's Local Road Network. SCC recognise the proposed speed limit change on this section of the A245 and the changes to the A245/Seven Hills Road junction outlined below but wish to see a detailed road safety audit of this arrangement. This is required to demonstrate that movements can be accommodated safely and does not result in fast moving traffic exiting the A3 meeting queuing traffic back from A245/Seven Hills Road junction or safety issues arising from having to weave/change lanes over a short distance.

7.2.7.3 SCC support Highways England's proposal to change the operation of the A245/Seven Hills Road junction so that traffic exiting Seven Hills Road (North) will no longer be able to make a right turn onto the A245 or pass straight over onto Seven Hills Road (South) and traffic exiting the A245 (from Byfleet) will no longer be able to make a right turn into Seven Hills Road (South). However, SCC request the following be considered and included:

- 1 Controlled crossing facilities across the A245 Byfleet Road to the west of Seven Hills Road (north) to allow Non-Motorised Users (NMU) to cross the A245 and access proposed cycle facilities that was being promoted as part of the scheme and associated Highways England Designated funds e.g. a cycle link from Cobham across the Painshill junction and along the A245 to Brooklands.
- 2 Justification for the proposal of only a single lane exit from Seven Hills Road (North) to show how this junction would operate in respect of the capacity / anticipated queuing at this junction to show that the junction operates efficiently.
- 3 The NMU route proposed along Seven Hills Road (south) currently stops short of the A245/Seven Hills junction (the route seems to be continuous from Ockham Roundabout to Seven Hills Road South and then stops). So SCC would request that a cycle facility be provided along the eastern side of Seven Hills Road (south) to connect up with the NMU route proposed on the A245 and provide a continuous link between Ockham Road Roundabout and Painshill as the proposed M25 Junction 10 scheme includes banning cyclists on the main A3.
- 4 Consideration in respect of the A245 eastbound arm of the Seven Hills Junction regarding extending the length of the nearside left turn lane on the A245 eastbound

approach to improve the traffic flow at this junction (there is a verge at the rear of the existing footway that could allow the footway to be realigned to provide space).

- 5 Confirmation that there is sufficient space within the red line boundary in the vicinity of the left turn filter to Seven Hills Road South to allow construction of the junction and Feltonfleet access in this area.
- 6 Seven Hills Road (south) will require resurfacing/highway maintenance improvements along its whole length as part of the Highways England project as under the proposals additional traffic will now be using Seven Hills Road (south) to provide access to properties on the west side of the A3 that would no longer have access from the A3.
- 7 That the Old Byfleet Road adjacent to Feltonfleet school be stopped up as part of the DCO only in the event of the proposal to ban the straight ahead and right turn out of Seven Hills (north) as part of the proposed mitigation arrangements.
- 8 That Highways England investigate the potential to link the Painshill and A245/Seven Hills Road traffic signal control.

7.2.7.4 SCC note that Highways England has submitted a revised proposal in respect of A245 Byfleet Road as part of its proposed change to DCO submitted on 4th November 2019 (Change 3 of AS-023) in that following further traffic modelling are no longer proposing to widen the entirety of the A245 to three lanes as it passes Manor Pond and approaches the A245/A3 Painshill Interchange. SCC is not in a position to support this proposal until revised traffic modelling/capacity/transport assessment, a Road Safety Audit and environmental information is provided demonstrating that this proposal will provide benefit to the Local Road Network and mitigate the impacts of the scheme both for traffic flow and users of the footpath proposed in the original design.

### **7.3 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV)**

- 7.3.1 The Joint Councils are concerned regarding the loss of HGV parking laybys that will result from the scheme and which have not been adequately addressed. HGV parking along this section of the A3 is long established and a very popular location for overnight parking before transporting goods into London, where there is very little lorry parking available. Roadside parking for HGVs in Surrey away from residential areas is also very limited. HGV parking is available for a charge at Cobham Services on the M25. After three hours a £35 charge for 24 hours is made and as a result lorries are frequently seen parked under bridge on motorway slip road.
- 7.3.2 Highways England are stating that they believe there to be spare HGV parking capacity on other laybys along the A3 to the south of M25 junction 10 and have produced a HGV parking survey report with the view that there is capacity on laybys further south along the A3. As this report did not contain any origin-destination surveys undertaken for HGVs SCC consider it likely that the bulk of existing demand is from drivers travelling along the M25, for whom the existing laybys at Wisley are accessible with only minor diversion off the M25. This is despite the availability of HGV parking at the Cobham Services, which albeit may involve a charge to HGVs. SCC are therefore concerned for additional mileage that HGVs would have to take, impact on residential areas (principally Burpham) to access and use alternative layby capacity identified by Highways England south west of Ockham that has not been taken account in the Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment, and potential displacement of parking on local roads.

7.3.3 The Joint Councils would therefore ask that Highways England either retain parking for these HGVs or demonstrate that the additional trips have been considered and would not displace onto local roads. Laybys are occasionally used as an abnormal load lay-up (e.g. to collect police escorts) and an alternative should be provided in the scheme design.

#### **7.4 Structures including maintenance access**

7.4.1 Queries remain around which structures proposed as part of the DCO, SCC is being asked to adopt. SCC has requested a schedule, however this information has not yet been provided. SCC also have an interest in third party owned structures carrying/crossing SCC's highway. And so SCC will need to be involved in the decision making on these elements to ensure that these structures do not restrict SCC's highway networks (and SCC's private land accesses for NMU routes).

7.4.2 SCC will need to agree Technical Approval of any temporary structure/works that support one of SCC's permanent or temporary highways (including PROW), regardless of whether it's on SCC's land. SCC will also need to be involved with the technical approval of any temporary structures affecting Surrey's highway/PROW network (i.e. temporary bridges in place whilst foot/bridle bridges are being reconstructed both over the A3 and M25).

7.4.3 SCC is concerned over the possible increase in traffic using the bridge over the River Wey Navigation at Pyrford resulting from the scheme. Should there be a material increase in traffic, SCC would expect Highways England to implement appropriate measure to mitigate any adverse impacts on the fabric of the bridge.

#### **7.5 Variable Message Signs (VMS)**

7.5.1 SCC has two existing VMS on the A245 either side of the Painshill A3 junction. These signs have been an essential tool to inform motorists of both immediate incidents and planned works/events but both have come to the end of their useful life.

7.5.2 SCC ask that Highways England fund the replacement of these two VMS together with the provision of new VMS on the Local Road Network to benefit the M25 junction 10 and nearby associated A3 junctions. This would ensure that motorists arriving onto the Highways England Strategic Road Network (SRN) are aware of issues in advance of arriving on the SRN. Other suitable locations for the provision of new VMS might be on B2215 Portsmouth Road leaving Ripley to join A3 northbound and B2039 Ockham Road to join A3 northbound.

7.5.3 If installed in advance of any works on the SRN itself, these signs would also be a useful communications tool to update on the scheme's construction progress with potential financial savings on portable VMS required during the works to serve the same purpose.

7.5.4 SCC continue to highlight opportunities to better coordinate with Highways England to ensure networks are integrated. Earlier this year SCC submitted a bid for HE Designated Funds for intelligent transport systems technology improvements around M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange to complement the scheme. The bid proposed the introduction additional ANPR and CCTV cameras and replacement VMS on the A245 and corridors approaching and leaving the Painshill and Ockham A3 junctions, but has yet to have confirmed funding from Highways England. Improved travel information to users could inform and promote greater transport choice by providing the travelling public with timely information of incidents and could result in potential changes to modes of travel.

## **7.6 Impact on Public Transport**

- 7.6.1 The hourly 715 bus route between Kingston and Guildford via Cobham serves RHS Wisley Gardens and SCC have been pressed by RHS Wisley and disability groups to ensure a service to RHS Wisley is maintained. Patronage on the route is increasing, with circa 3,500 boardings (total in both directions) at the Wisley stop during the period Jan – October 2019. Patronage varies seasonally and there is a clear increase during RHS Wisley event periods.
- 7.6.2 As Highway Authority, SCC note the changes to/removal of bus stops and bus turn around area at the RHS Wisley Gardens access as a result of the proposed scheme. It is understood that the assumption to date has been that as part of the scheme Highways England, in consultation with RHS Wisley Gardens, will be providing an enhanced turnaround facility off Wisley Lane at the entrance to RHS Wisley Gardens.
- 7.6.3 SCC's view is that this should be referenced in the Transport Assessment and include (as part of the scheme) bus shelters to an agreed form/high quality with real time passenger information and a commitment to be delivered to a set timescale that aligns the Highways England programme for the construction of the works with the relocation of the existing bus stops and the operation requirements of RHS Wisley Gardens.
- 7.6.4 The impact on bus routes stated in the Transport Assessment is that the existing bus stops in the vicinity of the existing Wisley Lane will be removed with the nearest bus stops being on the northbound off-slip and southbound on slip. While there is an ambition that some bus journeys will access RHS Wisley via the realigned Wisley Lane link road this will add journey time to the service and may not be financially viable, hence SCC seeks pump-priming from HE to fund this diversion – see below. The bus stops at the Ockham roundabout and at the entrance to RHS Wisley, off Wisley Lane should all be of the same standard. That is accessible kerbing, appropriate traffic management (bus stop clearways as necessary), safe passenger waiting area, bus stop pole/flag/timetable case, bus shelter (wooden) with lighting, and a real time passenger information display. Installing a RTPi display close to the main entrance of the RHS Wisley Visitor Centre would also give confidence to intending passengers prior to embarking on the walk to the bus stops.
- 7.6.5 Where passengers are expected to wait in remote locations where they are unfamiliar with the bus routes and geography, such as passengers who are visiting the area, it is vital that they are given the confidence that they are at the correct bus stop and that the bus is on its way. Recent passenger insight research by a large multinational bus operator has reinforced the value of RTPi at bus stops. Usage of real-time bus information via mobile apps and text messaging is generally low outside of city regions.
- 7.6.6 Safe pedestrian walking routes need to be provided between the bus stops and RHS Wisley. It is reasonable that a bus service may use both sets of bus stops at Ockham/RHS Wisley, or indeed only serve the Ockham bus stops. This will be subject to network planning and operational needs. Passengers using the Ockham bus stops will have to walk along the realigned Wisley Lane to access RHS Wisley Gardens which is some distance away (circa 1.2km) which they are unlikely to do. As a minimum to help mitigate the impact on bus users, it is the County Council's view that the scheme must include the construction of a pedestrian footway from these bus stops to access RHS Wisley Gardens via Mill Lane (this will require agreement with RHS Wisley). As passengers will choose to wait at bus stops within Ripley, SCC would ask that these bus stops/shelters be upgraded to an agreed form/high quality with real time passenger information.

- 7.6.6 In addition, it may be possible for SCC to approach the bus operator to divert their routes into the bus turnaround at RHS Wisley Gardens. The bus operators, however, have to meet required timetable and so this would not be attractive to them unless there was an incentive for them to do so. To address this Highways England should provide funding to SCC to use to incentivise this bus diversion (perhaps of the order of £30,000-£50,000/year for 2 years).
- 7.6.7 In terms of impact on buses SCC understand that the RHS Wisley Gardens bus stops need to be closed during construction phase with the proposal to provide shuttle buses to RHS Wisley Gardens from existing stops at Ockham Park Junction. SCC would suggest that it would be more attractive to passengers if a shuttle bus to RHS Wisley Gardens is provided from existing stops in Ripley Village. Mitigation for this issue is also sought regarding improvements to bus stops in Ripley as included in the Ripley mitigation package being sought (see para 7.2.1.20 sub para 3)
- 7.6.8 SCC would recommend this as the Ripley stops are less remote for users and would pick up more bus services, including passengers travelling from Woking. Until the Ockham bus stops are upgraded under the proposed Highways England scheme the waiting environment is not pleasant.
- 7.6.9 As regards the A3 southbound on-slip bus stop at the Painshill junction SCC views are that the bus stop location as shown adjacent to the traffic island to the Girl Guides access road is not the best location. SCC would ask to see the Road Safety Audit report considering the location of this bus stop and what other potential locations are possible.

## **7.7 Road Safety Audit**

- 7.7.1 SCC considers the current Highways England Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) undertaken for this scheme, as summarised in section 7.12 of Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment Report, to be too brief as it only covers 5 points – 3 comments around M25 Junction 10 itself but only 2 comments around the access to Feltonfleet school access which is only one of SCC's related Local Road Network areas.
- 7.7.2 SCC would expect the RSA to have also covered SCC's interests in the following areas:
- Ockham Road Roundabout
  - The exit for cyclists provided from the A3 northbound carriageway, towards Portsmouth Road, south of Ockham Park junction
  - Realigned Wisley Lane/overbridge/RHS Wisley Gardens junction
  - Old Lane
  - Elm Lane
  - Any NMU routes that Highways England are proposing is passed to SCC to adopt/maintain (subject to SCC's agreement) to show that safety matters have been addressed and there is sufficient width to accommodate the projected number of users and parapets on bridges
  - Redhill Road (southern end)
  - Painshill junction
  - A245 Byfleet Road
  - Seven Hills Road



7.7.3 Highways England have responded that the Stage 2 RSA will be undertaken at the end of the detailed design stage and would be more comprehensive covering more detailed aspects of the highway scheme including SCC interests. SCC remain concerned that a RSA hasn't been undertaken at this stage covering the Local Road Network areas at this stage as this could impact on the DCO red line boundary should changes be needed and to reassure SCC that the scheme layouts as presented as part of the DCO are deliverable.

7.7.4 SCC would also ask if consideration has been given to an effective method of screening headlights between the new service roads and the A3.

## **7.8 Speed limits**

7.8.1 SCC have engaged with Highways England over the course of the development of the DCO and are in agreement with all of the proposed speed limit changes (as set out in Schedule 3 Part 5 of the DCO). SCC welcomes the proposed change to DCO submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (Change 6 of AS-023) that amends the speed limit to 20mph on Elm Lane.

## **7.9 Impacts during construction**

7.9.1 Highways England have stated that a CEMP and a Traffic Management Plan will be put in place prior to the start of works. The scheme could have a major impact on the LRN during construction. SCC's view is that during construction, consideration of effective and safe traffic management, and mitigation of impacts to the LRN and businesses and facilities is essential e.g. RHS Wisley Gardens, Painshill Park and Feltonfleet School. This could also be covered in the Protective Provisions for Local Highway Authorities requested.

7.9.2 SCC note that Highways England have shared with SCC a draft Traffic Management Plan (TMP) setting out proposed diversion routes during construction. SCC have raised concerns on plans (at a meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2019) which Highways England are to address before SCC can agree to the TMP.

7.9.3 There is a need to ensure a continuous direct access remains in place from the A3 to Wisley Lane for all traffic during construction/until the new realigned Wisley Lane and bridge is open. There is not a suitable diversion as the bridge at Pyrford Lock has weight and width restrictions.

7.9.4 For any closures of the M25/A3 during the works, there will be use of diversions onto SCC's Local Road Network that will increase fatigue of our existing highway assets on those routes and SCC so request that funding is provided to mitigate these impacts. It will be important to take into account that not all bridges on the diversion routes may be motorway grade load capacity and potential funding of maintenance on tactical diversion routes/bridges should also be considered and provided.

7.9.5 SCC are also concerned about how access will be provided and maintained safely for NMUs to Wisley and Ockham Commons across the A3/ M25 and how the works to remove existing PROW carrying bridges will be programmed to avoid temporary closures of the PROW routes that would compromise accessibility for NMUs.

- 7.9.6 Access will need to be provided and maintained to Wisley and Ockham Commons both during construction and following completion to ensure safe access for cyclists, riders and walkers across the A3/M25 and access arrangements communicated to the general public.
- 7.9.7 SCC's comments on Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment on construction traffic are:
- (i) It is imperative that the construction compound does not allow access for any construction traffic (employees accessing work and HGVs) to/from B2215 via Ripley. This would have to be the subject of a condition and careful access design to allow only egress from the compound to the north. The ingress is understood to be off Ockham Park Roundabout, but a routeing agreement will need to be in place to prevent the use of the B2215.
  - (ii) As regards Table 7.28/29: SCC question why there are such comparatively low levels of traffic are accessing the construction southbound on the A3 from London, which presumably will be the main source of the workforce.
  - (iii) During the disruption of construction, an increase of 6% of main line flow on the A3 south of Junction 10 could be severe. Although this may be unavoidable this highlights the importance of effective communications with the travelling public, and protection is given to surrounding communities who would be subject to displaced traffic during these times of increased demand on the already stressed network. The Joint Councils suggest that two additional documents should be produced as part of this tool kit:
    - A Communications Strategy which dovetails with the LA's Communication Plans
    - A short-term/temporary displacement mitigation plan e.g. the HGV routeing from the Woking rail head should be via the A320 north to M25 (i.e. not via A320 south – as there are considerably more receptors in that direction).
  - (iv) SCC's view is that the Transport Assessment hasn't set out the impact regarding traffic congestion on SCC's Local Road Network during construction and what resulting mitigation is proposed. As such SCC would ask that Highways England set this out to meet their key stated objective to ***"Minimise impacts on the surrounding Local Road Network."***
- 7.9.8 There is a concern in relation to Volume 2.10 Temporary works plans which shows a Construction Site Compound on the A3 northbound, at the "Site of the former San Domenico Hotel". Since the site re-opened for use as a Starbucks we understand that there have been Road Traffic Collisions (RTC) and a number of near misses, where drivers have mistaken the start of the slip road into Starbucks for the exit slip for Painshill and then have swerved back into Lane 1 of A3. If a vehicle is exiting as a vehicle (almost) enters as set out above, then it could become more hazardous. As such SCC would ask; if this is an ideal location for a Construction Site Compound with frequent HGV movements as any RTC here could have major congestion consequences for A3/M25 J10 movements, how this location has been risk assessed and if so what mitigation is proposed.
- 7.9.9 Regarding construction compounds, SCC is keen to work with Highways England to understand parcels of land required and access routes where they are owned by SCC and would ask for commitment that compounds identified are fully restored to at least the condition that existed prior to construction, and recognising opportunity for landscape, habitats and biodiversity improvements.

## **7.10 Impact on non motorised users and Public Rights of Way**

- 7.10.1 SCC note the proposed NMU and PROW routes and would ask that Highways England confirm:
- (i) The proposed future ownership and maintenance responsibility for these routes
  - (ii) The proposed commuted sums and time periods to be paid to SCC if it is proposed and SCC accept the transfer ownership or maintenance responsibilities to SCC
- 7.10.2 It should be noted in response to Article 11 of the published DCO that SCC are not prepared to adopt the NMU route that runs parallel to the A3 (including any associated features e.g. earthworks, fencing, drainage etc.) as this is viewed as a replacement for the NMU route that currently runs along the A3 (that Highways England currently maintain) and the fact that cyclists are currently legally allowed to use the A3 but which we understand is to be removed as part of the proposed scheme. The provision of safe and commodious facilities for NMUs is an integral element of the trunk road improvement, and as such, the required infrastructure should be included within the overall maintenance provisions for the A3 London to Portsmouth Trunk Road.
- 7.10.3 SCC note the proposal to provide a new non-motorised user (NMU) route linking the new Wisley Lane and Portsmouth Road via Ockham Park junction and would also ask that a Road Safety Audit be undertaken and sent to SCC to provide reassurance that highway safety matters have been addressed and there is a sufficient width to accommodate the projected number of users. As this facility is contiguous with SCC adopted highway it would seem sensible that SCC adopt this subject to receiving details of the specific length proposed to be adopted along with a suitable agreed commuted sum/payment as a side agreement to the DCO to cover future maintenance before we can agree to any adoption by SCC.
- 7.10.4 SCC note that some of the NMU routes pass over the M25 which is covered by the M25 Design, Build, Finance and Operate (DBFO) and would ask if Highways England have consulted with the DBFO team managing the M25 DBFO and associated operators to determine if these routes are acceptable to them and that there is funding within the M25 Junction 10 Wisley Improvement scheme to fund any maintenance liabilities / commuted sums that may be requested by the M25 DBFO. This is asked so that SCC can be reassured that the routes being promoted by the scheme are achievable/affordable.
- 7.10.5 The drawings show a bridleway on the side of the Wisley Lane realignment and is proposed to be extended to Ockham Road North junction. SCC seek clarification if this would be part of Wisley Lane (if adopted by SCC) and not a separate public right of way recorded on SCC's Definitive Map and Statement. As such this facility would be an NMU route suitable for equestrians, cyclists and walkers, that would be within the overall width of (the new section of) Wisley Lane i.e. not a separate bridleway running parallel; as this has currently been described on the plan as a 'bridleway'
- 7.10.6 If this is to incorporate a NMU route, consideration should also be given to the different requirements of equestrians to that of cyclists as the construction details are not shown. A sealed surface is needed for cyclists and equestrians need an unsealed surface, such as rough stone/type-1. Adequate width will be needed to accommodate the two parts of the

for example this relates to the section of NMU route running parallel to the A3 where this NMU route. This comment applies for all other bridleways where cycle use is also proposed; proposed route is being shown as a Restricted Byway.

- 7.10.7 The drawings show a proposed footway/cycle track adjacent to the A245 westbound carriageway, between Seven Hills Road junction and Painshill junction and indicates this facility will be on top of the new proposed retaining wall. If this is the case a pedestrian/cycle 1.4m parapet will be required and the suitability of the construction form of wall to accommodate the parapet would need to be considered. A risk assessment would be required to determine the requirement for the provision of Vehicle Restraint System between the A245 carriageway and face of a retaining wall.

## **7.11 Impact on Council's financial position and delivery of statutory responsibilities**

- 7.11.1 The Joint Councils were disappointed to learn at the Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO that Highways England do not intend to enter into any s106 agreements with the local authorities. This Local Impact Report provides detail on the areas which the Joint Councils consider it essential that a S106 Agreement is negotiated during the remaining examination period.
- 7.11.2 **Commuted sums** – SCC's position on commuted sums has been made clear throughout the period of engagement with Highways England. The rationale for seeking commuted sums is to ensure that SCC as highway authority has sufficient financial resources to fund the future costs associated with taking on the liability for the asset including maintenance, inspection, associated works and, where appropriate, renewal costs/replacement of these additional assets which it will inherit as a result of the DCO. In this way, the purpose of securing commuted sums is to fund the future maintenance of these assets.
- 7.11.3 The Maintenance Grant received from government does not reflect increased maintenance liabilities as over the last few years it has seen a steady reduction as part of austerity measures. SCC has to now bid to government for maintenance monies, for example via the challenge fund, which replaces funding that used to be provided as grant funding. This is on an annual basis and is therefore subject to government funding changes. The maintenance grant SCC receives covers specific items only and excludes other items such as public rights of way. SCC has repeatedly asked Highways England to provide a list/schedule and location plans of the components (e.g. square area of surfacing, drainage structures, street lighting, drainage ditches etc) that it is seeking that SCC adopt and maintain. This information, however, has at the time of writing not been received.
- 7.11.4 Commuted sums would be required for any additional item that Highways England are including under the scheme that they then wish SCC to adopt/maintain. Such elements could include additional carriageway surfacing, new NMU routes, structures, drainage systems, earthworks, traffic signals and green infrastructure. Highways England have, at the date of drafting, verbally confirmed that they will provide commuted sums for green infrastructure which is welcomed by SCC but we would ask for confirmation of this in writing along with confirmation for commuted sums to cover all additional infrastructure that SCC are being asked to adopt and maintain.

- 7.11.5 There is precedent for payments of commuted sums between SCC and Highways England as SCC were required to pay a substantial commuted sum payment where a County Council scheme involved works on both the County network and a Highways England slip road.
- 7.11.6 SCC have requested that, as promoter, Highways England commit to providing legal sums to meet these costs that would then be set out in a separate legal agreement.
- 7.11.7 **Protective provisions for the Highway authority** - SCC would ask that Highways England agree, either within the DCO as Protective Provisions for the Highway Authority or via a separate agreement before the DCO is finalised provisions for the protection of the Local Highway Authority where the proposed scheme impacts on the Local Road Network (LRN). Such items should include:
- (i) commuted sums covering the components Highways England are asking SCC to adopt (subject to SCC's agreement)
  - (ii) agree a local operating agreement including Communications and Customer Care, Asset Handover, Asset Inspection, Routine Maintenance and Repair during the works, incident management during the works etc.
  - (iii) Highways England to facilitate an appropriately qualified officer of the local highway authority to participate in the design process for the detailed design of those parts of the development that Highways England propose to be adopted by SCC (subject to SCC's agreement)
  - (iv) agree joint inspections of works and testing of materials (including providing copies of all test certificates and results) that Highways England are undertaking on the LRN that Highways England propose to be adopted by SCC (subject to SCC's agreement).
  - (v) provide SCC with Road Safety Audits and use reasonable endeavours to carry out recommendations as they affect the LRN
  - (vi) ensure that whilst their contractors have use of the LRN they meet operational requirements e.g. in terms of material on the highway, winter maintenance, emergencies/emergency vehicle access, making good defects
  - (vii) indemnify SCC against any liability, loss, cost or claim arising out of or incidental to the carrying out of the Works
- 7.11.8 SCC requires the DCO to make reference to the South East Permit Scheme (SEPS). It comprises a permit scheme prepared in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Those wishing to undertake works affecting the highway are required to obtain a permit before carrying them out.
- 7.11.2 Specified works would therefore be subject to the SEPS as applied by SCC as Highway Authority. Since the introductions of SEPS in November 2013, it is required to be used by those wishing to undertake works on Surrey highways. It is administered by SCC as the Highway Authority. It comprises a permit scheme prepared in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 which provides for highway authorities to co-ordinate works

affecting the highway, discharging the duty to maintain the highway network under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

- 7.11.3 Those wishing to undertake works affecting the highway are required to obtain a permit before carrying them out. The permit application is considered by the highway authority and if the authority is satisfied that the SEPS objectives are met and that the works proposed would not compromise their statutory duties to co-ordinate and manage the local highway network, a permit is issued. Regular consultation with and dialogue between the highway authority and those wishing to undertake road and street works before a permit is applied for and issued, ensures that the works are co-ordinated in a way that minimises disruption.
- 7.11.4 The permit scheme has the benefit of being familiar and widely understood. It works well and is respected by those that use it in the county. SEPS will ensure that SCC retains the ability to comply with its statutory duties to co-ordinate works affecting the local road network. This approach was agreed by the Secretaries of State in their decision letter relating to the Thames Tideway Tunnel DCO. Further consultation with TFL, the highway authority running the permit scheme within the area of the Thames Tideway Tunnel has confirmed that the permit scheme is running well and that the bespoke scheme which was negotiated but not agreed prior to the decision on that scheme has not been required.
- 7.11.5 In addition, as per Section 74a of the (amended) 1991 New Roads and Street Works Act, Surrey County Council is currently developing a Lane Rental Scheme. This will mean that on specified key sections of the Local Road Network any activities reducing the number of lanes available to traffic or impacting on the operation of a junction will incur daily Lane Rental charges throughout any works periods. The Lane Rental Scheme is not fully developed and is still subject to SCC Cabinet and DfT/Secretary of State scrutiny, however it is expected to be in place prior to the commencement of the DCO scheme.

## Chapter 8 Impact on land

- 8.1 As set out in Highway England's submission 9.1 Transferring Historic Common Land and Exchange Land on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2019, Highways England has been engaged in discussions with SCC regarding the completion of transfers of common land and exchange land which should have vested in accordance with earlier compulsory purchase orders relating to the construction of the M25 in the 1970s and 1980s, but which have not been so vested.
- 8.2 Highways England has agreed to meet the further reasonable external legal costs incurred by SCC in completing the transfers. Highways England has provided draft transfer documents to SCC, together with copies of relevant title information for the Council's approval. SCC is in dialogue with Highways England and has provided Highways England with a table setting out what it believes are the outstanding issues to resolve. Normal conveyancing processes will need to be followed including proper title investigations and SCC's external solicitors have advised that the process is likely to take between 9-12 months.
- 8.3 **Impact on Ockham Bites car park** - The Proposal shows the access track to the green bridge occupying around a third of the surfaced area of the car park. This loss in capacity will have a significant effect on visitors to the common and surrounding area, revenue from parking charges and income to the Ockham Bites Café. SCC is committed to increasing visitor numbers to this and other countryside car parks, so future capacity is needed to accommodate this increase. The proposal access road will limit any future plans for car park expansion. The remodelling of the car park and impact on the building will require accommodation works to either be undertaken by Highways England or a suitable level of funding provided.
- 8.4 The proposed access track runs through the eastern side of the car park, which is where the majority of people directly access the common. The road is on a rising embankment and will therefore create a visual and physical barrier from the car park to the common. Access to the common is also needed for maintenance vehicles and fire access
- 8.5 **Impact of NMU route** - There are extensive strips of land remaining between the NMU and the A3 carriageway along much of its length leaving enclaves of land and SCC has made comment in respect of the NMU location. In terms of SCC's land we would ask that Highways England provide suitable financial compensation to reflect the adverse impacts on retained land values (including blighting) as a result of these enclaves of land not being contiguous with the remaining land on the other side of the NMU route.

## Chapter 9 Assessment of local impact

The Joint Councils have identified issues according to their local impact. Where negative impacts are identified the Joint Councils have identified mitigation options or DCO amendments that they consider are required in order for the adverse effects of the proposed scheme to be mitigated.

### Local Road Network

Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
LRN1	<p><b>Traffic Impacts on Local Communities – Ripley</b>                      The scheme Transport Assessment Report states that, <i>“as a result of the closing the existing A3/Wisley lane junction and realigning it to the Ockham Roundabout all trips to/from Wisley Lane to/from the A3 south are expected to travel via Ripley”</i>.</p> <p>It continues <i>“the closure of the direct Wisley Lane access to the A3 means southbound trips from Wisley Lane are choosing to travel via the new link road into the Ockham Park roundabout and then through Ripley, thereby avoiding the need to U-turn at M25 junction 10. This results in a large journey time improvement compared to either the existing journey via Ripley, as well as the probable ‘signed’ route via M25 junction 10 in the Do Something scenario. The scheme results in all trips routeing via Ripley as this route becomes the fastest option”</i> (para’s 7.8.5, 7.8.6, 7.8.12 and 7.8.14 and Figure 7.11 of Volume 7.4 Transport Assessment)</p>	<p>That Highways England confirm in writing their support and progress to conclusion the Approval in Principle for north facing slips at the Burntcommon junction.</p> <p>It is requested that appropriate mitigation is provided through Ripley. Mitigation to be secured through a s106.</p>	<p>Under the criteria for good design as set out in NPSNN Para 4.31 it is stated “a good design should meet the principal objectives of the scheme by eliminating or substantially mitigating the identified problems by improving operational conditions and simultaneously minimising adverse impacts. It should also mitigate any existing adverse impacts wherever possible, for example, in relation to safety or the environment. A good design will also be one that sustains the improvements to operational efficiency for as many years as is practicable, taking into account capital cost, economics and environmental impacts.”</p> <p>NPSNN Para 3.22 sets out “Severance can be a problem in some locations. Where appropriate applicants should seek to deliver improvements that reduce community severance and improve accessibility.”</p>



Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
	<p>Highways England, however, state (in para 7.5.3) that the assessment has not considered any mitigation in Ripley to manage changes in traffic flow resulting from the scheme.</p> <p>The Joint Councils consider that without mitigation the impact on Ripley is unacceptable.</p>		<p>NPPF para 102 provides “Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that (d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains...”</p> <p>The SCC Development Control Good Practice Guide details how the Highway Authority require applicants to enter into planning obligations to mitigate scheme effects.</p>
LRN2	<p><b><u>Painshill junction</u></b> There is no clarity around ownership/maintenance of the pedestrian crossing at the A3 southbound on slip from Painshill junction roundabout.</p>	It should be confirmed through the DCO that Highways England own and maintain this signal crossing.	N/A
LRN3	<p><b><u>A245 Byfleet Road</u></b> The scheme includes works to the Local Road Network at Painshill junction and A245/Seven Hills Road junction.</p> <p>The A245 is recognised by the Joint Authorities as a congestion hotspot and as such they are keen to ensure that all outstanding concerns and queries have been addressed by Highways England to ensure that</p>	That the scheme incorporates controlled crossing facilities across the A245 Byfleet Road to the west of Seven Hills Road (north) to allow Non-Motorised Users to cross the A245 and access proposed cycle facilities that was being promoted as part of the scheme and associated	NPSNN Para 3.17 sets out “the Government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the

Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
	<p>there is no detrimental impact for this section of the network.</p> <p>SCC support measures such as the banned right turn onto the A245 from Seven Hills Road (north) but a number of queries asked of Highways England relating to this section of the scheme remain unanswered. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Justification for the proposal of only a single lane exit from Seven Hills Road (North) to show how this junction would operate in respect of the capacity / anticipated queuing at this junction to show that the junction operates efficiently.</li> <li>- Confirmation that there is sufficient space within the red line boundary in the vicinity of the left turn filter to Seven Hills Road South to allow construction of the junction and Feltonfleet access in this area.</li> <li>- Confirmation that Highways England have investigated the potential to link the Painshill and A245/Seven Hills Road traffic signal control.</li> <li>- Confirmation that consideration has been given to extending the length of the nearside left turn lane on the A245 eastbound arm of the Seven Hills junction to improve the traffic flow at this junction (there is a verge at the rear of the existing footway that could allow the footway to be realigned to provide space).</li> </ul>	<p>Highways England Designated funds (a cycle link from Cobham across the Painshill junction and along the A245 to Brooklands).</p> <p>The NMU route proposed along Seven Hills Road (south) currently stops short of the A245/Seven Hills junction (the route seems to be continuous from Ockham Roundabout to Seven Hills Road South and then stops). The Joint Councils request that a cycle facility be provided along the eastern side of Seven Hills Road (south) to connect up with the NMU route proposed on the A245 and provide a continuous link between Ockham Road Roundabout and Painshill as the proposed M25 Junction 10 scheme includes banning cyclists on the main A3.</p> <p>That the Old Byfleet Road adjacent to Feltonfleet school be stopped up as part of the DCO only in the event of the proposal to ban the straight ahead and right turn out of Seven Hills</p>	<p>latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.”</p> <p>SCC’s Congestion Programme and Elmbridge Local Transport Strategy identify congestion issues on the A245 Byfleet Road/B365 Seven Hills Road and highlights the need for pedestrian and cycle improvements along the corridor.</p> <p>The Surrey Cycling Strategy prioritises achieving high quality, joined up cycle routes within the county.</p>

Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
	<p>In addition revised traffic modelling and environmental information is required in relation to change 3 of AS-023 submitted by Highways England.</p> <p>The Joint Councils have a number of specific requests for incorporation into the scheme design to optimise junction layout and non motorised user provision as well as ensuring there is future proofing for further improvements at a later date. .</p>	<p>(north) as part of the proposed mitigation arrangements.</p> <p>Seven Hills Road (south) will require resurfacing/highway maintenance improvements along its whole length as part of the Highways England project as under the proposals additional traffic will now be using Seven Hills Road (south) to provide access to properties on the west side of the A3 that would no longer have access from the A3.</p>	
LRN4	<p><b><u>Variable Message Sign Technology</u></b>            SCC has two existing VMS on the A245 either side of the Painshill A3 junction. SCC asks that as part of the scheme Highways England replace these signs as an essential tool to inform motorists of both immediate incidents and planned works as well as to provide a useful tool to aid communication around scheme construction progress.</p>	<p>To be secured through the DCO by S106. All VMS infrastructure and technology should come with a commuted sum.</p>	<p>To support a key element of the Surrey Congestion Strategy which aims to improve the day-to-day proactive management of the network by working in partnership with other organisations, such as Highways England</p>
LRN5	<p><b><u>Structures</u></b>            As Highway Authority, SCC has been asked to adopt a number of structures proposed as part of the scheme. A full schedule providing detail on these structures has not yet been provided.</p>	<p>See comments made below at SCC1 on the need for Protective Provisions for the Highways Authority.</p>	<p>The SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide sets out how SCC works with applicants under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (S278s) and use this mechanism to ensure safety and construction standards. Commuted</p>

Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
		<p>There are specific areas where approval of the Highway Authority will be required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approval of the design (loading, dimensions etc.) of the structure</li> <li>- Agreement on future maintenance responsibilities</li> <li>- Agreement that adequate maintenance access will be provided for all structures (including consideration to hard standings for maintenance vehicles). Land acquired should be adequate to accommodate suitable access for future inspection, maintenance and reconstruction of the highway asset. Where access strips are needed, SCC’s preference is to have these as part of the public highway rather than only an easement over third party land.</li> </ul>	<p>sums for maintenance and inspection fees are required.</p>
LRN6	<p><b><u>Structures supporting permanent/temporary highways</u></b>  SCC will need to agree technical approval of any temporary structure/works that support an SCC permanent or temporary highway (including Rights of Way). This is regardless of whether it is on SCC land.</p>	<p>See comments made below at SCC1 on the need for Protective Provisions for the Highways Authority.</p>	<p>The SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide sets out how SCC works with applicants under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (S278s) and use this mechanism to ensure safety and construction standards. Commuted</p>

Ref	Specific Issue – Local Road Network	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc)
	SCC also has an interest in third party owned structures crossing SCC highway and will need to be involved in the decision making on these elements to ensure that these structures do not restrict SCC’s highway networks.	There are specific areas where approval of the Highway Authority will be required.	sums for maintenance and inspection fees are required.
LRN7	<b>HGV parking</b> Concern that the loss of HGV parking laybys has not been adequately addressed within the scheme	That Highways England retain provision for HGV parking within the scheme	In line with the approach of the 2011 SCC Freight Strategy which advocates that freight issues are considered as part of major applications.
LRN8	<b>Collaborative Traffic Management (CTM) approach</b> Highways England to agree a CTM approach with SCC regarding the interaction of Highways England operated/maintained traffic signals with those operated and maintained by SCC.	SCC request that this scheme is included in the approach being developed by Highways England and that the Junction 10 team liaise with the CTM project.	It is understood that Highways England are developing/implementing a collaborative Traffic Management Approach programme.

### Non motorised users

Ref	Specific Issue – Non motorised users	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
NMU 1	<b>Maintenance of proposed parallel NMU route</b> This is a replacement for the current NMU route (maintained by Highways England) adjacent to the A3 and the current legal right to cycle on the A3 which Highways England are proposing to remove under the proposed scheme	That Highways England confirm their commitment to maintenance responsibilities for the NMU within the DCO.	NPSNN Para 3.17 sets out “the Government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the

Ref	Specific Issue – Non motorised users	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
			latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.”
NMU 2	<p><b><u>Confirmation of construction detail for NMU routes</u></b> To date construction details, including gradients and surface treatment, of new and altered PROWs have not been shown.</p>	That this construction detail for NMU routes is included within the DCO and that SCC is a consultee on this aspect.	In line with SCC’s Right of Way Improvement Plan which recommends a focus on the needs of network users.
NMU 3	<p><b><u>Pedestrian access from the proposed RHS Wisley bus stop to the gardens</u></b> The Joint Councils consider that there will be a detrimental impact on bus users who will have to walk from the Ockham bus stops along the realigned Wisley Lane to access RHS Wisley Gardens which is some distance away (circa 1.2km).</p>	As a minimum the scheme must include a pedestrian footway on the realigned Wisley Lane to provide access to RHS Wisley Gardens	<p>NPSNN Para 3.20 “The Government expects applicants to improve access, wherever possible, on and around the national networks by designing and delivering schemes that take account of the accessibility requirements of all those who use, or are affected by, national networks infrastructure, including disabled users. All reasonable opportunities to deliver improvements in accessibility on and to the existing national road network should also be taken wherever appropriate.”</p> <p>As specified in the SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide the highway authority will consider applications to ensure that non-car transport infrastructure can accommodate people’s everyday movement needs, such as ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adequate footways exist, and</li> <li>- suitably equipped bus stops exist within a reasonable walking distance</li> </ul>

Ref	Specific Issue – Non motorised users	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
			Where the existing highway infrastructure is inadequate, it is requested that the developer design and undertake necessary improvements.
NMU 4	<p><b><u>Need for further measures to compensate for removal of A3 bus stops</u></b></p> <p>The nearest bus stops will be on the northbound off slip and southbound on slip. These bus stops/shelters should be upgraded to an agreed form with real time passenger information provided as these existing bus stops are neither particularly convenient nor a pleasant place to wait.</p> <p>In addition clarification is required as to whether Highways England has investigated the potential for bus operators to divert their routes into the bus turnaround at RHS Wisley.</p>	Upgrades to bus stops to be secured through the DCO by S106	As above – see NMU3

### **Road safety**

Ref	Specific Issue – Road Safety	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
RS2	<p><b><u>Inadequacy of Road Safety Audit</u></b></p> <p>SCC consider that Road Safety Audit that has been made available is not comprehensive (as set out in para 7.7), in that information for additional locations should have been included.</p>	That additional Road Safety Audit evidence is provided for assessment during the course of the examination.	<p>NPSNN Para 4.62 sets out the road safety audit process to be followed to ensure that the operational road safety experience is applied to design.</p> <p>Section 39 of the 1998 Road Traffic Act</p>

			The SCC Transport Development Control Good Practice Guide details the requirements for planning applications assessed by the County Council in relation to safety audits.
--	--	--	---

**Impact on Surrey County Council’s financial position and ability to deliver statutory responsibilities**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Specific Issue – Impact on SCC</b>	<b>Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required</b>	<b>Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence)</b>
<b>SCC1</b>	<p><b><u>Adoption of new/proposed scheme components</u></b>            SCC await a full schedule of the scheme elements that it is proposed will be adopted by the Highway Authority, but it includes additional carriageway surfacing, structures (including maintenance access), drainage systems, new drainage pond for pollution control, earthworks, traffic signals and green infrastructure.</p> <p>In non DCO situations where Highways England undertake works on the Local Road Network it is usual for Highways England to enter into an agreement with the Local Highway Authority under section 4 of the Highways Act 1980. This provides for obligations such as works being completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council, changes to the works requiring consent, Highways England paying the cost of the works, Highways England indemnifying the Council against certain claims which may be made against it and a clear description of works within the highway boundary. It is not clear to SCC, as Local</p>	<p>That Highways England include “Protective Provisions for the Local Highway Authority” within the dDCO.</p> <p>SCC maintain that the position of the highway authority is no different from that of the third parties whose interests are currently protected under Schedule 9.</p> <p>This schedule should include headings such as Provision of Detailed Information, The Local Highway and the Works, Stage 3 Certificate and the Maintenance Period, Inspection and Test of Materials, Final Certificate, Payment of Costs etc.</p>	More detail is included in SCC2 below.



Ref	Specific Issue – Impact on SCC	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence)
	Highway Authority where the requirement for a section 4 provision would fit under the DCO.		
SCC2	<p><b><u>Commuted sums</u></b> As Highway Authority SCC is concerned at the lack of reassurance within the DCO in respect of the maintenance burden that would fall to SCC for elements of the scheme that SCC will be forced to adopt.</p> <p>The rationale for seeking commuted sums is to ensure that SCC as highway authority has sufficient financial resources to fund the future costs associated with taking on the liability for the asset including maintenance, inspection, associated works and, where appropriate, renewal costs/replacement of these additional assets which it will inherit as a result of the Order. Any funding received from Government through the Revenue Support Grant is insufficient. In this way, the purpose of securing commuted sums is to fund the future maintenance of these assets</p>	<p>That Highways England include “Protective Provisions for the Local Highway Authority” within the dDCO.</p> <p>SCC maintain that the position of the highway authority is no different from that of the third parties whose interests are currently protected under Schedule 9.</p> <p>This schedule should include the provision of commuted sums to SCC.</p>	<p>The Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport’s (ADEPT) published a guidance document on ‘Commuted Sums for Maintaining Infrastructure Assets’ in November 2009. This document has been widely adopted by local highway authorities and has been broadly accepted as national standard procedures and principles for the assessment and collection of commuted sums.</p> <p>The SCC Transportation Development Control Good Practice Guide details SCC’s approach to commuted sums</p>
SCC3	<p><b><u>Absence of a S106 agreement</u></b> The Joint Councils were disappointed to learn at the Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO that Highways England do not intend to enter into any s106 agreements with the local authorities.</p>	<p>This Local Impact Report provides detail on the areas which the Joint Councils consider it essential that a S106 Agreement is negotiated during the remaining examination period.</p>	<p>Under the criteria for good design as set out in NPSNN Para 4.31 it is stated “a good design should meet the principal objectives of the scheme by eliminating or substantially mitigating the identified problems by improving operational conditions and simultaneously minimising adverse impacts.”</p>

## Land interests

Ref	Specific Issue – Land interests	Summary of Council’s proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
LI1	<p><b><u>Adverse impact/blighting on County Council’s retained land alongside the NMU route</u></b></p> <p>There are extensive strips of land remaining between the NMU and the A3 carriageway along much of its length leaving enclaves of land.</p>	<p>That Highways England clarify their approach to financial compensation for these orphaned strips of land.</p>	<p>Proposals will result in a material impact on the value of the land as a result of these enclaves of land not being contiguous with the remaining land on the other side of the NMU route.</p>
LI2	<p><b><u>Ockham Bites car park</u></b></p> <p>Proposals show a loss in car park capacity of approximately one third. The proposed access track will also create a visual and physical barrier from the car park to the common.</p>	<p>Scheme to fund and incorporate suitable accommodation works to remodel the car park to create replacement parking.</p> <p>Requests for Highways England to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- investigate reducing height of embankment and creation of easily accessible public and vehicular access across access track to link with common</li> <li>- investigate the feasibility of realigning the access track to the western side/rear of café.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposals will have a material impact on an SCC asset and requesting re-provision of car parking capacity is a proportionate approach to accommodation works.</p>

## Biodiversity

Ref	Specific Issue	Summary of Council's proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
B1	<p><b><u>Land management agreements and commuted sums</u></b>            The detail of land management agreements and associated commuted sum payments remain to be finalised.</p>	<p>Requirement for S106 agreement negotiation to be concluded during 6 month examination period.</p>	<p>NPSNN Para 5.181 states “The Secretary of State should also consider whether mitigation of any adverse effects on green infrastructure or open space is adequately provided for by means of any planning obligations, for example, to provide exchange land and provide for appropriate management and maintenance agreements”</p>
B2	<p><b><u>Green bridge maintenance</u></b>            Management agreement and commuted sums required for SCC maintenance element of green bridge.            The green bridge appears to be integral to the scheme in linking the new heathland areas. Concerns around maintenance responsibilities and the associated funding to undertake maintenance remain. SCC consider that maintenance should be dealt with in the same manner as other compensatory mitigation.</p>	<p>Management agreement and commuted sum for maintenance element of green bridge to be secured through the DCO by S106 Agreement.</p>	<p>NPSNN Para 5.36 states “in particular, the applicant should demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- developments will be designed and landscaped to provide green corridors and minimise habitat fragmentation where reasonable;</li> <li>- opportunities will be taken to enhance existing habitats and, where practicable, to create new habitats of value within the site landscaping proposals, for example through techniques such as the 'greening' of existing network crossing points, the use of green bridges..”</li> </ul> <p>NPSNN Para 5.37 states “The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any</p>

Ref	Specific Issue	Summary of Council's proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
			consent and/or in any planning obligations entered into in order to ensure that mitigation measures are delivered."

### Lead Local Flood Authority

Ref	Specific Issue	Summary of Council's proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
LLFA 1	<b><u>Protective provisions for Surrey County Council in respect of ordinary watercourses</u></b> Any works to any watercourse will need to be assessed and approved.	To reach an agreed position on Protective Provisions for inclusion at Schedule 9.	In compliance with SCC's role as Lead Local Flood Authority
LLFA 2	<b><u>Manor Pond</u></b> Clarity required on maintenance responsibilities as well as access arrangements	If required, management agreement and commuted sum for maintenance to be secured through the DCO by S106	NPSNN Para 5.37 states "The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any consent and/or in any planning obligations entered into in order to ensure that mitigation measures are delivered."

### Materials and Waste

Ref	Specific Issue	Summary of Council's proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
WA1	<b><u>Outstanding queries around waste and material assumptions used</u></b> SCC has raised queries relating to:	That further detail is provided through the examination process.	In line with policies and objectives of the emerging Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capacity for both hazardous waste and topsoil material.</li> <li>- Transport implications of obtaining heavy material (particularly aggregate)</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

Ref	Specific Issue	Summary of Council's proposed mitigation/ DCO amendment required	Relevant Planning Consideration (NPS, Local Policy, Guidance, Local Evidence etc.)
WA1	<p><b><u>Concerns around impacts to the LRN during construction</u></b></p> <p>HE are required to produce a Traffic Management Plan in accordance with Requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of the DCO. SCC note that Highways England have shared with SCC a draft Traffic Management Plan (TMP) setting out proposed diversion routes during construction. SCC have raised concerns on this TMP (at a meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2019) which Highways England are to address before SCC can agree to the TMP.</p>	<p>SCC require HE to submit for its approval the Traffic Management Plan in accordance with Requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of the DCO within the Examination period.</p>	<p>Traffic Management Act 2004</p>

## Comments on DCO document

The Joint Councils also have a number of specific comments on the draft DCO drafting. Further comments will be made at deadline 3, following submission of the first revised dDCO.

Draft DCO comment	
Ref	Comment
DCO1	<p>Throughout the dDCO, deemed consent is conferred if a consultee has not responded within a certain amount of time – often 28 days. Any such application for consent should contain a clear reference to this deemed consent provision and this should be expressly required within all such provisions.</p> <p>The phrase unreasonably withheld is also included throughout the dDCO, with no definition provided.</p>
DCO2	<p>Part 1, Citation and commencement, para 6 rather than the wording “will be no less advantageous than” should it state “will be improved and enhanced than it was before”?</p>
DCO3	<p><b>Article 2 Interpretation</b></p> <p>The definition of maintain is broad and the County Council query what is meant by a number of the terms. The County Council has specific concern at the use of the tailpiece as there is no clarity on the process that would be followed to determine if works do give rise to any materially different effects to those identified in the ES.</p>
DCO4	<p><b>Article 9 - Consent to transfer benefit of order</b></p> <p>The County Council request further detail as to why this would be necessary. Where this would apply to the Local Road Network, the County Council would like consideration to be given to a requirement to consult the Highway Authority</p>
DCO5	<p><b>Article 10 – Application of the 1991 Act</b></p> <p>The County Council consider that Article 10 should be drafted to confirm that the Scheme would be subject to the South East Permit Scheme (SEPS), operated by Surrey County Council under the Traffic Management Act 2004 which changes the notification system under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991’. Section 56 –C of the 1991 Act (amended by Section 43 of the TMA 2004) should not be dis-applied. This will enable SCC to better fulfil its ‘Network Management Duty’ as required by the TMA 2004, and provide a greater degree of confidence for the delivery of scheme without concerns over conflicting works on the Local Road Network impacting upon the scheme delivery programme. Adherence to the SEPS will ensure that other activities on the highway can be successfully coordinated around the delivery of the scheme and the systems used for SEPS will allow for accurate information on the works being carried out on the Local Highway Network to be automatically populated and updated onto existing public facing websites thus minimising un-necessary direct contacts to customer contact centres of both the Applicant and the Local Highway Authority. On those Local Highway Authority Streets where the Surrey Lane Rental Scheme (SLRS) is in operation, as per Section 74a of the (amended) 1991 Act, works in relation to the Scheme which adversely impact upon traffic flows during the traffic sensitive times specified in the National Street Gazetteer (NSG) will be subject to a daily Lane Rental charge at the applicable rate as set out in the SLRS.</p>
DCO6	<p><b>Article 11 – Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets</b></p> <p>Expand title of article to “Construction and maintenance of new, altered and diverted streets and other structures”</p>

Draft DCO comment	
Ref	Comment
	<p>SCC is concerned at the lack of reassurance that the structure of this article provides for Highways Authorities in respect of the maintenance burden that would fall to SCC. In non DCO situations where Highways England (are undertaking works on the Local Road Network it is usual for Highways England to enter into an agreement with the Local Highway Authority under section 4 of the Highways Act 1980. This provides for obligations such as works being completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council, changes to the works requiring consent, Highways England paying the cost of the works, Highways England indemnifying the Council against certain claims which may be made against it and a clear description of works within the highway boundary. It is not clear to SCC, as Local Highway Authority where the requirement for a section 4 provision would fit under the DCO. SCC require detail on what consultation and approval mechanism are proposed.</p> <p>We would request that an additional part be added to Schedule 9 (Protective Provisions) entitled <b><i>“For the Protection of the Local Highway Authority”</i></b>. The position of the highway authority requires protection in addition to those third parties whose interests are currently protected under Schedule 9.</p> <p>Under Article 11 (1), (2) would request that after the wording “unless agreed with the local highway authority” be revised to state wording “unless agreed in writing with the local highway authority”</p> <p>Under Article 11 (3) would request that after “waterproofing membrane)” the wording “unless agreed in writing with the local highway authority” be added.</p> <p>‘reasonable satisfaction’ ‘otherwise agreed’ – these need to be tightened up and a mechanism for agreement/approval put in place</p> <p>Provisions should include a maintenance period or Defects Liability Period (DLP)</p>
DCO7	<p><b>Article 12 – Classification of roads</b> 12(1) Definition of open for traffic is required</p>
DCO8	<p><b>Article 13 – Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets</b> 13(1) In the absence of a definition of reasonable here and throughout, it is assumed that the arbitration provision at Article 47 will be invoked.</p> <p>13(5) Part 1 of the 1961 Act relates to compensation for Compulsory Acquisition. Would it apply here?</p> <p>13(6) Is there a reason for this departure from Article 11 of the GMP?</p>
DCO9	<p><b>Article 15 – Access to works</b> As drafted, the undertaker may form and layout means of access or improve existing means of access without seeking consent/approval/agreement of the relevant highway authority or street authority. Clearly such consent/approval/agreement must be sought from the relevant authority. If required, SCC can provide a form of words.</p>

<b>Draft DCO comment</b>	
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Comment</b>
DCO10	<p><b>Article 17 – Traffic regulation</b></p> <p>SCC will make further comment on these provisions. Initial comments include:  17 (2) Consenting process required and a definition of ‘unreasonably withheld’  17 (8) Highways England is only required to take representations into consideration – not to act on them</p>
DCO11	<p><b>Part 4 Article 18 – Discharge of water</b></p> <p>18(6)(a) should this reference be to Homes England?</p>
DCO12	<p><b>Article 20 – Authority to survey and investigate land</b></p> <p>A requirement should be included to ensure that the undertaker restores the land to the condition and level it was in on the date on which the survey or investigation began or other such condition as may be agreed with the owner of the land.</p> <p>20(1) This article authorises the entering on to of any land within the Order limits or which may be affected by the authorised development. What is envisaged by ‘may be affected by the authorised development’? This appears to be a very broad power to enter land.</p> <p>20(7) It is unclear how section 13 of the 1965 Act can be made to apply to an authority to survey and investigate land in this way using section 125 of the Planning Act 2008 and perhaps the undertaker can clarify this. It should be borne in mind that section 13 provides a mechanism for obtaining a warrant to deliver possession with costs to be paid by the person refusing to give possession to be offset against any compensation payable by the acquiring authority and if none, recovery can be effected using the procedure in Schedule 12 to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 (taking control of goods).</p>
DCO13	<p><b>Part 5 Powers of Acquisition and Possession of Land</b></p> <p>Further comment on this part of the draft DCO will be made during the relevant issue specific hearings.</p>
DCO14	<p><b>Article 31 – Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development</b></p> <p>31 (1) (c) The provision of means of access should be subject to highway authority approval.</p> <p>There may be considerable time between taking of possession and up to two years after completion of authorised development. This may have potential wide ranging consequences.</p>
DCO15	<p><b>Article 32 – Temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development</b></p> <p>32 (1) Maintenance period should be clarified or defined.</p> <p>32 (1) (b) The provision of means of access should be subject to the approval of the highway authority.</p> <p>This could be considered more akin to acquisition of a right to enter into land over a long period or an intermittent period of time, rather than temporary possession.</p>
DCO16	<p><b>Part 6 Article 38– Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows</b></p> <p>6.38 (3) Do the compensation provisions of the 1961 Act apply here without modification?</p> <p>6.38 (4) Consent from the relevant Local Authority should be required prior to the removal of any hedgerow or part not specifically identified on the Schedule and plan.</p>



<b>Draft DCO comment</b>	
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Comment</b>
DCO17	<b>Part 7 – Article 47 Arbitration</b> Queried how arbitration costs are to be dealt with.
DCO18	<b>Requirement 3 – Construction and handover environmental management plans</b> 3(4) Add in “upon completion of construction of the authorised development the CEMP must be converted into the HEMP and the authorised development must be operated and maintained in accordance with the HEMP” (the HEMP must be prepared before completion to allow for timely conversion)
DCO19	<b>Requirement 23 – Anticipatory steps towards compliance with any requirement</b> What steps are contemplated within this provision as steps taken before the coming into force of the Order which may be taken into account for determining compliance? Are they steps that would have been agreed with the relevant planning authority?
DCO20	<b>Schedule 9 – SCC</b> request that additional Protective Provisions “For the Protection of the Local Highway Authority” be added.
DCO21	<b>Schedule 9 – Part 4 For the Protection of Surrey County Council in respect of ordinary watercourses</b> Discussions are underway with Highways England to seek agreement on the wording of the Protective Provisions.