

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

TR010030

9.47 List of references to traffic movements in alternatives from Issue Specific Hearing 2

Rule 8(1)(k)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

January 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

Development Consent Order 202[x]

9.47 List of references to traffic movements in alternatives from Issue Specific Hearing 2

Regulation Number:	8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010030
Application Document Reference	TR010030/EXAM/9.47
Author:	M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange project team, Highways England and Atkins

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	28 January 2020	Deadline 3

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1. Introduction	4
2. References to traffic movements in alternative Scheme options	5

1. Introduction

1.1.1 This document has been prepared in response to item 16 set out in the letter from the Planning Inspectorate titled Action Points from Issue Specific Hearing 2 dated 20th January 2020.

1.1.2 The item requested of the applicant is:

“Submit a table setting out the traffic movements that were referred to by Interested Parties under Agenda items 3a) to g).”

1.1.3 Agenda items 3a) to g) are as follows:

“a) The ExA will ask the Applicant to provide a summary of the details of the 21 options considered prior to Option 14 being selected as its preferred option. Furthermore, the Applicant will be asked to provide an explanation of the process for assessing and discounting the various options.

b) Access and associated security arrangements for Heyswood Campsite and Court Close Farm.

c) Access arrangements for Painshill Park.

d) Access arrangements for the former San Domenico Hotel site. To include consideration of any implications for complying with highway design standards stated in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

e) Access arrangements at Elm Corner.

f) The role that the potential provision of north facing slips at the Burnt Common junction, in association with the redevelopment of the former Wisley Airfield, would play in relieving existing and future traffic on the local road network.

g) The RHS alternative scheme, i.e. retention of left turn out of Wisley Lane and provision of south facing slips at the Oakham Park junction/roundabout. To include consideration of any implications for complying with highway design standards stated in the DMRB and any other relevant guidance.”

1.1.4 Section 2 summarises all mentions of traffic movements under the agenda items above, as referenced by Interested Parties (IPs) during Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2), which took place on the 15th and 16th January 2020.

2. References to traffic movements in alternative Scheme options

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
3 (general)	23:35 (Part 1)	Highways England Surrey County Council	Terminology to be used throughout the hearing	HE: During the hearing, discussions will use varying terminology depending on what is appropriate to the subject, including Two Way Average Annual Daily Traffic Flows, flows during a particular hour and flows by direction. SCC: Agreement with this approach.
3b	1:08:19 (Part 1)	Girlguiding Greater London West	Heyswood Campsite Access – Court Close Farm	Residents at the property next door to the campsite (Court Close Farm), which would share the proposed access, comprise 8 lodgers within the one property. This results in a significantly higher number of movements to the property than would ordinarily be expected.
3b	1:45:35 (Part 1)	Girlguiding Greater London West	Heyswood Campsite Access – traffic generation to the campsite	The majority of traffic is Friday to Sunday, though traffic is more varied throughout school holidays. ~9,900 vehicles moved on and off the site over the entire course of 2019. For a typical Friday at full occupancy of the residential blocks, there would be up to 100 vehicle movements (in & out). It is difficult to be precise as vehicle movements vary greatly based on occupancy and the activities being undertaken on a given day. There have been events where there were up to 500 vehicle movements during a single day. Predominantly vehicle traffic is in private cars, with occasional access by coaches and minibuses. Coaches and minibuses will usually leave the site following drop-off and return later to pick-up.
3b	1:50:51 (Part 1)	Girlguiding Greater London West	Heyswood Campsite Access – Court Close Farm	Court Close Farm are conscious that they would prefer not to drive across the campsite regularly, due to the number of vehicles at the property (belonging to the 8 lodgers).
3b	1:51:55 (Part 1)	Surrey County	Heyswood Campsite Access –	The road, from the access off the A3 on-slip to the boundary of

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
		Council	Appropriateness of design	<p>Heyswood Campsite, has been designed to the appropriate standard, given the traffic generated by the Girl Guides Association.</p> <p>Beyond the eastern boundary of Heyswood Campsite, where the road would run through campsite land and on to Court Close Farm, this road would only need to be single lane track (minimum 3m wide), as it serves only one property.</p>
3b	2:08:30 (Part 1)	Painshill Residents Association	Heyswood Campsite Access – Access off the Painshill southbound on-slip road	Siting of the proposed junction is vulnerable and could be unsafe, as vehicular traffic tends to accelerate rapidly as it leaves the Painshill interchange before joining the A3.
3c	2:12:20 (Part 1)	Painshill Park Trust	Painshill Park – Western access	<p>Western access gate (onto the A3) is used infrequently, by emergency vehicles, and by contractors, whose access would be programmed. Several upcoming works on this side of Painshill Park would require access by contractors for restoration work.</p> <p>Construction vehicles would include large trucks to remove timber according to a timetable of proposed works.</p>
3d	2:40:32 (Part 1)	Highways England & Surrey County Council	San Domenico Site	<p>HE accepts that the existing businesses on the Former San Domenico site depends on passing trade for their viability and that the scheme would remove access and result in this type of business becoming unviable.</p> <p>SCC agrees with this position and future development would be subject to a separate application and Transport Assessment.</p>
3f	04:45 (Part 2)	Guildford Borough Council & Surrey County Council	Wisley Airfield – Distribution of traffic	<p>The distribution of traffic was not in dispute between Surrey County Council and WPIL within the planning appeal for the proposed Wisley Airfield development.</p> <p>SCC is not currently able to interpret this in terms of resultant traffic flows via Ripley, however a paper could be produced at Second Written Questions.</p>
3f	08:30 (Part 2)	Surrey County Council	Burntcommon North Facing Slips	North facing slips would remove other long distance traffic from Ripley High Street, mitigating the need for further capacity for traffic serving

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
				the proposed Wisley Airfield development.
3f	11:18 (Part 2)	Guildford Borough Council & Surrey County Council	Burntcommon North Facing Slips	<p>The Strategic Highways Assessment Report looked at Burntcommon slips with traffic management on Ripley High Street, in combination with a previous iteration of the M25 J10 Scheme.</p> <p>The conclusion was that, coupled with traffic calming measures in Ripley, the north facing slips at Burnt Common reduced the flow of B2215 traffic through the village by approximately 200 vehicles each way in the a.m. peak hour (with the Local Plan growth in place and in comparison to the Do Nothing scenario).</p> <p>Modelling undertaken by GBC & SCC found that north facing slips at Burntcommon would be both easier to achieve given geographical and geometric constraints than south facing slips at Ockham Interchange, and would also have a greater impact on reducing traffic through Ripley. However, this scenario does not account for the rerouting of Wisley Lane nor an increase in visitor numbers at RHS.</p>
3f	38:27 (Part 2)	Guildford Borough Council & Surrey County Council	Effects of the Scheme on Wisley Airfield scheme.	Increase in traffic flows along Old Lane would conflict with the stated requirements of Local Plan allocation A35, as it would discourage and restrict the use of Old Lane as a cycle route connecting Wisley Airfield to Effingham Junction station.
3f	42:55 (Part 2)	Guildford Borough Council & Highways England	Allowance for growth at RHS Wisley.	<p>GBC: In the absence of the NSIP Scheme no allowance was made in the Local Plan for forecasted growth at RHS Wisley, in terms of traffic dispersion onto local roads, as the existing A3 access would have been retained.</p> <p>HE: Modelling has been undertaken for a “busy day”, which assumes visitor numbers of approximately double those of an average day under RHS Wisley’s growth scenario.</p>
3g	1:11:25 (Part 2)	RHS Wisley & Highways England	RHS Wisley – Traffic to RHS originating from the south	<p>There were discrepancies between HE and RHS traffic figures as to the proportion of traffic accessing RHS Wisley from the south on the A3.</p> <p>HE: This discrepancy may have arisen through different methodologies of data gathering. HE utilised number plate recognition, and RHS used</p>

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
				<p>its membership database.</p> <p>RHS: This is partially correct. Calculations were based on visitor numbers rather than all visits (for example including deliveries and staff), so it was felt that membership data was the most appropriate data source. HE's ANPR survey only covered one weekday when visitor numbers were lower than normal.</p>
3g	1:40:39 (Part 2)	RHS Wisley & Highways England	RHS Wisley – Concerns around rerouting of visitor traffic	<p>RHS: Access from the south is of particular concern, but there are also issues in terms of access from the north.</p> <p>RHS had been concerned throughout the development of the Scheme, that the proposal would encourage traffic from the south to divert via Ripley and Send.</p> <p>REP2-011 Table 4.1 shows 2015 base AADT flow for Ripley High Street of 17,410. By 2037, Do Something number for this flow is 30,360, which is a 75% increase and unsustainable.</p> <p>The DCO scheme would also require visitors leaving RHS to route over the bridge via Ockham Park Interchange to join the A3 northbound, whereas the existing situation requires only a simple left-out turn. This is an added inconvenience.</p> <p>HE: It should be noted that the Do Minimum predicted AADT flow along Ripley High Street, without the Scheme is 28,942, a 5% difference not 75%. The increase in traffic is due to other developments such as Wisley Airfield, and other background growth in traffic. This number does not account for any reduction in traffic flows through Ripley associated with Burntcommon north facing slips.</p>
3g	1:57:28 (Part 2)	RHS Wisley	RHS Wisley – HE's traffic model	<p>REP2-011 Tables 2.8 and 2.9 show increases in journey times for RHS Wisley traffic with the NSIP Scheme for both the route via J10 and the route via Ripley.</p> <p>In terms of Table 4.1, reference to the base scenario was to put the increase in traffic in context. Ripley is already congested, and as a consequence of this HE has struggled to produce validated junction models that replicate the congestion which already exists. HE are not</p>

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
				providing mitigation in Ripley despite forecasts for traffic from RHS and Wisley Airfield to divert via Ripley High Street.
3g	2:02:29 (Part 2)	Highways England	RHS Wisley – Safety and design standards of alternatives	<p>The Scheme has been designed to comply with DMRB, and overall traffic to RHS Wisley travelling through J10 will be a small percentage (5% increase due to the Scheme). There will be an increase in traffic through Ripley, but there would be no materially greater safety risk.</p> <p>By contrast, a new left-out option from Wisley Lane onto the A3, particularly with increased visitor numbers, would be substandard in design and require vehicles to cross over up to two lanes of traffic to move into the correct lane. This is not considered to be a safe movement.</p>
3g	2:04:47 (Part 2)	Surrey County Council	RHS Wisley – Through traffic via Wisley Airfield development	<p>SCC: Assuming there was a through route across the Wisley Airfield development, there could be scope for RHS traffic to cut across the Wisley Airfield development and join the A3 at Old Lane, rather than route through Ripley.</p> <p>RHS: Agreement with the position of SCC.</p> <p>HE: Internal layout for the Wisley Airfield development is a matter for the developer and SCC.</p> <p>ExA: This should be considered by the Applicant, as it will have implications for the traffic model. This will be raised in the Second Written Questions.</p>
3g	2:10:32 (Part 2)	Highways England & Surrey County Council	Implications for Ripley High Street without Wisley Airfield scheme.	<p>HE: Modelling has been done including the Wisley Airfield development, showing an increase of only 5% of traffic on Ripley High Street, as shown in Table 4.1 of REP2-011 (the TASIR). The 2022 scenario does not include Wisley Airfield, for which the Do Minimum Scenario shows an AADT of 21,470, and in the Do Something an AADT of 22,520.</p> <p>SCC: If you look at the Do Something and Do Minimum for Wisley Lane in the same Table, there are 1,880 additional vehicles, which shows the impact of RHS Wisley. The “Other trips” need to be added to this, which comes to 1,575 vehicles, which comes to a combined total</p>

Agenda Item	Time of Comment in Recording	Interested Party	Subject	Summary of Comment
				<p>of ~3,400 additional vehicles AADT. This gives a broad brush idea of the increase of traffic along Ripley High Street, and demonstrates why mitigation such as Traffic Management is needed.</p> <p>HE: This excludes traffic from the airfield development that would use Old Land and thus the impact of the scheme in 2037 is 1440 AADT.</p>

© Crown copyright (2020).

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

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**,
or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

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

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

