

The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Environment Transport and Infrastructure
Planning Group
Surrey County Council
County Hall
Kingston Upon Thames
KT1 2DY

For the attention of Mr Jones

Emailed to: M25Junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Your Ref: TR010030

Our Ref: IP 20023014

11th February 2020

Dear Mr Jones

Planning Act 2008

Application by Highways England for an order granting development consent for the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange improvement project

Submission made pursuant to Deadline 4

This submission comprises responses to Highway England's comments on the Joint Council's Local Impact Report.

Comments on HE response to LIR (REP3-007)

Page no. Para/Issue ref	Issue	HE response	SCC comment
P15. Ref 7.2.1.20	The Joint Councils have requested mitigation measures to address concerns in Ripley	SCC has acknowledged in a meeting with Highways England held on 11 December 2019 that the measures requested and set out in paragraph 7.2.1.20 of the LIR would not have the effect of reducing traffic flows through Ripley.	This is not a statement that SCC made at this meeting, neither is it referenced in the draft HE traffic modelling meeting minutes held on 11 th December and shared with SCC on 6 th February (yet to be agreed by SCC). The County Council stands by comments made within the LIR in relation to mitigation requirements for Ripley. As stated, the measures are also intended to slow traffic speeds through 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

Page no. Para/Issue ref	Issue	HE response	SCC comment
			SCC consider that a threshold of +30% for severance is too blunt a measure to determine whether mitigation is required. It has to depend on the circumstances of where the increase is occurring.
P17. Ref 7.6.4	Impact on 715 bus journey times as a result of the scheme	HE state that the alternative access will increase bus journey times by approximately 30 seconds	SCC would ask that HE provide clear evidence on the impact (positive and negative) on bus journey times to demonstrate no negative impact on bus journey times SCC would reiterate that it has not been agreed that all buses would divert without financial contribution.
P22. LRN5	Whether sufficient space provided within the DCO red line for maintenance access	HE is confident sufficient space has been allowed for appropriate maintenance access.	SCC would ask that HE provide drawings showing the space provided to allow suitable maintenance access for elements of the scheme that HE are proposing that SCC adopt and maintain.
P27. LI1	Enclaves of land left between NMU and A3 carriageway	The proposed HE boundary would be aligned along the A3 side of the NMU route, as a result of which, there will not be any enclaves of different land ownership.	The does not appear to accord with Volume 2.2 Land Plans, eg. sheet 3

These comments are not exhaustive and are intended to correct inaccuracies or request further clarification. Surrey County Council's position on outstanding issues in relation to the scheme remain as set out in the written representations and joint authorities' LIR submitted to the examination process.

Comments and progress on outstanding issues will continue to be documented through updates to the Statement of Common Ground with Highways England throughout the examination process.

Yours sincerely



Caroline Smith – Planning Group Manager