

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND (05/02/20) – DRAFT (based on issues listed by HE in REP3-013)

Relevant Issue	HE Position	RHS Position
The strategic traffic model used by Highways England for the Scheme has been appropriately developed for the base year (2015)	HE to respond	Agree (in part). RHS note that this model is not suitable to provide an acceptable basis upon which to determine future year effects on the local road network.
The micro-simulation model used by Highways England for the Scheme has been appropriately developed for the base year (2015)	HE to respond	Disagree. The microsimulation model has only been developed for the AM and PM peaks – there is no inter-peak model. Furthermore, as noted in the S-Paramics Local Model Validation Report, the journey time validation routes are only partial (eg through Ripley) and the validation of the routes is not sufficient, particularly routes 5, 9, 10 and 18.
The forecasting methodology used by Highways England for the purpose of the traffic modelling exercise includes the appropriate proposed land use developments and other highway infrastructure and it has been implemented to Highways England standards.	No further action	Disagree. The modelling of the Wisley Airfield development has not included the associated mitigation at Burnt Common and within Ripley.
The Highways England modelling as regards RHS traffic uses an event day (when RHS has more visitors than on a non-event day)	HE to respond	Agree (in part). However, cross referencing with actual model output suggests that not all of this traffic is actually assigned to the network.
The results from the traffic modelling fairly represent the effects of the Scheme in terms of traffic issues as regards the SRN and the local highway network.	HE to respond	Disagree. The traffic modelling commences from a 2015 Base which has not been validated, particularly in respect of Ripley. Future forecasting based on this modelling, which then routes traffic away from the Strategic Road Network onto such local roads as a direct consequence of the DCO Scheme will not be accurately predicted. HE are not able to state how effective their proposed signing strategy (which seeks to retain traffic on the A3) will be.
Although the traffic modelling assumes all traffic travelling to and from the gardens from the south travel via Ripley in reality some will travel via the SRN	No further action	Disagree. See previous comment above.

		Further, it is not acceptable to proceed on this assumption whereby a Strategic Road Improvement Scheme is being promoted which actually results in the local road network being a more attractive proposition.
Standards The highways design standard that applies to the “left out” from Wisley Lane as proposed by RHS is CD122	HE to respond	Agree based on the specific option presented by RHS.
Safety The Wisley Lane diversion will provide a safer access/egress to/from RHS Wisley than the existing one.	HE to respond	Disagree. There has been no comprehensive/wider assessment of this in terms of traffic having to route along other links and through junctions via the longer signed route or via the local villages of Ripley and Send
Safety The Wisley Lane diversion will provide a safer access/egress to/ RHS Wisley than the “left out” proposed by RHS	HE to respond	Disagree. There has been no comprehensive/wider assessment of this in terms of traffic having to route along other links and through junctions via the longer signed route or via the local villages of Ripley and Send
Changes to journey distances and journey times to and from RHS Wisley as a result of the DCO Scheme	The changes in distances set out in tables 2-2 – 2.7 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information report (APP-REP2-011) (columns 2 and 3) are agreed as regards the following routes: A3 north of Junction 10 M25(CW) M25 (ACW) A3 South B2215 via Ripley	Disagree. See attached plans regarding journey distance comparisons
Origin of RHS visitor traffic	The distribution of traffic to/from RHS Wisley (tables 2.2 – 2.7, column 4 of the report) are agreed based on the ANPR data used by Highways England	Disagree. RHS consider that the HE ANPR distribution (collected for all traffic on a relatively low attendance day) does not reflect the higher attendance distribution which HE suggest has been modelled.
Journey Times The journey times information in tables 2.8 and 2.9 of the report are agreed	Journey Times [Agree/Disagree] The journey times information in tables 2.8 and 2.9 of the report are agreed.	Disagree. For the reasons set out in response to the traffic modelling above, journey times are not agreed