

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

TR010030

9.60 Response to Surrey County Council's Deadline 4 letter

Rule 8(1)(c)(i)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

March 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

Development Consent Order 202[x]

9.60 RESPONSE TO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S DEADLINE 4 LETTER

| | |
|---|---|
| Rule Number: | Rule 8(1)(c)(i) |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010030 |
| Application Document Reference | TR010030/9.60 |
| Author: | M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange project team, Highways England and Atkins |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Rev 0 | 3 March 2020 | Deadline 5 |

Table of contents

| Chapter | Pages |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Introduction | 4 |
| 2. Highways England's Response to Surrey County Council's Deadline 4 letter | 5 |

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document sets out Highways England's comments on the Deadline 4 covering letter [REP4-048] by Surrey County Council (SCC) on the 11 February 2020.
- 1.1.2 Where issues raised within the letter have been dealt with previously by Highways England, for instance in response to a question posed by the examining authority in its first round of written questions [REP2-013], in Highways England's comments on written representations [REP2-014] or within one of the application documents or other examination document, a cross reference to that response or document is provided to avoid unnecessary duplication. The information provided in this document should, therefore, be read in conjunction with the material to which cross references are provided.
- 1.1.3 It should also be noted that the Applicant has submitted alongside this document a revised Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County Council (HE document ref: TR010020/Volume9.37 (1)), detailing the current position as regards agreement between Highways England and Surrey County Council as of 3 March 2020 (Deadline 5).
- 1.1.4 In order to assist the examining authority, Highways England has not provided comments on every point made by the Surrey County Council including for example statements which are matters of fact and those which it is unnecessary for Highways England to respond to. However, and for the avoidance of doubt, where Highways England has chosen not to comment on matters contained in the response, this should not be taken to be an indication that Highways England agrees with the point or comment raised or opinion expressed.

2. Highways England's Response to Surrey County Council's Deadline 4 letter

| Point Reference | Highways England's comment on LIR | Surrey CC's comment | Highways England Response |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| 7.2.1.20 | <p>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.</p> | <p>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 11th December and shared with SCC on 6th 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 end general Wisley Lane traffic to use Highway England's signed 'u' turn route through the M25 J10 roundabout. 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</p> | <p>Highways England withdraws the statement that "SCC has acknowledged... that the measures requested in paragraph 7.2.1.20 would not have the effect of reducing traffic flows through Ripley", and notes this as errata in the Applicant's comments on the Joint LIR document [REP3-007].</p> <p>However, the Applicant maintains that some of the mitigation measures proposed by SCC, e.g. resurfacing, will not have the effect of reducing traffic flows through Ripley</p> <p>The threshold of +30% additional traffic flow is derived from guidance contained in Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic - Institute of Environmental Assessment 1993 and is a suggested threshold for minor severance effects, with 60% increase for moderate effects and 90% for major effects. This is still considered to be standard practice in consideration of severance effects.</p> |
| 7.6.4 | <p>HE state that the alternative access will increase bus journey times by approximately 30 seconds</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>SCC would reiterate that it has not been agreed that all buses would divert without financial contribution.</p> | <p>Table 5.1 in the TASIR [REP2-011] shows the projected changes in journey times for traffic following the 715 bus route, noting that there is an error in the table. The values in the northbound column should be inserted into the southbound column and vice versa.</p> <p>The figure of 30 seconds difference between the Without Scheme and With Scheme scenarios, is only the case for the northbound route during the morning peak in 2022, the southbound route during the morning peak in 2037 and the northbound route in the evening peak in 2037. Other</p> |

| Point Reference | Highways England's comment on LIR | Surrey CC's comment | Highways England Response |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>entries in Table 5.1 show variation between -21.9 and +2.0 minutes difference depending on the year, direction and morning/evening peak.</p> <p>In the point 2.19.3 of the SoCG with SCC [REP3-012], it is stated that the bus diversion will add up to approximately a three minute increase in journey time. The three minutes in the SoCG is the increased journey time due to the additional distance resulting from the diversion along Wisley Lane to RHS that does not take account of peak period journey time savings at J10 from reductions in traffic delay and congestion delivered by the Scheme, that are presented in Table 5.1 of the TASIR. Outside of the peak periods the additional journey time is, therefore, likely to be up to approximately 3 minutes in each direction.</p> |
| LRN5 | HE is confident sufficient space has been allowed (within the red line boundary) 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. | <p>This is addressed in point 1.4.1 of the latest update to Highways England's Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County Council (TR010030/EXAM/ Volume 9.37 (1)), submitted at Deadline 5.</p> <p>Highways England can confirm that a plan showing space for suitable maintenance access for those elements to be adopted and maintained by SCC has been provided to SCC.</p> |
| LI1 | 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, e.g. sheet 3 | This is addressed in point 9.1.1 of the latest update to Highways England's Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County Council (TR010030/EXAM/Volume 9.37 (1)), submitted at Deadline 5. |

© 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