

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

Question No	Question to	Question	Response
3.	Air quality and human health		
2.3.2	Royal Horticultural Society (RHS) and Natural England (NE)	Please provide the relevant guidance or scientific rationale for the need to include, or not include, an assessment of Ammonia concentrations in the assessment of air quality effects on the SPA.	<p>The scientific rationale is set out in REP3-050, point 2.7, pages 5 and 6. Essentially, clear evidence has recently become available that ammonia from road traffic can make a <i>significant</i> contribution to Ndep alongside roads, probably more than doubling the Ndep. This is supported by a report just issued (attached at Appendix A) that makes clear the importance of ammonia from road traffic for Ndep. This report is supported by a freely available tool to allow current and future emissions to be calculated (published alongside the report in Appendix D).</p> <p>REP3-050, point 2.7, pages 5 and 6, also sets out that studies being carried out elsewhere are including ammonia from road traffic. The same approach should be taken in the SIAA</p>
2.3.4	RHS	What do you consider the NOX concentrations in the SPA arising from the Proposed Development would be when assessed against the critical level of 30µg/m3?	The NOx concentrations in the SPA are those set out in APP-050, the appendix to the Air Quality Chapter, in Table 5.7.10. There are many locations on the transects where the critical level of 30 µg/m ³ is exceeded, by more than a factor of 3 in some cases (i.e. 90 µg/m ³) and will therefore be damaging to vegetation. These exceedances, some of which are worsened with the Scheme, are not discussed in the SIAA.
2.3.7	RHS	What do you consider would be the appropriate IAQM descriptors that should be applied to the modelled air quality effects of the Proposed Development upon human health within Ripley [paragraph 5.6 of REP1-041]?	Highways England has presented revised results for worst-case receptors in Ripley in REP4-005 in a table on page 60. The descriptors have been added to the result, as below. It should be noted that following LA 105 guidance (REP3-020 para 2.89), there would be no consideration of these receptors as they are all below the objective; the table setting out " <i>Information for judgement of significant air quality effects of a project</i> ", is to " <i>be completed using the outputs from the air quality modelling for only those sensitive receptors where there are exceedances of the air quality threshold ...</i> " (emphasis added) (REP3-020, para 2.89 and Table 2.91).

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

			<p>Estimated Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations in Ripley, adjusted using local verification factor, $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>2022 DM</th> <th>2022 DS</th> <th>2022 Change</th> <th>IAQM Descriptors</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>R59</td> <td>27.1</td> <td>27.9</td> <td>+0.8</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R1</td> <td>24.5</td> <td>25.3</td> <td>+0.8</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R2</td> <td>29.6</td> <td>30.3</td> <td>+0.7</td> <td>Slight Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R3</td> <td>27.7</td> <td>28.8</td> <td>+1.1</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R4</td> <td>29.5</td> <td>30.7</td> <td>+1.2</td> <td>Slight Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R5</td> <td>31.3</td> <td>33.0</td> <td>+1.7</td> <td>Slight Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R6</td> <td>31.5</td> <td>33.1</td> <td>+1.6</td> <td>Slight Adverse</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Receptor ID	2022 DM	2022 DS	2022 Change	IAQM Descriptors	R59	27.1	27.9	+0.8	Negligible	R1	24.5	25.3	+0.8	Negligible	R2	29.6	30.3	+0.7	Slight Adverse	R3	27.7	28.8	+1.1	Negligible	R4	29.5	30.7	+1.2	Slight Adverse	R5	31.3	33.0	+1.7	Slight Adverse	R6	31.5	33.1	+1.6	Slight Adverse
Receptor ID	2022 DM	2022 DS	2022 Change	IAQM Descriptors																																							
R59	27.1	27.9	+0.8	Negligible																																							
R1	24.5	25.3	+0.8	Negligible																																							
R2	29.6	30.3	+0.7	Slight Adverse																																							
R3	27.7	28.8	+1.1	Negligible																																							
R4	29.5	30.7	+1.2	Slight Adverse																																							
R5	31.3	33.0	+1.7	Slight Adverse																																							
R6	31.5	33.1	+1.6	Slight Adverse																																							
4	Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations Assessment																																										
2.4.8	RHS	If the Proposed Development was to be implemented what do you calculate would be the Nitrogen deposition rates within the SPA for 'short vegetation' and 'forest'?	<p>This will have to await a revised Table from Highways England of Ndep (Vicki Sykes of Atkins has accepted that there is no clear set of Ndep data taking account of the new deposition velocities and the assumption of all RHS traffic from the south using the A3 route). But this will still not include ammonia, unless Highways England is asked to provide the table with an estimate of ammonia contribution (at a simple level by assuming it doubles the Ndep).</p> <p>It is though clear that the Ndep rate is above the critical load (10 kgN/ha/yr) across the whole of the SPA, even well away from the roads and therefore damaging effects upon the SPA are already occurring and will be made worse by the proposed scheme.</p>																																								
12.	Socio-Economic impacts																																										
2.12.10	RHS	Would the projected annual reduction in visitor numbers of 6.5% (paragraph 3.10 of the note prepared by Hatch Regeneris [REP1-039]) that has been attributed to the implementation of the Proposed Development be within the range of the annual variations in visitor numbers that have historically arisen at the gardens?	<p>The projected annual reduction in visitor number of 6.5% is both beyond the standard annual variations in visitor numbers that have historically arisen at the gardens and represents a continuous impact rather than a one-off annual variation. The RHS has seen a steady growth in visitor numbers over the last 10 years. Whilst there have been occasions where growth has been below the projections these changes have been i) for a single year only and ii) under the control of the RHS i.e. as a direct result of an RHS action.</p> <p>The impact of the DCO Scheme will be both severe and, more importantly, continuous. It is not a one-off 'shock' to the business. It will create a 'new normal' level of visitor attendance, 6.5% below the current projections.</p>																																								

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

2.12.11	RHS and Applicant	<p>For the purposes of drawing conclusions from the attitudinal survey undertaken on the RHS's behalf, is it statistically legitimate to treat the 293 completed questionnaires as though they represent responses from 645 individuals [paragraph 1.15 of REP1-039]?</p>	<p>It is statistically legitimate to treat the 293 complete questionnaires as though they represent responses from 645 individuals. The RHS knows that the average group size attending Wisley Garden is 2.2. This is sourced from regular, fully independent, survey work conducted by BDRC on behalf of the Association of Leading Visitor Attractions (ALVA). The analysis is taken from a large sample size of the visitor population and is statistically legitimate.</p> <p>The group size of 2.2 has simply been applied to the 293 completed respondents to produce the estimate that it represents 645 individuals. Given the robustness of the ALVA survey, this is statistically legitimate.</p>
2.12.12	RHS and Applicant	<p>Please comment on the following questions asked in the attitudinal survey [Appendix A within the note prepared by Hatch Regeneris [REP1-039] in terms of exhibiting any statistical bias and/or ambiguity:</p> <p>a) Question 4 – could this question be subject to statistical bias as there is no neutral type response, 'reasonable', 'ok', with 'unsure' not be comparable with reasonable or ok?</p> <p>b) Question 5 i. Does this question have any real meaning as it requires respondents to be aware, as a matter of course, of the duration and/or length of the trips that they ordinarily make in travelling 'to' RHS Wisley?</p>	<p>a) Question 4 - The questionnaire provided an unbiased range of two positive, two negative, and one neutral responses. A response of "reasonable" or "ok" are both positive responses and so would be captured within the "reasonably easy" response. If someone was indifferent or didn't have an opinion, then they were able to apply the "unsure" response. A market researcher was available on-site at all times, so if a respondent was uncertain about a question they could be assisted.</p> <p>b) Question 5 i. This question has strong meaning. Around 89% of visitors to Wisley Garden are repeat visitors, some of whom visit a significant number of times every year. These visitors will have a very good appreciation of their journeys to the Garden. The popularity of SatNav systems also means that drivers are now highly attuned to journey times. All 293 respondents to the questionnaire provided a response to Question 3, asking "how long does your current journey to RHS Wisley Garden typically take", providing further evidence that visitors had a good appreciation of travel times.</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		<p>ii. Given the reference to 'journey to RHS Wisley' will respondents have appreciated that possible additions of an 'extra 10 minutes and five miles' to their journeys would relate to the duration/length of round trips and not just to the journey to the gardens, as could be implied by the sole reference 'to'? Could the absence of a reference to 'from' as well as 'to' affect the weight that should be attached to the responses to this question?</p> <p>c) Question 6 – could the format for this question be subject to any statistical bias with the neutral type answer being worded 'unsure' rather than something like 'no effect'?</p> <p>d) Question 7 – what weight can be attached to the responses made to this question, given that respondents would have needed to undertake a calculation to determine any percentage reduction in visits made by them rather than expressing a reduction in the number of visits made as a simple whole number, ie 1, 2, 3, 4 etc?</p> <p>e) Question 8 – is the wording of this question meaningful, given that the predicted increase of '12 million additional vehicle miles' travelled is not set within the context of either a specified time period or the overall number of vehicle miles travelled by visitors to RHS Wisley during whatever the relevant time period is for the purposes of answering this question?</p>	<p>ii. The absence of a reference to 'from' does not affect the weight that should be attached to the responses. The overriding context of the survey was explained to respondents when the questionnaire was handed out by the market researcher. This highlighted that the DCO Scheme will create a range of journey time impacts from different directions and when travelling to and from the Gardens. In a number of cases the impact is significantly greater in one direction than the other.</p> <p>c) Question 6 - There is no statistical bias in this question. It is a yes/no question – either the delay will, or it will not, affect the frequency of visits. There is no neutral response. The response 'unsure' is for those respondents who cannot decide if the change in journey time would affect them or not.</p> <p>d) Question 7 - Significant weight can be attached to the responses made to this question. Six straightforward multiple-choice responses were presented to respondents presenting a range of potential impacts from low to high. Respondents were not asked to estimate their reduction in trips to a small percentage point, rather to select from brackets of 20 percentage points. This permitted respondents to provide a reasonably broad estimate, without having to decide precisely whether they would reduce their trips by a specific number, which would have been more challenging to do.</p> <p>e) Question 8 - This question is meaningful in the context of highlighting the significant impact of the DCO Scheme on vehicle mileage and as a lead into Question 9, which identifies the types of concerns visitors may have. The responses were solely for RHS insight and were not applied anywhere within the economic impact assessment.</p>
2.12.13	Applicant and RHS	<p>With respect to the potential for there to be a lengthening of travel distances and times for visitors journeying to and from RHS Wisley:</p> <p>a) When making travel route planning decisions and/or decisions about whether to make a journey or not, is equal weight applied to the time taken and the distance</p>	<p>a) Higher weight is normally placed upon travel time than travel distances when making route planning decisions. The Department for Transport has conducted extensive research, that is</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		<p>travelled or is greater weight given to one of these factors compared to the other? If unequal weight is attributed to the time taken or the distance travelled please identify the proportion of weight that is applied to each factor and explain why that is the case.</p> <p>b) In paragraph 3.52 of the Motion Transport Assessment of May 2016 prepared for the RHS [REP2-040] the average duration of the visitor stay at RHS Wisley is identified as being between 3 and 4 hours. Given that average duration of stay, how significant would a predicted travel time increase of up to 10 minutes be to visitors making a round trip with an origin to the south of RHS Wisley when they were making decisions as to whether or not to visit these gardens?</p> <p>c) Has the RHS' attitudinal survey and the subsequent evaluation of its results adequately evaluated the relative significance of the duration of stays at RHS Wisley relative to the increase in journey</p>	<p>incorporated within its Transport Analysis Guidance, that provides metrics by which to assess travel choices. Travel time is a direct metric that is included, whilst travel distance forms part of the assessment of the cost of operating a vehicle (fuel and non-fuel). The precise weight for each element varies according to journey purpose.</p> <p>The RHS has followed the DfT guidance, but in the context of the DCO Scheme, the impact of journey distance will be more exaggerated due to the convoluted and confusing nature of the route from the south on the A3, via Junction 10, to and from the Garden. This will have a much larger influence on traveller's behaviour than absolute distance might typically have alone.</p> <p>Within the RHS assessment, respondents to the Visitor Survey will have applied their own individual weightings to journey time and distance when stating how they may alter their behaviour.</p> <p>b) There are two points in relation to this question. Firstly, whilst the average duration of stay may be between 3 and 4 hours, there is a significant distribution around this average. Some durations of stay are shorter, including visits to just the plant centre and café. The RHS is forecasting that around 1 in 15 visits to the Garden will be curtailed by the DCO Scheme and it is likely that many of the reduction in trips will be associated with visits of shorter duration.</p> <p>Secondly, increases in journey times are more likely to be contextualised in relation to travel times to the Garden, as opposed to duration of stay at the Garden. Department for Transport Appraisal Guidance provides evidence that travellers consider delays to be disproportionately negative in comparison to normal journey time. As such, travel disruption and delays will have a disproportional impact on individuals' decision to make a trip.</p> <p>c) Individuals responses to the Visitor Survey will have taken into account respondents' own personal circumstances, including travel times and normal durations of stay. Around 59% of respondents indicated the delays created by the DCO will not impact the number</p>
--	--	---	--

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		times predicted to arise were the Proposed Development to be consented and implemented?	of times they visit and so, for these individuals, duration of stay could have been an important factor. However, for 37% of respondents who indicated that the delays will impact their choices to visit the Garden, their personal circumstances will have dictated that absolute journey times and delays are more critical.
2.12.14	RHS	With respect to the estimation of the behavioural changes amongst visitors of RHS Wisley that have been attributed to the implementation of the Proposed Development [Section 3 of REP1-039], please explain the statistical basis for arriving at the 'factors' that have been applied to the degree of 'frustration' that respondents have identified in responding to Question 5 of the attitudinal survey.	<p>In applying the results of the Visitor Survey, the RHS has taken a conservative approach. Rather than include, in full, those respondents who indicated they would 'probably' reduce the number of trips to the Garden, factors were applied. These factors were based upon the level of frustration that respondents indicated they would feel about the delay.</p> <p>If a respondent indicated they would be highly frustrated and that they would probably reduce their visits, this was interpreted as meaning there was a very high probability that they would reduce their trips. A factor of 0.9 (or 90% probability) was applied for this group of respondents.</p> <p>If a respondent indicated they would not be very frustrated but that they would probably reduce their visits, this was interpreted as meaning there was a very low probability that they would actually reduce their trips. A factor of zero was applied for this group of respondents and so they were treated as not reducing the number of trips to the Garden.</p> <p>The factors in between were on a sliding scale but applied to be conservative in nature.</p>
13.	Traffic, transport and road safety		
2.13.10	Applicant and RHS	Given the assessment of the side road options, which includes 'the RHS Alternative' under the headings of 'WIS12+WIS-10+OCK04' (section 2.2.5), 'Ockham south facing slip roads' (section 4.2), 'Ockham Interchange: South-Facing Slip Roads' (section 5.3.3) and 'Amendments to WIS12' (section 6.1.2) in the Applicant's 'Scheme Assessment Report Side Roads Addendum of November 2017 [REP3-017], a document which was contemporaneous with the making of the Preferred Route Announcement in November 2017, is it reasonable or	<p>The RHS Alternative was not modelled prior to the submission of the DCO (including at the PRA stage).</p> <p>As a result, the effectiveness of the Alternative, against the Baseline was not examined.</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		unreasonable to say that the alternative access arrangements for RHS Wisley promoted by the RHS is an 'option' that was or was not assessed prior to the submission of the application for the Proposed Development?	<p>The distances set out in Appendix A attached¹ demonstrate that, whether travelling from the north or south, the RHS Alternative would result in;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) similar or shorter travel distances when compared to the Existing routes, and; (ii) significantly shorter journeys to/from the south than the DCO Scheme meaning that Wisley Land traffic would not assign (within the model) away from the SRN and onto the local road network through the villages of Ripley and Send as is the case with the DCO Scheme, and; (iii) significantly shorter journeys to the north than the DCO Scheme, avoiding the need for u-turns at Ockham <p>As a consequence, the RHS Alternative would ensure that traffic currently routeing on the SRN would continue to do so, unlike the DCO Scheme.</p> <p>Notwithstanding RHS's concerns with the HE model generally and the lack of certainty with its output, in the absence of modelling the RHS Alternative, it is not possible for HE to conclude as they have in Section 4.2 of REP3-017 in connection with Air Quality.</p>
2.13.11	Applicant, SCC and RHS	Notwithstanding that SCC would not wish to promote the use of a vehicular route from RHS Wisley via Wisley Airfield and Old Lane onto the A3, as stated at Issue Specific Hearing 2 and in REP3-036, given that allocation A35 of the Guildford Local Plan 2019 requires a through route to be available between the Ockham Park junction and Old Lane, what proportion of the southbound vehicular traffic exiting RHS Wisley might route via the airfield as an alternative to either making a U-turning manoeuvre at J10 of the M25 or routing via Ripley (the B2215)?	The traffic modelling summarised in Appendix B of the Response to REP4-005 suggests that none of the Wisley Zone traffic (which includes RHS trips) would route via Old Lane to head south. The same Appendix shows that with the DCO Scheme the proportion of Wisley Zone traffic via Ripley would be of the order of 25% (compared to the 6% level stated from HE's ANPR survey in combination with 0% using the A3 south route).
2.13.14	Applicant and RHS	The RHS in its written submissions concerning the retention of a left turn from Wisley Lane and weaving distances, for example in REP1-044, has referred to DMRB document CD122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions) as containing relevant	Grade separated on the basis that the DCO Scheme proposes Wisley Lane itself to bridge over the A3 at a different grade and so CD122 applies.

¹ These include the now-agreed changes in distance between the DCO Scheme and the Existing. HE has not been willing to consider the distances relating to the RHS Alternative within this table. However, they have been based on the same plans which RHS and HE have been exchanging in relation to SoCG matters.

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		design standards. Under the RHS alternative would a left turn from Wisley Lane be a grade separated junction or an at grade junction with the A3, and is CD122 therefore the relevant design guidance?	
2.13.15	Applicant, SCC and RHS	Where there is a junction between a multi lane dual carriageway and a side road how does the number of lanes on the dual carriageway affect the propensity for weaving to take place? The answer to this question should be given in general terms and should therefore disregard any local circumstances relating to the Proposed Development.	<p>The number of lanes do not affect the <u>propensity for weaving</u> to take place, The weaving flows are; (i) those movements which join a mainline and then cross into an offside lane or lanes, and (ii) those movements which cross from offside lanes into a nearside lane or lanes to diverge from the mainline. The propensity for weaving is therefore a function of the downstream destination of traffic, rather than how many lanes exist. If the weaving components are sufficiently high, then standards (CD122) promote the addition of lanes to accommodate weaving traffic.</p> <p>Whilst the ExA seeks through its question an answer in general terms, the RHS would respectfully note that the proposed four lane arrangement proposed by the DCO Scheme comprises a downstream two lane drop and so traffic merging onto the mainline would need to cross lane 2 (as counted from the nearside lane) in order to head in the direction of the offside lanes (A3 North). Those already on the mainline heading for the destinations served by the nearside two lanes are likely to be within those two lanes on the approach to the junction and this could be further encouraged with appropriate signage (so that the weaving component is reduced). The capacity improvements resulting from the additional A3 lane and the junction improvements which address the downstream congestion (at J10) would assist in providing gaps in traffic for weaving movements to take place.</p>
2.13.18	Applicant and RHS	<p>With respect to the RHS alternative scheme [REP1-044] if a left turn from Wisley Lane onto the A3 was to be retained:</p> <p>a) Would the available 'LAct' weaving length meet the extant published DMRB standard or would there need to be a departure from the standard for an improved left turn junction to be provided? For the Applicant – in responding to this question please provide any relevant extracts from the DMRB?</p>	<p>a) See RHS Response to HE's Deadline 4 responses which provides updated information in relation to design-standard related discussions. Whilst there would be a need for a Departure from Standard application to address comments received in respect of the 'Near Straight' and "Horizontal Curvature" requirements of CD122, there would not be a need for a Departure application in respect of the weaving length.</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		<p>b) Are weaving lengths affected by the speed limit applying to an all-purpose dual carriageway?</p> <p>c) With respect to the consideration of the potential for weaving to occur and whether the provision of a side road access would or would not be safe, what significance is to be placed on the time of day, ie during peak or inter-peak hours, when the majority of the weaving may arise?</p> <p>d) With respect to traffic departing from RHS Wisely, is the RHS's proposition that the majority of traffic performing a weaving manoeuvre would be off peak [page 2 of REP3-043] applicable to event days given that in Table 5.8 of the Motion TA [REP2-040] 36% of traffic is shown departing the gardens between 16.00 and 19.00 hours.</p> <p>e) For the Applicant - If a departure from standard was necessary, please explain the process for obtaining such a departure and the likelihood of such a departure being granted.</p>	<p>b) No. The minimum weaving length is 1km for a rural all-purpose dual carriageway.</p> <p>c) This is relevant in the context of RHS because unlike, say a connection which serves predominantly commuter/peak period traffic, most trips occur outside or the peaks and at weekends. At these times, background traffic on the A3 will be lower meaning that gaps in traffic will be greater.</p> <p>d) The traffic activity as a whole for the Garden is very much off-peak, with approximately 75% off all trips generated between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00hrs. For clarification, the reference to 24% in paragraph 4 of REP3-043 page 2 was in relation to the proportion of traffic leaving the garden as a whole heading for A3 north (ie traffic distribution point). As shown in the attendance data in REP2-041, the highest attendance days tend to be on Sundays. The data presented in Table 5.8 of the Motion TA is based on the busiest day during 2014, which was Sunday 7 September 2014. Whilst the departure profile presented shows 36% departing during the period 16:00 to 19:00 hours, this is lower than, say, commuter-based activity which would be expected to be around 50% or more of the daily departure rate. The average departure rate during the 16:00 to 19:00 period from Table 5.9 of the Motion TA would be less than 4 vehicles per minute. With 24% joining the A3 and weaving across to the offside (to head north on the A3), this equates to less than 1 vehicle per minute on average at this time.</p> <p>e)</p>
2.13.19	Applicant and RHS	Should the 'RHS Alternative Scheme' be described as an option or a variant of Option 14 (the Applicant's preferred scheme), given that it appears that it is only the proposed Wisley Lane diversion together with the absence of south facing slips at the Ockham Park junction that the RHS has an objection to?	The RHS Alternative should be an Option because although the additional components are relatively simple provisions the effect of their inclusion would be very significant (see Response to REP4-005).

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

2.13.20	Applicant and RHS	<p>With respect to the potential for road traffic accidents to arise, comparing: a) travelling further and making a U-turning manoeuvre at Junction 10 and b) weaving associated with the use of a retained left turn from Wisley Lane which of scenarios a) or b) might be expected to give rise to the greater number of accidents and why?</p>	<p>As noted in the RHS Response to REP4-005, only 2 Slight accidents in the five year period now referred to be HE resulted in weaving related accidents from the Wisley Lane connection with the A3 northbound. Within the comparisons sought the retention of a Wisley Lane connection with the A3 northbound would remove the need to travel down to Ockham, u-turn at the roundabout and travel back up onto the A3 northbound carriageway via the northbound on-slip at Ockham. In general terms, RHS consider that the retention of the Wisley Lane connection would be likely to result in fewer accidents than the u-turning option.</p> <p>However, in order to answer this question with greater accuracy, the RHS Alternative would need to be modelled by HE and output compared with the DCO Scheme. Such an exercise could then consider the wider safety benefits of retaining SRN traffic on the A3 rather than resulting in a 30% switch of RHS traffic currently on the SRN to the LRN (as the HE model predicts would be the case as a consequence of their DCO Scheme).</p>
2.13.23	RHS	<p>a) Please explain how the projected increases in visitor numbers referred to in Table 1 in the note prepared by Hatch Regeneris [REP1-039] have been calculated, as it appears that for each year after 2018 a figure of the order of 70,500 has simply been added year on year between 2018 to 2024.</p> <p>b) In calculating anticipated visitor growth should any allowance be made for the potential for a busier/more crowded attraction acting as a deterrent to visitors? If so what allowance for that has been included in the projections for visitor growth referred to in REP1-039?</p> <p>c) What allowance has been made for increases in road traffic and possible delays, and therefore potential deterrence to people</p>	<p>a) The Counterculture Report [REP3-052] provides the estimate of future visitor numbers in 2024 resulting from the investment programme at RHS Wisley. This was calculated as part of the business planning process for RHS Wisley Garden applying market forecasting. RHS data for annual visits in 2019 was 1,071,000. A linear profile has been applied within the REP1-039 analysis. Reported 2019 data that is now available indicates annual visits are higher than projected, indicating a conservative approach has been adopted.</p> <p>b) No. The investment programme at RHS Wisley has explicitly been designed to provide a greater range of attractions and capacity to enable growth. The forecasts within the Counterculture Report [REP3-052] take this into account and so no further allowance is required within the assessment of projected visitor growth.</p> <p>c) No specific allowance has been made for increases in road traffic and possible delays. The forecast future visitor numbers within the Counterculture Report [REP3-052] were based upon an</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		visiting RHS Wisley, in the absence of the Proposed Development?	assessment of prevailing market conditions up to 2024. The majority of trips to the Garden are outside of peak travel periods and so congestion impacts, for which the DCO Scheme has been designed to mitigate, are of less significance in this period.
2.13.24	RHS	Table 3 in REP1-039 and Appendix M in REP1-044 identify the estimated 'southerly' entry to/exit from RHS Wisley as being of the order of 37% of visitors. However, in Figure 7.1 of the TA of May 2016 prepared by Motion [REP2-040] the distribution of the southerly exit from RHS Wisley for the PM peak hour on Wednesdays is identified as being 23%, with a further 4% of vehicles each turning into Portsmouth Road or Mill Lane and Ockham Road (North) at the Ockham Park roundabout. Why is there a difference in visitor distributions referred to in REP1-039 and REP2-040?	<p>The trip distribution data applied within REP1-039 was taken from an assessment of postcode data for all visitors (Members and Non-Members) to the RHS Wisley Garden in 2018. This source provides the most representative and significantly larger sample of data specifically for visitors across all days across the year, including event days. It allocated visitors routes to the Garden based upon their origin locations.</p> <p>In contrast, the data prepared within the Motion Transport Assessment [RE-040] represented all trip types to and from the RHS Garden, including workers, volunteers, and deliveries, and the purpose of the report was, primarily, to assess the impact within peak periods of travel. It represents a much smaller sample size of trips to the Garden and does not specifically represent visitor trips.</p>
2.13.25	RHS	<p>With respect to the estimates of future growth in visitor numbers stated in the note prepared by Hatch Regeneris [REP1-039], which culminate in a figure of 1,494,000 visitors in 2024 and the implications that the implementation of the Proposed Development might have on visitor numbers:</p> <p>a) what assumptions have been made about the geographical distribution for the additional visitors that are expected to visit RHS Wisely, ie an even distribution across the established catchment area for the Gardens or weighting for some locations within the catchment area?</p> <p>b) how robust are those assumptions?</p>	<p>a) No such assumptions have been made. The Counterculture Report [REP3-052] did not specifically consider the socio-economic demographic of the additional visitors to the RHS Garden. There is no evidence to suggest that the profile will significantly vary from the current profile of visits. In many cases it may be existing visitors increasing the frequency of their visits. As such, the same geographic profile has been applied.</p> <p>b) N/a as no assumptions have been made.</p>
2.13.26	Applicant and RHS	Given the projected growth in visitor numbers at RHS Wisley, what would be the anticipated driver delay and economic impact upon the Garden's operation in the absence of any changes to M25 J10 and the A3 between the Ockham Park junction and the Painshill junction.	The RHS does not have the traffic modelling tools to respond to this question. However, given that approximately 75% off all RHS trips are generated between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00hrs RHS Wisley is less affected by existing AM and PM Peak Period congestion than, say, commuter traffic travelling in the peaks.

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

2.13.27	Applicant and RHS	<p>In terms of any effects on visitor numbers at RHS Wisley during the construction period for the Proposed Development, is it appropriate to use the reductions in visitors numbers that have arisen while on-site works have been undertaken at the gardens as a sensitivity measure for any 'extended impacts' that there might be on visitors numbers were the Proposed Development to be consented and implemented, as referred to in paragraph 3.14 of REP1-039?</p>	<p>Yes, it is appropriate as it is the best available evidence. The RHS analysis did not include a direct assessment of the impact of traffic congestion and delay during the construction phase, because this information had not been made available by HE. In the absence of this data, the RHS has only been able to draw upon the evidence it had available. As a sensitivity test, the 'extenuated impacts' assessment demonstrates that the negative impacts could extend well beyond the 'central case'.</p>
2.13.29	Applicant, SCC, WPIL and RHS	<p>In submitting your respective updated SoCG at Deadline 5 (D5) please ensure that the following matters are addressed in those SoCGs:</p> <p>a) Confirmation as to whether the base year (2015) traffic flows identified by the Applicant in the submitted application documentation for the B2215 (Portsmouth Road/Ripley High Street), Newark Lane and Rose Lane are or are not agreed.</p> <p>b) Assuming the Proposed Development were to be consented and implemented, confirmation as to whether the predicted AM peak, Inter-peak and PM peak hour traffic flows for the Do-minimum and Do-something scenarios in 2022 and 2037 identified by the Applicant in the submitted application documentation are or are not agreed.</p> <p>c) Confirmation as to whether any of the B2215's links between its junctions with the A3 and A247 and the B2215's junctions with Newark Lane and Rose Lane are or are not currently operating at capacity.</p> <p>d) For any link or junction referred to in c) above for which it is predicted that the capacity will be exceeded in the future (ie post-dating the operation of the Proposed Development should it receive consent), please provide an indication when it is expected the capacity of the link or junction would be exceeded and what the reason for the capacity exceedance would be. You are reminded in addressing the above listed matters in the SoCG that</p>	<p>These points are covered within the SoCG.</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		for any matter that is not agreed a full explanation for why there is disagreement shall be provided.	
16.	Compulsory Acquisition		
2.16.5	RHS	<p>The ExA notes that the RHS objects to the compulsory acquisition of plots 11/2 and 2/27[REP1-038].</p> <p>a) Having regard to the condition for compulsory acquisition stated in Section 122(3) of the PA2008, namely ‘...that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily’ please explain why you consider that the compulsory acquisition sought by the Applicant with respect to plots 11/2 and 2/27 would or would not satisfy the previously mentioned condition in Section 122(3) of the PA2008.</p>	<p>The RHS has decided to withdraw all its objections in relation to Plots to be compulsorily acquired (in the event that the DCO is confirmed) save in respect of Plots 2/27, 2/27(a) and 2/30 for the reasons explained below.</p> <p>a) The condition at Section 122(3) of the PA2008 is that there should be a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily. Government Guidance related to the compulsory acquisition of land under the PA2008 explains that for there to be a compelling case, the public benefits that will be derived from the compulsory acquisition must outweigh the private loss that would be suffered by those whose land is to be acquired (para 13). The resource implications of the proposed scheme are also something that should be taken into account.</p> <p>Plot 2/27 (which is to be acquired permanently), together with Plot 2/27a and 2/30 (which will be subject to temporary possession), lie at the main vehicular entrance to the RHS Gardens at Wisley from the A3. Plot 2/30 comprises part of Wisley Lane, the access road into, and out of, the Gardens.</p> <p>The purpose of acquiring Plot 2/27 is to construct the northern end of a bridge that will pass over the A3 and provide a new entrance to the Gardens. HE says that access to the Gardens from Wisley Lane will be maintained throughout the scheme works and during the 12-18 month construction period of the new bridge. However, it is unable to explain how this will be achieved given that the bridge will be built immediately adjacent to the existing entrance, with no apparent surrounding area for enabling works other than for Wisley Lane itself. HE has advised that the question of how the bridge will be constructed will be answered by its contractor, Balfour Beatty, but currently no solution has been made known to RHS.</p> <p>Should vehicular access from Wisley Lane be prevented during the scheme works, the Gardens would effectively have to close. This</p>

REP5-XXX RHS Responses to ExQ2

		<p>b) Additionally please confirm that the extent of your objection to the Compulsory Acquisition and/or Temporary Possession powers sought by the Applicant, insofar as they relate to the land owned by it, are limited to plots 11/2 and 2/27, given the previous reference in your relevant representation [RR-024] to in effect an objection in principle to compulsory acquisition of any RHS land.</p>	<p>would have a significant and unacceptable financial impact at a time the Gardens would be seeking to realise the benefit of £65 million of current and ongoing investment. The loss that would be suffered would be at a level that undermines the compelling case for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>For these reasons RHS maintains its objection to the compulsory acquisition of plot 2/27, until such time that HE enters into a Land and Works Agreement that provides a solution to the maintenance of uninterrupted access to the Gardens from Wisley Lane during the Scheme works.</p> <p>b) The RHS objects to the compulsory acquisition of Plot 2/27 and also, for the same reasons, the temporary possession of plots 2/27a and 2/30.</p> <p>It no longer objects to the compulsory acquisition of Plot 11/2, (save as to access over RHS Land) on the basis that it will not be permanently acquired and will be returned to RHS following the undertaking of works by HE. RHS also does not oppose the compulsory acquisition of any of its other land (or rights over land) included in the draft Order, nor does it object to the temporary possession of land, other than for plots 2/27a and 2/30.</p> <p>RHS also does not oppose the compulsory acquisition of any of its other land (or rights over land) included in the draft Order, nor does it object to the temporary possession of land, other than for plots 2/27a and 2/30.</p>
--	--	---	--