

## **Property Consultants**

Unit 2, Paris, Parklands, Railton Road, Guildford, GU2 9JX T 01483 238389 E david.moody@brutonknowles.co.uk W brutonknowles.co.uk Offices across the UK

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2020

National Infrastructure Planning Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS16NP

Dear Sirs,

Written response to questions raised by the Examining Authority on behalf of Mrs Agnes Patricia Engelen

Site: Court Close Farm, Portsmouth Road (A3), Cobham, Surrey KT11 1EN

Further to my letter dated the 26<sup>th</sup> November, I have set out below further points raised by my client regarding the proposed temporary and permanent rights and acquisitions as a result of the proposed M25 JCT 10/A3 Wisley Interchange Improvement.

## 2.12.8 - Question to the Applicant, GGLW and the owner of Court Close Farm

Question a) Further to the meeting that took place between the Applicant, GGLW and the owner of Court Close Farm on 6 February 2020 to discuss an 'alternative solution' for access to the Heyswood campsite and Court Close Farm [paragraph 2.2.1 of REP4-010], please provide an update on how discussions have progressed since the 6 February meeting.

On the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2020, Highways England and their representatives met with my clients' Mrs Pat Engelen, and the Girl Guides, to discuss an alternative route for the Private Means of Access (PMA), which would avoid dissecting the Girl Guides site at Heyswood Campsite, and alleviate some of the significant safeguarding concerns raised previously. It was noted however, that elements of their proposal would require private agreements to be in place requiring use of land (permanently) that is outside of the currently proposed development boundary, and which would be required to facilitate the inclusion of passing bays or minor widening of the working area.

The idea was generally considered an improvement to the plan currently submitted for consideration, and both The Girl Guides & Mrs Engelen were more positive in support of the alternative options being discussed. The preference was for the option to include passing bays as opposed to the traffic light solution.

There was however a matter raised, which my client needs to have clarified as a matter of urgency regarding the way in which Highways England is expecting the new road to be maintained. I understand that this will be a PMA and that by virtue of providing it, Highways England and Surrey County Council Highways will not be responsible for its future maintenance, which will lie with its users.

Whilst the principle remains quite straight forward, I noted that the Highways England's representatives in attendance referred this this affecting the entire length of the new road back to the Painshill/A3 slip road junction. I have asked for confirmation of where I can find Highways England's proposal in regard to the future maintenance responsibility of the PMA.













This would burden my client with a responsibility to maintain in part or contribute to the maintenance of a new road, which will be around 1km in length. I believe Highways England will owner the proposed PMA upon completion of the proposed works and retain access over the road for access to its gantries.

My client currently enjoys access directly off the A3, and therefore has very little maintenance liability outside of her property boundaries. If this is not to be replicated as part of the scheme, which I feel should be Highways England's criteria in implementing its replacement, I have requested details of what consideration has been assessed in my clients favour to offset any subsequent costs and liabilities.

Subsequently, the following additional enquiries have been made by Highways England:

- 1. Whether my client (Mrs Engelen) would consider a freehold sale of her title in full
- 2. A follow up meeting on the 24th February 2020, to update her on the alternative access proposals

The follow up meeting was to discuss a variation to their alternatives proposed during the 6<sup>th</sup> February meeting. Essentially, the proposal remained the same, though an additional 3m width would need to be acquired temporarily, through the Girl Guides site, currently outside of the DCO boundary. It was also noted that Highways England did not think their alternative proposal would get approval.

 Please see plans attached: HE551522-ATK-HGN-A3-L2-R13\_\_OP-SK-CH-000006 Rev C02 & 000010 Rev C01

To date, we have not received copies of the meeting minutes from the 6th or 24th of February site meetings.

This has only raised further concerns about how and what Highways England are intending the deliver and under what means. Safeguarding for the Girl Guides site remains of paramount importance. The alternative alignment appears in principle to offer a far more palatable solution to the current plans with the Examining Authority for consideration, though my client awaits Highways England's meeting notes from the the 6<sup>th</sup> & 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020 to be in a position to comment further.

Yours sincerely



**David Moody** MInstRE Associate

By email: M25Junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk



