

## **M25 Junction 10 / A3 Wisley Interchange Improvement project**

### **Planning Inspectorate reference: TR010030**

#### The Examining Authority's Deadline 6

Comments from Ockham Parish Council re project update and proposed changes to the Scheme and DCO\* that we have been advised will be submitted by HE to meet Deadline 6:

\*we understand that these are changes to 8 & 9 of the DCO.

#### **Old Lane/Elm Lane junction**

We consider that the widening of Elm Lane to a width of 5.5 metres for a distance of 20 metres from the junction with Old Lane is a sensible safety strategy.

We do not believe that the slowing measures indicated in [HE551522-ATK-HGN-XX-SK-CH-000093\\_CO1.pdf](#) are sufficiently robust to slow vehicles down. As previously stated, we believe that SCC would be able to provide statistics showing that vehicles regularly exceed the 40 mph speed limit on Old Lane. We anticipate that with a free flow access from M25, vehicles will enter Old Lane at speed from the motorway and will not follow the 40 mph restriction. We reiterate our position stated at ExQ2 for 2.13.30: *To facilitate the proposed Elm Lane junction with Old Lane, we believe that there should be traffic slowing measures implemented on Old Lane between A3 and the proposed junction point.*

Whilst we would prefer not to see the removal of any vegetation, we appreciate that this is to provide a better sight line. However, as the sight line will also enable drivers to see further ahead along Old Lane, the vegetation removal could establish a false sense of security to drivers who will not necessarily allow for the Elm Lane junction.

We would like to ascertain who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of vegetation growth?

To address the safety issue, we propose rumble strips from the A3 approach. These are an effective measure and should slow the traffic down as they approach the junction.

This ties in with the SCC response to the ExQ2, specifically page 19, section referenced 2.13.30.

After discussion by videocall on 02.04.20 with HW, we established that whilst our views do not fully align at present, all parties (to include OPC, Elm Corner Residents Group, SCC and HE) are keen to ensure that the design of this junction is safe. We understand that the detailed design phase of the project commences in mid April 2020 and that HE will look again at the possibility of including a roundabout at the junction.

#### **Proposed Construction Worksite on FWA**

We understand that the reference to WIPL as owners of this land is an error and that WIPL should be replaced by the new landowners Taylor Wimpey.

We note the provision of a minimum of 3 metre bund along the north eastern boundary which we welcome. Following discussion with HE on 03.04.20 we do believe that any bund provided should be significantly higher and incorporated with planting / acoustic fencing.

When we met at the site visit, we were assured that the area would be a minor site for storage only, this appears to no longer be the case with a significant amount of activity proposed. This will impact substantially on residents of Ockham, primarily those who live in the hamlet of Elm Corner.

We do not agree that as stated by HE, the environmental effects of the site as proposed would not have any material change to the effects already assessed. We refute this and have requested that HE provide us with the evidence to support this statement.

The letter states *infrequent materials processing activities*. Infrequent is an ambiguous statement and we have requested clarity on this. We also note that it is anticipated that this activity will be carried out *intermittently* for periods of around two to three weeks every few months but we draw no comfort from this statement which is similarly ambiguous.

We can see that drawing [HE551522-ATK-LDC-A3 L1-DR-ZL-096502-Rev 0.pdf](#) shows the earthworks material storage and processing is to be located at the furthest point from Elm Corner within the compound but that the equally pollutant structures storage area to include a worksite for construction, welding and assembly of steelwork will be positioned close to EC. This is completely unacceptable. Vibration from all these works will be significant as will dust and noise pollution.

We have also requested greater detail from HE about the following:

1. Re the temporary welfare facilities proposed? We were advised that there would be no residential provision on site and have requested confirmation of this.
2. How will the site be accessed by workers coming on site – will it be entirely through the existing Elm Lane? Will there be a car park provided there for the construction workers?
3. What will be the working hours of the site? We have already stated our dissatisfaction with the proposal that the construction compounds are fully functional for long days Monday to Saturday inclusive.
4. We assume that a Site Environmental Management Plan / Construction Management Plan relating to the construction work site on FWA has been prepared and have requested direction to this within the Examiner's document library.

To summarise, we are extremely concerned that residents of Elm Corner will be subjected to years of construction noise and vibration, dirt and disruption if the construction compound is implemented as proposed. The impacts of the works will also affect the village of Ockham as a whole and for this level of construction activity to be proposed so close to our historic village is ill conceived.

## Conclusion

In our conversation on 02.04.20 with HE, we were advised that they would be submitting the information outlined in [HE551522-ATK-HGN-XX-SK-CH-000093 C01.pdf](#) and [HE551522-ATK-LDC-A3 L1-DR-ZL-096502-Rev 0.pdf](#) without any changes. We expressed that we were dissatisfied with

this as had understood that the purpose of our discussion was to find common ground. The matter of the proposed construction worksite on FWA remains as a huge concern to Ockham Parish residents and most specifically to Elm Corner residents who are going to be very negatively impacted by the level of work and the length of the project.

HE advised that BBA have been appointed to lead the detailed design phase of the project. We have requested that we are consulted as the detailed design develops.

HE advised that monthly planning meetings have been arranged for several stakeholders and ECRG and OPC have been offered the same opportunity.