

1<sup>st</sup> April 2020

**Examination Deadline 6 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2020**

**ELM CORNER RESIDENTS GROUP response to changes 8 & 9 to the DCO**

**Old Lane/Elm Lane junction**

1. We agree re the widening of Elm Lane to a width of 5.5 metres for a distance of 20 metres from the junction with Old Lane and consider this a sensible safety strategy.
2. However, we do not believe that the slowing measures indicated in [HE551522-ATK-HGN-XX-SK-CH-000093\\_C01.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 and that there have been many accidents right on this bend. We anticipate that with a freeflow access from M25, vehicles will enter Old Lane at speed from the motorway and will not follow the 40 mph restriction.
3. Old Lane is a renowned rat run for vehicles avoiding traffic problems on the M25 from junction 10 to junction 11 and the 40 mph restriction on this road is rarely adhered to.
4. The better sight line proposed by removal of vegetation could encourage greater speeding along this stretch of road.
5. We do understand that there is no extant planning permission for the former Wisley airfield but do believe that the probable extra traffic movements if the 'newtown' is built have been included in the modelling for the A3/M25 junction improvements. Is it therefore not sensible to consider, also, the large increase in traffic along Old Lane which will be occasioned by this development.

**Recommendations**

The construction of a mini roundabout at the Old Lane/Elm Lane junction. This, as we have mentioned before in our representations, is our preferred option and by far the best option for road safety for the residents of Elm Corner and the wider public.

In addition we feel that the installation of rumble strips to alert drivers to the upcoming bend and/or speed activated warning signs. These measures would be 100% more effective than a mere SLOW sign painted on the road.

**Proposed Construction Worksite on Former Wisley Airfield**

1. We are not clear why HE state that they are still liaising with WIPL about this area of land. We thought that it was now owned by [REDACTED]. Please advise.
2. We believe the review of the worksite proposed has resulted in it becoming significantly larger than the original proposed construction compound. Please advise.
3. We do not agree that the environmental effects of the site as now proposed would not have any material change to the effects already assessed. We refute this and request that we are provided with the evidence to support this statement. The additional uses on the site include materials processing, structures storage area and worksite (formwork construction, welding/assembly of steelwork), ancillary traffic management area and welfare facilities. These will unquestionably present material changes to the noise, dust and light pollution and increased traffic movements.
4. The letter states *infrequent materials processing activities*. Infrequent is an ambiguous statement and we would like 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.

5. We are extremely concerned that residents of EC will be subjected to years of construction noise, dirt and disruption if the construction compound is as proposed.
6. 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 EC 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.
7. We require greater detail about the temporary welfare facilities proposed? We were advised that there would be no residential provision on site. Is this still the case?
8. 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?
9. 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.
10. The siting of this works compound will ensure that the prevailing south westerly winds will cause serious dust, dirt and noxious odour nuisance to the residents over a 2 -3 year period.

### **Recommendations**

As we have stated before the whole of this worksite could easily be located at the far southern end of the hardstanding at least a further 500 metres from the residential receptors located in EC.

We request that materials processing should not be carried out at this worksite and that materials should be transported to an already established and designated work yard which is not at such close proximity to a residential area.

### **Sequencing of Elm Lane / Old Lane Works**

The proposal to commence this work early in the programme is both sensible and acceptable to the residents.

### **Bolder Mere / A3 Flooding**

We await further information following your investigation.

In addition we wish to advise HE/EA/SWT that one of our residents, a retired engineer, has photographic evidence of the cause of the A3 flooding. It is due to a lack of maintenance in the North West corner of the lake where the run off from the lake is not going into the A3 culvert grid, as it is generally blocked with debris. In a high flow situation the lake run off then breaches the edge of the lake and runs onto the side of the A3. He would be happy to discuss his findings with HE/EA/SWT before there is a recurrence of the flooding and indeed to attend a site visit once the lockdown has been lifted. This flood prevention work needs to be addressed immediately by the relevant agencies.

