

Our Ref: SMW/KB  
Your Ref: TRO10030

24 April 2020

The Planning Inspectorate  
National Infrastructure  
Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Att: Gavin Jones

**By email only: m25junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk**

Dear Sirs

**Re: The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules  
2010 (As Amended) – Rule 17**

**Application by Highways England for an Order Granting  
Development Consent for the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley  
Interchange**

**Request for further information**

**Our Clients: Messrs Mr and Mrs P Young [REDACTED]  
Mrs A Barklam [REDACTED]  
Miss B Kendrick [REDACTED]**

First, by way of background, please note that in accordance with the additional guidance issued to applicants and interested parties, because only a small number of matters are raised, this response is only being sent by letter.

The three parties that I represent are Affected Parties (AP) as each of their individual property's noted above, and which front [REDACTED], will be subject to physical works, primarily the realignment of their entrances.

Question 3.5.1

My Clients are extremely concerned about how the use of the proposed construction compounds on the adjoining Wisley airfield will impact upon them. We understand from the Project Manager that it is proposed to set up a working group which the residents of Elm Lane and their representatives would be invited to join so that the impact of the use of the compounds can be monitored. Whilst this is a welcome suggestion and my clients would be very keen to participate in such a group, nonetheless the concern remains that this may give them little practical influence when the physical impact of the works is at its greatest.

In particular, our clients are concerned about the following matters:-

- a) The hours of operation and the use of floodlighting.
- b) The proposed height of the bund is 3m. It is recognised that this will provide a useful barrier, it could potentially be higher and /or topped with an acoustic fence.
- c) It will be necessary to consider weed control on this earth bund as the prevailing wind will blow weed seeds into gardens of all of the residents' properties.
- d) There is a general concern about the location of the compound as had it been located further to the west, the impact of the residents would have been significantly reduced.

#### Other matters outside the scope of the Rule 17 questions

There are a few key matters which our clients particularly wish to draw the Inspectorates attention to and we hope that given the unusual circumstances that have arisen as a consequence of the Coronavirus and the postponement of the March examinations, that the Inspectorate will allow the following observations to be considered:

1. With regard to the proposed alterations to the junction of Elm Lane and Old Lane, the current proposal to paint "slow" on the road. This is considered completely inadequate. The design of the scheme will encourage greater speeding along the relevant section of Old Lane and this is potentially hazardous. As a minimum there should be rumble strips across the road, and/or anti-skid resistant surfacing and a speed activated warning sign.

We note that in Surrey County Council's (SCC) response to the Inspectors second written questions submitted on 18 February 2020, SCC has already raised concern at Paragraph 2.13.30 (d) that the entrance to Elm Lane may not be wide enough to safely allow traffic turning into Elm Lane from Old Lane to pass traffic exiting Elm Lane. This needs careful analysis and design.

2. The second matter relates to the creation of a turning head at the western end of Elm Lane where the existing byway is to be stopped up. The proposed stopping up is proposed just to the west of the entrance into Orchard Cottage. First, the adjoining properties being [REDACTED] object strongly to the proposed location of the turning head which will have a significantly detrimental impact on both properties and in its current proposed situation is too close to Orchard Cottage and the substation. Indeed, it is very likely that cars who have mistakenly travelled west along Elm Lane will go past the turning head and then need to reverse back along Elm Lane potentially turning into the entrance to Orchard Cottage. The loss of trees in particular will cause a serious loss of privacy to "Twenty Twelve" creating a line of sight from the turning area directly into the master bedroom.

Moreover, the actual use of the proposed turning head will have a particularly detrimental impact on Twenty Twelve. It would be better if a turning head was created ideally on the north side of Elm Lane opposite the proposed site, or as a second preference to the west of Orchard Cottage.

However, notwithstanding this, the existing design of the turning head is much too close to the sub-station with a serious risk of cars reversing into it.

We hope very much that the above comments will be able to be taken into account.

Yours sincerely,



**Stuart M Walker BSc MRICS FAAV**

Email: [stuart.walker@whiteandsons.co.uk](mailto:stuart.walker@whiteandsons.co.uk)