

# M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange

TR010030

## 9.36 Statement of Common Ground with Guildford Borough Council

Rule 8(1)(e)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

May 2020

# Infrastructure Planning

## Planning Act 2008

### Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

### M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange Development Consent Order 202[x ]

---

#### 9.36 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Rule 8 (1) (e)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010030
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010030/APP/9.36
<b>Author:</b>	M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange project team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 2	1 May 2020	Deadline 8
Rev 1	3 March 2020	Deadline 5 (Highways England's comments only)
Rev 0	28 January 2020	Deadline 3 (Agreed by Highways England and Guildford Borough Council)

---

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Guildford Borough Council.**



**Signed.....**

**Jonathan Wade**

**Project Manager**

**on behalf of Highways England**

**Date: 01 May 2020**



**Signed.....**

**Peter O'Connell**

**Service Delivery Director**

**on behalf of Guildford Borough Council**

**Date: 01 May 2020**

# Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Purpose of this document	5
1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	5
1.3. Terminology	5
<b>2. Record of Engagement</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Table of issues and matters to be agreed</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 2.1: Record of Engagement	6
Table 3.1: Examination Documents	12
Table 3.2: Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council (GBC) – Table of Issues and Matters to be Agreed – Final Version dated 01 May 2020	15

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the proposed M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange improvement scheme ("the Application") made by Highways England Company Limited ("Highways England") to the Secretary of State for Transport ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order ("the Order") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG covers the final position as agreed with Guildford Borough Council (GBC) as at 1 May 2020 and supersedes the versions submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-011] and Deadline 5 [REP5-008]. Although the SoCG relates to the DCO examination period only, it is acknowledged that there will be a need for further agreement between the parties during detailed design and the execution of works.

## 1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG is based on the version that was agreed by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Guildford Borough Council as at 28 January 2020. As noted above, it has been updated to incorporate Highways England's further comments, however these have not been agreed by Guildford Borough Council as at Deadline 5.

## 1.3. Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG, the term 'Agreed' indicates where the relevant issue has been resolved and the term 'Not agreed' indicates where it has not been possible to fully resolve any differences between the parties during the examination. The extent and reasons for any disagreement are summarised in the tables where applicable.
- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Guildford Borough Council, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to Guildford Borough Council.

## 2. Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Record of Engagement**

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
<b>Local Authority Liaison Meetings</b>		
27.07.2018	Meeting	This was the first LA Liaison Meeting, where all 3 LAs attended together. The DCO process and a list of DCO deliverables were discussed, with an action to send a comprehensive list to each LA. The LA responses to Statutory Consultation were discussed and it was agreed that Highways England would send Surrey County Council (SCC) and GBC response letters. Speed limits and bus stop designs were discussed, with the action on SCC to provide written comments. SCC comments on the PIER were acknowledged by Highways England, with an action on Highways England to provide a response to Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC)'s PIER comments.
27.09.2018	Meeting	A scheme and programme update were provided. Drawings of replacement land would be shared with the LAs once available. It was agreed that once the PCF Modelling report was drafted, a modelling meeting would take place prior to Feltonfleet School liaison. Side road agreements were discussed, with the action on Highways England to provide further information to SCC. The proposed Targeted Consultation dates and content were discussed. Highways England agreed to share the consultation summary report which includes the regards table with all 3 LAs. The requirement for Planning Performance Agreement was discussed, with an action on all 3 LAs to respond to Highways England with a preferred option and business case.
16.11.2018	Meeting	A high-level overview of the scheme changes was provided, outlining the new alignment of the Wisley Lane overbridge through the airfield and summarising the conversations with RHS Wisley for changing the bus route to utilise the existing infrastructure. The moving of the NMU route from the south to the north side of the A3, the widening of the Old Lane left in/out and NMU route changes were justifiable in order to follow land contours. Changes to the M25 northbound slip lane, and the reduced J10 roundabout elongation were discussed. Noting that Redhill bridge was now an NMU access only and there was the potential for a small amount of land for an NMU route near to Feltonfleet school. The small changes to obtain the

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		<p>correct amount of replacement land were discussed.</p> <p>GBC queried a section of SPA replacement land believed to be within the 400m buffer zone for Wisley Airfield. Noting that the airfield development programme is advanced and may take precedence over the M25 J10/A3 scheme. There was an action for Highways England to share CAD file of Red Line Boundary with GBC for further assessment to be undertaken.</p>
22.01.2019	Meeting	<p>A scheme update and revised programme was provided, with an expected DCO submission date of Spring 2019. A summary of the targeted consultation responses was presented, with 85% of the responses received from members and supporters of The Girl Guide Association.</p> <p>GBC expressed the desire to seek legal advice on adequacy of consultation, due to the small changes that had been made to the scheme that were not present in the targeted consultation materials.</p>
15.03.2019	Meeting	<p>An update of Design Fix 3.1 was presented, specifically: Heyswood Campsite NMU (route moved to the north side of the A3), Seven Hills road south, at the junction all movements are permitted from Seven Hills Road South, left turn only from Seven Hills Road and right turns are banned from the A245 Eastbound. This design improves the junction but does move some traffic to the Painshill roundabout. There are no additional noise/air quality impacts, thus the proposal is being taken forward. In addition, it was explained that the SPA replacement land field, near to Wisley Airfield, had been replaced by a field currently owned by RHS Wisley. RHS Wisley are willing to sell this land and discussions over acquisition will take place. This parcel gives the scheme enough land to meet the SPA compensation and mitigation land requirements.</p> <p>It was noted there was concern about the EBC emerging local plan, this parcel of land will be checked to ensure it is not within 400m of any proposed developments. An action for Highways England was set to check the land parcel is not within 400m of any proposed developments in the emerging EBC local plan.</p>
23.04.2019	Meeting	<p>The consultation changes at Seven Hills junction were discussed. Feltonfleet School (FFS) are keen to extinguish highway rights on Old Byfleet Road, which has been discussed and agreed by Surrey County Council (SCC), FFS and HE. Banning the right and straight-ahead movements from Seven Hills Road (North) allows a traffic signal stage to be removed, reducing congestion on the A245. The forecasting shows that removing these movements</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		<p>does not displace a significant number of vehicles, though it may have more of an impact on those living at the base of Seven Hills Road. Each of the Local Authorities received an issues log specific to their correspondence prior to this meeting. For the majority of points raised Highways England have provided a response, with the remaining responses being “in progress”. These logs show high level information which will provide the basis for the statements of common ground (SoCG).</p> <p>Highways England wanted to hold a meeting with SCC to present a draft paper which concerned various scheme land parcels and their future maintenance. If possible, the paper will be released in draft for SCC to have early sighting. It was suggested that Surrey Wildlife Trust be invited as they are land managers for SCC.</p> <p>SCC asked if a councillor briefing would be held post DCO submission. Highways England agreed that 3 separate presentations could take place.</p>
21.05.2019	Meeting	<p>A land management update and overview was provided, outlining Highways England’s approach to the environmental issues that need to be addressed. In view of the need to acquire and/or use land within the SPA for the purposes of the Scheme it is necessary, in order to protect its integrity as a SPA to enhance some land already in the SPA and also provide additional land to (in effect) form part of the SPA by way of compensation for that to be used. As the Scheme also includes land that is designated as common land and open space, replacement for this land also has to be provided. The ratios of land take and replacement were explained and that the ratios are based on discussions with key stakeholders (NE, RSPB, SWT) (for the SPA land) and precedent established on other schemes including the M25 in this location when it was built in the late 1970s/early 1980s (for the common land/open space).</p> <p>EBC raised concern over the proposed cyclists’ route alongside the A245 in terms of safety and segregation between motorists and cyclists. Highways England explained that this route was selected due to safeguarding issues at Feltonfleet School and to provide cyclists with a clear route and avoidance of steps, he acknowledges this did make the route slightly longer.</p> <p>It was agreed that all three LAs are to provide JW with some available dates to hold a presentation at an existing council planning meeting. GB suggested once the DCO submission has occurred he could schedule a Q and A session with councillors.</p>
24.07.2019	Meeting	<p>GBC did not attend this meeting; however, they received a copy of the minutes.</p>



Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
		An update was provided on: the DCO application, the Project, commuted sums, PPA, land management workshop & councillor presentation. SCC stated that they had concerns regarding the lack of detail in the Road Safety Audit and agreed to provide feedback in due course.
26.09.2019	Meeting	<p><b>GBC did not attend this meeting; however, they received a copy of the minutes.</b></p> <p>SCC were the only LA in attendance; however, the minutes were sent to all LAs.</p> <p>Topics covered included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Way forward with SCC SoCG and the inclusion of the Relevant Representations.</li> <li>• Commuted Sums update.</li> <li>• Land Management update, and agreement for SCC to share existing management contract with HE Legal.</li> <li>• Common Land, history and way forward.</li> </ul>
29.10.2019	Meeting	<p>All 3 LAs were in attendance.</p> <p>Topics covered included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Way forward with SoCG approach for all 3 LAs, using headings from Rule 6 Letter.</li> <li>• Design changes under BBA.</li> <li>• Arranging further meetings with each LA to review draft SoCGs.</li> </ul>
03.12.2019	Meeting	<p>Elmbridge Borough Council and Guildford Borough Council attended the meeting. Surrey County Council sent their apologies. Key topics covered included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Painshill Park and Surrey Fire and Rescue – Engagement</li> <li>• Green Bridge Update</li> <li>• Side agreement update</li> <li>• HE and SCC collaboration on ExA written questions</li> <li>• SoCG approach and programme</li> </ul>
<b>Councillor Presentations – Scheme Update post DCO submission</b>		
23.07.2019	Presentation and Q&A	Scheme & DCO Update with Q&A session.
<b>Technical Meetings</b>		
08.03.2018	Meeting	EIA scoping minerals and waste
26.03.2018	Workshop	NMU design
01.11.2018	Meeting	Traffic modelling.
13.09.2018	Meeting	Land acquisition.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
01.02.2019	Meeting	Replacement and SPA compensation land.
15.02.2019	Meeting	Traffic modelling
25.02.2019	Meeting	Highways classification
12.03.2019	Meeting	M25J10 scheme structures
17.01.2020	Meeting	SoCG meeting
17.03.2020	Skype Meeting	GBC SoCG update meeting
28.04.2020	Skype Meeting	SoCG finalisation meeting
<b>Shared Documentation (not including Consultation materials)</b>		
09.10.2017	Email	SOCC Memo of Information (Informal information on the SOCC approach)
26.01.2018	Email & Post	SOCC response letter
25.01.2018	Email & Post	SMP incorporation letter (letter informing of the inclusion of J10-16 smart Motorways programme).
02.02.2018	Email & Post	Statement of Community Consultation
25.09.2018	Email	HGV layby results (surveys of HGV layby usage)
12.10.2018	Email & Post	HE response to GBC statutory consultation submissions
25.10.2018	Email	HE Traffic forecasting report (advanced draft)
25.10.2018	Email	HE Operational report (advanced draft)
31.10.2018	Email	Links and nodes (peak flows) scheme modelling
12.11.2018	Email	Notification of development safeguarding letter and PDF (Drawing to include the land acquisition requirements of the scheme and the area to be safeguarded ahead of development.)
13.11.2018	Email	Targeted consultation letter, brochure and general arrangement drawings
15.11.2018	Email	Red line boundary comparison drawings
16.11.2018	Email	DCO works plans
16.11.2018	Email	DCO draft work and requirements schedules 1- 4
29.11.2018	Email	DWG of Route protection plan
03.12.2018	Email	CAD files of Red Line Boundary
04.12.2018	Email	Speed Survey Data
21.12.2018	Email	Full draft DCO and schedules
25.01.2019	Email	GIS Mapping Files
25.01.2019	Email	Scheme papers for the 4 NMU routes near J10

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the Issues tables)
05.02.2019	Email	A1 scheme plans (in lieu of the Statement of reason)
21.02.2019	Email	Speed limit, rights of way and scheme layout plans
11.03.2019	Email	Road Safety Audit and designer's response
03.04.2019	Email	General Arrangement Drawings
09.04.2019	Email	SPA buffer shapefiles
16.04.2019	Email	SPA, Ecology and Compensation dataset
17.05.2019	Email	Draft of Issues Log.
30.07.2019	Email	A selection of DCO hard copy drawings. Drawings only, and not the entire documents of 2.1 – 1 page of drawings 2.3 – 32 pages of drawings 2.4 – 32 pages of drawings 2.5 – 33 pages of drawings 2.7 – 10 pages of drawings 2.8 – 35 pages of drawings
27.11.2019	Email	Early oversight of the documentation that HE submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA)
17.12.2019	Email	RHS Wisley Data
19.12.2019	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 2.
21.01.2020	Email	Statement of Common Ground (1 <sup>st</sup> draft)
29.01.2020	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 3
09.02.2020	Email	Statement of Common Ground Outstanding Matters
12.02.2020	Email	Documentation submitted to ExA for Deadline 4
25.02.2020	Email	Statement of Common Ground (updated version for agreement)
18.03.2020	Email	Draft updated SoCG for further discussion/comment.
17.04.2020	Email	Updated SoCG for discussion/agreement
23.04.2020	Email	Updated SoCG following Deadline 7 submissions
28.04.2020	Email	Finalisation of SoCG for Deadline 8
29.04.2020	Email	Finalisation of SoCG for Deadline 8

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Highways England and (2) Guildford Borough Council in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

### 3. Table of issues and matters to be agreed

3.1.1 The list below states the relevant examination documents used in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.1: Examination Documents**

Reference	Title
RR-062	Guildford Borough Council Relevant Representations
REP1-012	Guildford Borough Council Deadline 1 Submission – Written Representation
REP1-048	Wisley Property Investment Limited Deadline 1 Submission – Written Representation
REP2-002	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision 1)
REP2-011	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 9.16 Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report
REP2-013	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 9.18 Applicant’s Response to Written Questions
REP2-014	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 9.19 Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations
REP2-022	Highways England Deadline 2 Submission – 9.27 Response to RHS Comments on Air Quality
REP2-032	Guildford Borough Council Deadline 2 Submission – Response to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions
REP2-047	Surrey County Council, Elmbridge Borough Council and Guildford Borough Council Deadline 2 Submission – Joint Council Local Impact Report
REP3-007	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission- 9.32 Applicant’s comments on Joint Local Impact Report (Rev 0)
REP3-008	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission- 9.33 Applicant’s comments on IP responses to Examining Authority’s First Written Questions (Rev 0)
REP3-011	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission – 9.36 Statement of Common Ground with Guildford Borough Council (Rev 0)
REP3-014	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission- 9.39 Statement of Common Ground with Wisley Property Investments Limited (Rev 0)
REP3-015	Highways England Deadline 3 Submission – 9.40 Statement of Commonality (Rev 0)
REP3-023	Highways England

Reference	Title
	Deadline 3 Submission – 9.48 Applicant’s Response to Guildford Borough Council’s Relevant Representation RR-062 (Rev 0)
REP3-038	Surrey County Council Deadline 3 Submission – Annex C – Strategic Highway Assessment Report for Guildford Local Plan
REP3-039	Surrey County Council Deadline 3 Submission – Annex D – Strategic Highway Assessment for Guildford Local Plan: Burnt Common/Ripley
REP4-005	Highways England Deadline 4 Submission – 9.51 Applicant’s comments on RHS’s Deadline 3 submission
REP5-002	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission -3.1(2) – Revised draft Development Consent Order (Clean Version)
REP5-008	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.36 (1) – Statement of Common Ground with Guildford Borough Council
REP5-009	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.37 (1) – Statement of Common Ground with Surrey County Council
REP5-011	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.40 (1) – Statement of Commonality
REP5-014	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.58 – Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions
REP5-027	Highways England Deadline 5 Submission – 9.72 – Supporting data in response to Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions on Traffic, Transport and Road Safety
REP5-038	Guildford Borough Council Deadline 5 Submission – Response to Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions
REP6-003	Highways England Deadline 6 Submission – 3.1 Revised draft Development Consent Order (Clean) Revision 3)
REP6-013	Highways England Deadline 6 Submission – 9.78 Comments on Interested Party Responses to ExQ2
REP7-004	Highways England Deadline 7 Submission – 9.82 Applicant’s Response to Examining Authority’s Third Written Questions
REP7-012	Highways England Deadline 7 Submission – 9.90 Applicant’s comments on Examining Authority’s schedule of changes to the draft DCO
REP7-013	Highways England Deadline 7 Submission – Cover Letter Request for Changes 7-9

Reference	Title
REP7-016	Highways England Deadline 7 Submission – Volume 10.12 – Report on Proposed Scheme Changes 7-9
REP7-021	Guildford Borough Council Deadline 7 Submission (covering letter)
REP7-022	Guildford Borough Council Deadline 7 Submission – Response to Examining Authority's Third Written Questions
REP7-025	Surrey County Council Deadline 7 Submission – Response to Examining Authority's Third Written Questions

**Table 3.2: Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council (GBC) – Table of Issues and Matters to be Agreed – Final Version dated 01 May 2020**

3.1.2 Table 3.2 has been agreed with GBC as the final version of this Statement – 1 May 2020.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>1. LOCAL PLANNING CONTEXT</b>				
<b>1.1 Relevant statutory development plan</b>				
1.1.1	REP2-047 (para 5.8.1)	The current statutory development plan for Guildford Borough comprises the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites which covers the period between 2015 and 2034 and was adopted on 25 April 2019 together with the extant Local Plan 2003 policies.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>1.2 Policy A35: Former Wisley airfield, Ockham</b>				
1.2.1	REP2-032 (ExQ1 1.12.8)	Policy A35 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 requires the developer of the former Wisley Airfield site to provide the following transport mitigations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Primary vehicular access to the site allocation will be via the A3 Ockham interchange;</li> <li>2. A through vehicular link is required between the A3 Ockham interchange at Old Lane</li> <li>3. Other off-site highway works to mitigate the impacts of the development. This will include mitigation schemes to address issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) On the A3 and M25 and at the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange</li> <li>(b) On B2215 Ripley High Street</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(c) At the junctions of Ripley High Street with Newark Lane/Rose Lane</li> <li>(d) On rural roads surrounding the site</li> <li>(e) At junction of Old Lane with A3 on-slip (Guildford bound).</li> </ul> <p>4. The identified mitigation to address the impacts on Ripley High Street and surround rural roads comprises the two new slip roads at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and associated traffic management</p> <p>5. A significant bus network to serve the site and which will also serve Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford and Cobham. This will be provided and secured in perpetuity to ensure that residents and visitors have a sustainable transport option for access to the site;</p> <p>6. As off-site cycle network to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet to be provided with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist”.</p>		
<b>1.3 Policy A42 Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common</b>				
1.3.1	REP2-047 para 6.21	Policy A42 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 allocates 4ha of land on both sides of the A3 and north of the A247 for the development of the new north facing slip roads. The Local Plan requires these slip roads to be delivered in connection with the development of the former Wisley Airfield site (under Policy A35).	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Although GBC clarifies that it may also seek contributions towards the delivery of the new north facing slip roads from other developments as planning applications come forward in</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			accordance with the GBC Local Plan policies ID1 and ID3.	
<b>1.4 Implications of Policies A35 and A42</b>				
1.4.1	Page 1 of RR-062	Guildford Borough Council (GBC) considers that the Burnt Common slip roads would provide the most effective means of mitigating the impact of Wisley Airfield development traffic on Ripley as they would offer more traffic benefit than the option of south-facing slips at Ockham Park junction (as reaffirmed at the ISH for the Scheme held on 15 January 2020).	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.4.2	N/A	The former Wisley Airfield allocation (Policy A35) is the only allocation in the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 that is contingent upon the delivery of the Burnt Common slips. There are no other policy commitments requiring the delivery of north facing slip roads at Burnt Common in connection with specific development allocations and there is no requirement in the Guildford Borough Local Plan that they be delivered as part of the Scheme.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC clarifies that it may seek contributions towards the delivery of the new north facing slip roads from other developments as planning applications come forward in accordance with the GBC Local Plan policies ID1 and ID3. GBC notes that the Burnt Common slip roads are included within the Local Plan Infrastructure Schedule (see items SRN7 and SRN8).</p> <p>Highways England’s position as regards the Burnt Common slips is set out in REP2-014 (see comments on REP1-020) and in REP3-00 (see comments on LRN1). In summary, the Burnt Common slips are required in the Guildford Borough Local Plan as mitigation for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site. Most of the predicted traffic growth in Ripley will be due to background growth and growth proposed in the Guildford Borough</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Local Plan and not as a result of the Scheme, see Highways England’s comment on this at 2.13.3 in REP6-013.</p> <p>Highways England’s traffic modelling has shown that the principal effect of the Scheme at Ripley will involve the rerouting of some RHS Wisley Garden visitor traffic and other Wisley Lane traffic due to the closure of the A3/Wisley Lane junction. The provision of the Burnt Common slip roads would not have any bearing on this and thus would not serve to directly mitigate the effects of the Scheme in this regard.</p>	
1.4.3	REP2-047 (para 6.13)	The traffic impacts on Ripley associated with the development of the former Wisley Airfield site can be mitigated by the provision of the Burnt Common slips and associated traffic management and that there is no requirement for any additional traffic measures to be implemented in Ripley under Policy A35 (3)(b) and (c).	<p><b>Partially agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC agrees with this statement with the exception of there being no requirement for any additional traffic calming measures to be implemented in Ripley under Policy A35.</p> <p>This is because GBC considers that Policy A35 should be read in conjunction with Policy ID3 of the Guildford Local Plan. In particular, Policy ID3(6) and (7) sets out that “(6) New development will be required to provide and/or fund the provision of suitable access and transport infrastructure and services that are necessary to make it acceptable, including the mitigation of its otherwise adverse material impacts, within the context of the cumulative</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>impacts of approved developments and site allocations. GBC considers that this mitigation: (a) will maintain the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Networks and the Strategic Road Network to the satisfaction of the relevant highway authorities, and (b) will address otherwise adverse material impacts on communities and the environment including impacts on amenity and health, noise pollution and air pollution. (7) Planning applications for new development will have regard to the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 6 which sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the Plan depends, or any updates in the latest Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan.”</p> <p>Mitigation to address impacts within B2215 Ripley High Street is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as LRN7. GBC’s view is that it could therefore be the case that mitigation in Ripley High Street as part of the ‘associated traffic management’ is necessary alongside the delivery of the Burnt Common slip roads and this would have to be determined as part of any future planning application. GBC considers that is what Policy ID3 seeks to set out for any planning application.</p> <p>Highways England observes that Policy A35(4) stipulates that the identified mitigation for the effects of the development of the former Wisley Airfield site on Ripley High Street comprise the</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Burnt Common slip roads and associated traffic management. Equally Highways England does not seek to challenge GBC's opinion that it is able to seek mitigation for other impacts on the local road network under Policy ID3 in connection with other planning applications as they come forward. However, it remains the position that there is no other specific provision within the Local Plan requiring the implementation of off-site highway works at the junctions of Ripley High Street and Newark Lane/Rose Lane or any other works on the B2215 Ripley High Street associated with any development sites allocated in the Guildford Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>On this basis, it is assumed that the forecast do-minimum traffic levels as modelled by Highways England are therefore taken as being acceptable under Local Plan policy without any further highway interventions beyond the Burnt Common slips and associated traffic management.</p>	
1.4.4	REP2-047 (paras 6.17, and 7.2.1.20) and RR-062 (page 1)	<p>The Government's Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025 (RIS2) published on 11 March 2020 includes a scheme for the A3/A247 Ripley South (the Burntcommon junction) in the pipeline for possible delivery in Road Period 3 (RP3) from 2025/26.</p> <p>Alternatively, a developer funded scheme could be brought forward (including in connection with any future planning application for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site), subject to further</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Highways England notes that RIS2 makes clear that the availability of developer funding towards any pipeline scheme, which includes the A3/A247 Ripley South scheme, will make a significant difference to the likelihood of it coming forward for delivery in RP3.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		modelling and transport appraisal in accordance with the Government's web-based Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG).		
1.4.5	REP2-047 (Paras 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.1.12))	The phasing of development on the former Wisley Airfield site will be a matter to be addressed as part of the town and country planning process when a future planning application comes forward under the Guildford Local Plan Policy A35. No timing requirement is specified in the wording of Policy A35 for the delivery of the Burnt Common slip roads, although the potential for 1,000 dwellings to be built on the former Wisley Airfield site ahead of the slips was discussed at the planning appeal for former Airfield site.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
1.4.6	REP2-032 (1.13.5) And REP2-047 (paras. 6.12 and 7.2.4)	Under the access arrangements provided for in Policy A35 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019, traffic generated by the former Wisley Airfield development and seeking to travel to and from the south, will either access the A3 at the A247 Burnt Common junction (travelling via the Ockham Park junction and Ripley) or will access the A3 at the Old Lane junction (using the through-site link to Old Lane). There are no restrictions in Policy A35 as to which access point may be used.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC however shares Surrey County Council's concern that the closure of Old Lane to southbound traffic south of the Pond Car Park has not been modelled within the Scheme transport assessments.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the statement in column 3 accurately reflects Policy A35 paragraphs (1) and (2). It also notes that Surrey County Council (SCC) has agreed that there is no planning policy commitment that specifically requires the closure of any part of Old Lane (see item 2.9.1 of the SoCG between Highways England and SCC [REP5-009].</p>	As noted in Highways England's comments on Surrey County Council's written representations (REP2-014 – see comment on REP1-020-12 on page 30) the introduction of a closure on Old Lane is a matter to be addressed when a planning application for the former Wisley Airfield site is submitted as this measure is not required for the purposes of the Scheme.

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Highways England’s traffic modelling assumes that the points of access to and egress from the former Wisley Airfield site will be via the Ockham Park junction and Old Lane.</p> <p>If Old Lane were to be closed to southbound traffic, this is likely to have the effect of reducing modelled flows on Old Lane. However, there is no reason to expect that it would reduce the flow of traffic predicted to exit the former Airfield site to head south on the A3, as this is likely to continue being the quickest route to join the A3 especially for southbound traffic. The majority of the reduction in WPIL flows through Ripley predicted in the 2037 DS scenario relates to traffic flows bound for the A3 southbound for which the closure of Old Lane is highly unlikely to materially change.</p> <p>Highways England strongly defends the robustness of its modelling and no evidence has been put forward to demonstrate that it has under-estimated any likely impacts on the local road network.</p>	
<b>2.0 DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (dDCO)</b>				
<b>2.1 dDCO articles &amp; associated schedules</b>				
2.1.1	1.15.4 of REP2-032	The articles in the draft DCO (dDCO) as amended [REP6-003] are appropriate for the Scheme, including articles concerning arbitration and that Schedule 8 correctly identifies all relevant Tree Preservation Orders of relevance to the Scheme as they relate to	<b>Agreed (with one exception).</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		<p>trees within the boundary of Guildford Borough Council's administrative area.</p>	<p>GBC agrees the articles of the DCO with one exception relating to the definition of maintain in article 2.</p> <p>In its response to ExQ1 (REP2-032) GBC expressed concerns about the definition of maintain, how it would be enforced and who would adjudicate should there be a materially different impact from that identified in the ES.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to concerns expressed about the definition of maintain in REP3-008 (see comment made on point 1.15.4 on page 21) and in REP3-007 (comment on DCO3 on page 30). It considers that the definition is well precedented and justified. It is also more restrictive than in other DCOs because it contains a tailpiece limiting maintenance activities to environmental limits. It will be for the undertaker to check that it is building the Scheme within the permitted environmental limits set by the DCO, given that it would be a criminal offence to breach its terms.</p> <p>Highways England notes that the Examining Authority has not suggested that this aspect of the definition be changed in its Schedule of Changes to the dDCO published on 9 April 2020. However, the definition of maintain is the subject of ExQ3.15.1 and Highways England's further response on the matter can be found in</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>REP7-004 and in its response to the Examining Authority's schedule of changes [REP7-012].</p> <p>Highways England notes that GBC has not raised any other issues with the articles in the dDCO. GBC has stated in REP7-021 that it supports the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the dDCO. Highways England's response to the Examining authority's schedule of changes published on 9 April 2020 is provided in REP7-012.</p>	
<b>2.2 dDCO requirements</b>				
2.2.1	<p>REP2-032 (1.15.11) and REP2-047 (DCO3)</p> <p>See also GBC's response to ExQ 3.15.13 and 3.15.17 in REP7-022.</p>	<p>The requirements as set out in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO ( REP6-003) are appropriate and provide an appropriate framework for securing the necessary and relevant environmental mitigation measures and other environmental control measures.</p>	<p><b>Agreed (with 3 exceptions).</b></p> <p>The requirements are agreed with three exception concerning the use of the tailpiece in requirement 5, the time period for the replacement of trees and shrubs in requirement 6(5) and the wording of the requirement 18 (submitted at deadline 5 [REP5-002].</p> <p>As set out in GBC's response to ExQ1 [REP2-032] GBC considers that the tailpiece in Requirement 5(1) could be too wide reaching and is seeking further justification. GBC supports the Examining Authority's suggestion to omit the tailpiece from requirement 5, as set out in the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the dDCO published on 9 April 2020.</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>For the time period specified in requirement 6(5), GBC considers that a period of at least 10 years should be required instead of the 5 years. See GBC's response to the ExQ 3.15.13 [REP7-022]. GBC supports the Examining Authority's suggestion to extend the time period to 10 years as set out in its schedule of changes published on 9 April 2020.</p> <p>As to requirement 18, GBC considers that it should be amended to be more precise (about the restrictions in the areas hatched red) and more enforceable and that the term 'except with the consent of the owner' should be omitted. See GBC's response to Ex Q 3.15.17 [REP7-022].</p> <p>Highways England's position as regards the use of the tailpiece in requirement 5 is set out in REP2-013 (see answer to question 1.15.10 on page 130), as well as in REP3-007 (comment on DCO3 on page 3), in REP3-008 (see comments on 15.1.11 on page 23) and in REP7-004 (see response to Ex Q3.15.10). Highways England considers that the use of the tailpiece is both proportionate and precedented.</p> <p>As to the time period in requirement 6(5) within which the Undertaker will be required to replace trees and shrubs, Highways England has confirmed in its response to ExQ 3.15.13</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>[REP7-004] that the 5 year period is the standard length for such maintenance in Highways England’s guidance documents (Volume 2 – Notes for the Guidance on the Specification of Highway Works in Series NG 3000 Landscape and Ecology May 2008) and is sufficient to ensure that the proposed soft landscaping becomes established. In REP7-012 Highways England confirms that it does not agree with the Examining Authority’s suggested amendment to extend the time period to 10 years.</p> <p>As to GBC’s comments on requirement 18, Highways England confirms that the intention of requirement 18 is to prevent any intrusive works in the areas shown on the Tree Protection Plan. In response to GBC’s comments, Highways England will submit an amendment to the wording of requirement 18 at Deadline 8, as follows:</p> <p><i>“No intrusive works in connection with the authorised development may be carried out and no plant, materials or vehicles will be used or stored in the areas shown cross-hatched red on the RHS Tree Protection Plan, except with the consent of the owner of RHS Garden Wisley, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed.”</i></p> <p>However, Highways England maintains that obtaining consent from RHS rather than from</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>the Secretary of State following consultation with the local planning authority as is the case for other requirements, is appropriate in this instance, given that requirement 18 is specifically intended to address the concerns of a particular landowner.</p> <p>See also issue 4.3.4A below.</p>	
2.2.2	N/A	The procedures for discharging requirements as set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the amended dDCO [REP2-023] are appropriate and involve GBC appropriately.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>3.0 SCHEME DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING DESIGN</b>				
<b>3.1 Need/in principle support for the Scheme</b>				
3.1.1	REP2-047 para 1.6	In principle, GBC supports the need for the Scheme, including to provide sufficient capacity for the traffic likely to be generated by planned growth, including the former Wisley Airfield development.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC wishes to ensure that the development does not however result in unacceptable impacts on the residents, businesses or the environment.</p>	
<b>3.2 Scheme objectives</b>				
3.2.1	REP2-047 (para 2.2)	The Scheme objectives as set out in Table 2.1 in APP-002 are appropriate as regards the need for the Scheme and the nature of the environment in which it is located.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC, as one of the Joint Councils has commented that its focus is on minimising impacts on the surrounding local network objective.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
<b>3.3 Alternatives</b>				
3.3.1	N/A	Highways England has appropriately considered a range of Scheme alternatives and its reasons for selecting the preferred Scheme are robust and reasonable.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>3.4 Engineering design</b>				
3.4.1	N/A	The engineering design of the Scheme, including the alignment of the proposed Wisley Lane diversion will not jeopardise the delivery of any committed or allocated development, including development allocated on the former Wisley Airfield site.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>4.0 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT AND NON-MOTORISED USERS</b>				
<b>4.1 Traffic Modelling and Transport Assessment</b>				
4.1.1	REP2-032 (ExQ1 1.4.3)	The list of proposed developments contained in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 of the Transport Assessment [APP-136] correctly reflect the scale, type and location of planned growth within the modelled network area relevant at the time of the assessment.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>4.2 Impact on Strategic Road Network</b>				
4.2.1	N/A	There are no matters of contention between Highways England and GBC as regards the operation of the Strategic Road Network with the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>4.3 Impact on the Local Road Network/Local Communities</b>				
<b>Ripley</b>				
4.3.1	RR-062	Highways England has modelled a reasonable worst-case scenario as regards changes in future traffic	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	<p>REP2-047 paras 7.2.1.10 and 7.2.4.4</p>	<p>flows through Ripley, because its model makes no allowance for any potential mitigation benefits associated with the Burnt Common slips and it predicts that all of the Wisley Lane traffic on a busy RHS Wisley Garden event day would reroute via Ripley and not via the M25 junction 10 signposted route.</p>	<p>However, GBC agrees with SCC's position set out in its responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-025].</p> <p>Highways England considers that it has modelled a reasonably worst case for the following reasons:</p> <p>Firstly, the traffic model assumes that 100% of trips travelling to and from Wisley Lane from and to the south will route through Ripley. In practice, some of these trips may follow the signposted route via M25 junction 10 rather than travel through Ripley, given that the difference in journey times between the two routes will not be significant (approximately 1 minute)</p> <p>Secondly, as explained in REP3-007 (see comment on paragraph 7.1.2 on page 13, the traffic modelling is based on a busy weekday event day being held at Wisley Garden, which can generate up to twice the volume of traffic compared with a typical non-event day. This means that Highways England has modelled and assessed a far higher volume of RHS Wisley traffic than is likely to be the case on most days and indeed higher than the flows the Joint Councils refer to as a likely worst case</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>(see Table 1 on page 30 of the LIR [REP2-047].</p> <p>As shown in Table 4.1 of [REP2-011] Highways England's traffic model assumes that the Scheme will result in approximately 1,620 additional two-way trips from Wisley Lane traffic routing through Ripley in the 2022 do-something scenario and 1,880 two-way trips in the 2037 do-something. These flows are significantly greater than the range of 1,200-1,500 trips referred to as worst case in paragraph 7.2.1.10 of the Joint Council's Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-047] and which were derived from RHS Wisley's own modelling and assessments.</p> <p>On a more typical weekday, the number of additional RHS Wisley trips likely to reassign through Ripley on account of the Scheme could be in the order of approximately 1,000 trips in 2022 and 1,100 trips in 2037, far less than the 1,620 to 1,880 flows that have been assessed for the 2022 and 2037 do-something scenarios.</p> <p>Thirdly, no allowance has been made for the Burnt Common slips in the model and as confirmed in paragraph 4.7.9 of the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) produced by Surrey County Council (SCC) for Guildford Borough Council [REP3-038] and in the extracts submitted by SCC [REP3-039], these</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>slips would have the effect of significantly reducing traffic through Ripley. In this regard, the predicted flows through Ripley are therefore likely to be overstated.</p> <p>Highways England acknowledges that the modelling for the 2037 do-something scenario (see Figure 4.1 of the TASIR [REP2-011]) does show a reduction in the volume of Wisley Airfield development traffic routing through Ripley with the Scheme. This effect is largely on account of WPIL traffic accessing the A3 via the Old Lane junction rather than travelling through Ripley to access the A3 at Burnt Common. The majority of the reduction in WPIL flows through Ripley in the 2037 DS scenario relates to traffic flows bound for the A3 southbound for which the closure of Old Lane is highly unlikely to materially change.</p>	
4.3.2	RR-062 page 1; REP2-032 (1.3.3) REP2-047 para 7.2.1.20	The Scheme will have a limited effect on overall traffic flows through Ripley, including allowing for any routing of traffic likely as a result of the proposed closure of the Wisley Lane junction.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC agrees with SCC's position set out in its responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-025].</p> <p>Highways England considers that the additional volumes of traffic through Ripley on account of the Scheme (even taking a reasonable worst-case approach to the assessment) are not sufficient to give rise to any significant adverse impacts. See the Transport Assessment</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Report [APP-136] and paragraph 4.1.4 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report (TASIR) [REP2-011].</p> <p>In the year of opening (2022 DS scenario) the Scheme will result in a 4.9% increase in AADT (see Table 4.1 of the Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report) [REP2-011]. Traffic flows in the busiest morning peak will not increase by more than 2% as is shown in Table 7-9 on page 86 of the Transport Assessment (APP-136) (as amended by the Errata [REP1-003]). These increases in flows can be accommodated without material deterioration in traffic congestion and delay and no evidence has been put forward by any interested party to demonstrate otherwise.</p> <p>See also 4.3.1 above.</p>	
4.3.3	REP2-047 (para 7.2.1.20)	The Scheme is not expected to give rise to a severance effect at Ripley.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC agrees with SCC's position set out in its responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-025]. GBC share's Surrey County Council's view that the Scheme will cause severance and place making issues at Ripley predominantly during the inter-peak.</p> <p>No agreement has been reached between GBC and Highways England as to a definition of the term 'severance'. As set out in Highways England's response to the LIR [REP3-007] (see</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>comment made in relation to para. 7.2.1.20 on page 15) Highways England considers that an increase in two-way flows of 30% is commonly held to be the threshold at which a severance effect is considered possible (based on the threshold identified in the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic, published by the Institute of Environmental Assessment). Those Guidelines refer to a 30% increase being likely to give rise to a minor severance effect, with thresholds for moderate and major severance effects being 60% and 90% respectively.</p> <p>Clearly the predicted 5% increase in two-way flows (AADT) and 12% increase in inter-peak flows will be significantly below these thresholds, including that for a minor effect.</p> <p>Reference should also be made to Highways England's response provided in REP3-007 (see comment on paragraph 7.1.2 on page 12) which explains that whilst the Scheme will result in a proportionately greater increase in traffic flow through Ripley during the interpeak periods (approximately 12%), as the overall volume of traffic passing through Ripley between peak periods is considerably less (approximately 28% less than the morning peak (2022)), the potential for a traffic related severance effect will be lower.</p> <p>Highways England observes that GBC has not put forward any evidence to justify why it considers the Scheme will cause 'place making</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>issues at Ripley'. Highways England does not accept that the modelled increases in traffic flows as a result of the Scheme would materially affect the sense of place or place-making at Ripley.</p>	
4.3.4	RR-062 (page 2) and REP2-047 para 7.2.1.20)	The predicted changes in traffic flows through Ripley on account of the Scheme are not of sufficient magnitude to warrant the provision of highway/transport measures at Ripley as mitigation.	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC agrees with SCC's position set out in its responses to ExQ 3.13.3 and ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-025]. GBC shares Surrey County Council's view that the Scheme should fund a comprehensive mitigation package in Ripley to address its traffic and place making impacts.</p> <p>Highways England does not accept that there is a need for the Scheme to fund a comprehensive package of improvement measures at Ripley as mitigation for the Scheme's impact on the operation of the local road network nor as mitigation for its environmental effects.</p> <p>Highways England has put forward a range of evidence which demonstrates that the overall increase in traffic flows directly attributable to the Scheme will be small (5% AADT and less than 2% in the morning peak periods) and this assessment takes account of any possible rerouting of RHS Wisley traffic, based on one of their busier event days. On a typical RHS day, the volume of traffic that may route through</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Ripley on account of the Scheme will be notably less than assessed.</p> <p>Given the limited changes in traffic flows, the Scheme will not adversely affect the operational performance of the local road network through Ripley. Neither are the predicted increases traffic flows assessed as being likely to give rise to any significant environmental effects, including noise and air quality on any receptors in the village. Neither does Highways England accept that the predicted changes in traffic flow on account of the Scheme will materially affect the sense of place or character of Ripley.</p> <p>In contrast, traffic flows through Ripley without the Scheme (when compared against the 2015 base flows) are predicted to increase far more significantly than the small increase likely to be attributable to the Scheme.</p> <p>For example, it can be deduced from the flows presented in Table 4.1 of the TASIR [REP2-011], that do-minimum traffic flows through Ripley in the 2022 opening year, are expected to increase by approximately 23% compared with the base case, a far greater increase than is likely to be attributable to the Scheme. Should GBC and SCC accept the same 1,000 dwellings trigger for the Burnt Common slips (which paragraph 7.2.1.14 of the LIR [REP2-</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>047] indicates will add 735 AADT through Ripley), it is possible that traffic flows through Ripley could increase by as much as 28% compared with 2015 base flows, without any requirement for mitigation to be provided.</p> <p>Highways England considers that it would be unreasonable to require its Scheme to mitigate impacts that are likely to occur regardless of whether the Scheme comes forward or not.</p> <p>However, and notwithstanding Highways England's position that mitigation is not needed on account of the Scheme, in responding to Ex Q 3.13.4 [REP7-004], Highways England has put forward wording for an additional DCO requirement on this matter should the Examining Authority recommend and the Secretary of State determine that provision should be made within the DCO for the implementation of measures at Ripley. See issue 4.3.4A below.</p>	
4.3.4 A	N/A	<p>The suggested wording for a possible requirement relating to the provision of a scheme for the management of traffic flows at Ripley as set out in Highways England's response to Ex Q 3.13.4 [REP7-004] would satisfactorily address GBC's concerns as regards the need for mitigation measures in Ripley.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>GBC shares Surrey County Council's (SCC) view (see SCC's response to ExQ 3.13.4) [REP7-025] that the ExA should impose a requirement on the applicant that requires it to provide a scheme to mitigate against the impacts of the additional traffic caused by the Scheme on the B2215 at Ripley. GBC has</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>considered the wording put forward in Highways England’s response to Ex Q3.13.4 [REP7-004] and agrees that the requirement would satisfactorily address its concerns as regards the need for mitigation at Ripley subject to the amendments agreed with Highways England and set out below.</p> <p>Highways England has put forward at Deadline 7 (see its response to ExQ3.13.4) [REP7-004] wording for a requirement to address this point. The scheme for the management of traffic flows as referred to in that wording would primarily serve to dissuade RHS Wisley traffic from using the B2215 through Ripley, which in turn would help address GBC’s and Surrey County Council’s concerns about the effects of traffic on the sense of place at Ripley. The requirement would also provide a mechanism for securing the necessary funding and implementation of the measures.</p> <p>Following further discussion with GBC and SCC, Highways England proposes a number of amendments to the requirement wording in comparison with that submitted in its response to ExQ 3.13.4 [REP7-004]. These amendments are required to provide a reasonable and proportionate level of flexibility in the specification of the measures to be secured, should other similar measures be agreed as preferable or more effective or to</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>accommodate the views of the local community. They would also provide a greater level of precision and clarity as to the timing of the relevant scheme vis a vis the construction of the authorised development. The suggested amendments are as follows:</p> <p><i>Requirement [xx] – Works in the village of Ripley</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>No part of the authorised development comprising Work No. 33 ('the Wisley Lane Diversion') is to <del>must not</del> open for traffic until a scheme for the management of traffic flows along the B2215 through the village of Ripley has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the local highway authority and the local planning authority;</b></li> <li>2. <b>Unless proposed by the undertaker and agreed in writing by the local highway authority, the scheme to be submitted to the Secretary of State must</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Comprise two traffic gateway features, two puffin crossings, speed cushions and speed tables, or similar measures, all to be provided along <del>an</del> that approximately 1km stretch of the B2215 that lies between the existing village entrance signs.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>(b) Contain a cost estimate for the design and construction of the proposed works and specify arrangements by which either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The undertaker will provide funds to the local highway authority to cover the approved cost (<i>being either the cost estimate as referred to above or if the Secretary of State considers that another figure is appropriate then that other figure</i>) of the local highway authority designing and constructing the approved works; or</li> <li>(ii) The undertaker will undertake the design and construction of the approved works at its own expense up to the value of the approved cost <i>pursuant to an appropriate agreement with the local highway authority.</i></li> </ul> <p>Highways England reiterates that it does not consider such a requirement to be necessary because it does not consider a scheme for the management of traffic flows through Ripley is needed on account of the Scheme. That is a matter of its interpretation and judgement, having regard to the modelled traffic flow data and its understanding of the capacity of the local road network at Ripley. However, should</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>the Examining Authority and Secretary of State determine otherwise and consider the requirement to be necessary, Highways England's view is that the scope of the requirement as worded above is appropriate and would satisfy the relevant tests set out at paragraph 4.9 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p> <p>Highways England does not however consider that the measures requested in the Local Impact Report (see paragraph 7.2.1.20 (3)) [REP2-047] are appropriate or proportionate given the modest increase in traffic flows attributable to the Scheme and would involve excessive cost at £2.4m.</p>	
<b>Old Lane</b>				
4.3.5	REP2-047 (para 7.2.4)  REP2-032 (ExAQ1.13.5)	There is no dispute between Highways England and GBC as regards the assumption in the traffic modelling that traffic from the former Wisley Airfield site will be able to exit on to Old Lane and access the A3 southbound carriageway via the A3/Old Lane junction.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>However, GBC shares Surrey County Council's concern about the projected increase in trips along Old Lane and that the closure of Old Lane to southbound traffic south of the proposed access to the former Wisley Airfield site is seen as a key mitigation for the Local Plan allocation.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to the points raised about increased traffic on Old Lane in REP2-013 (see comment on REP1-020-12 on page 30). AADT traffic flows on Old Lane (between the A3 and Ockham Lane) are</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>predicted to increase by 12% in the 2022 do-something case. Numerically, this will equate with one additional vehicle every two minutes which can be easily accommodated without any impact on the operation of the local road network.</p> <p>The larger increase in traffic flows on this section of Old Lane (100%) predicted in the 2037 do-something scenario will be attributable primarily to Wisley Airfield traffic accessing the A3 via Old Lane. Nonetheless, SCC has agreed that the improvements to the A3/Old Lane junction proposed as part of the Scheme will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the predicted traffic flows without loss of operational performance [see SoCG REP5-009- item 2.9.3.]</p> <p>If Old Lane were to be closed to southbound traffic, this is likely to have the effect of reducing modelled flows on Old Lane. This is confirmed in the Inspector's Report on the Wisley Airfield appeal (see paragraph 20.64 of the Inspector's Report, included in REP1-048). However, Highways England considers that this is a matter that should be determined as part of the mitigation for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site and is not for Highways England's scheme to assess. Highways England strongly defends the robustness of its modelling and assessments.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
4.3.6	REP2-047 (para 7.2.4.2)	<p>At this stage, no design details are available as regards the off-site cycle network required by Policy A35 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 and which is to be provided between the former Wisley Airfield site and Effingham Junction. Whilst the principle of closing Old Lane (to southbound traffic) south of the former Wisley Airfield site is supported by GBC (and SCC) as a means of reducing traffic flows on Old Lane, there is no firm policy commitment to this solution at this stage. Accordingly, it is reasonable that no allowance for this proposal has been included within the traffic modelling for the Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>The Guildford Borough Transport Strategy December 2017 at page 18 shows proposal AM3 mapped onto the local road network including Old Lane. AM3 is described as “Off site cycle network from the Land at former Wisley airfield site to key destinations, with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist...”</p> <p>GBC considers that Highways England should have taken this into account in the modelling work that was prepared for the Scheme.</p> <p>GBC also considers that this requirement was addressed at the appeal relating to the former Wisley Airfield site and the expectation is now that the off-site cycle network referred to in Policy A35(6) is taken to mean an on-road cycle lane along Old Lane.</p> <p>Highways England notes that Surrey County Council has agreed that there is no planning policy commitment which specifically requires the closure of any part of Old Lane to southbound traffic and that on this basis there is insufficient certainty to include this in the traffic modelling. See issue 2.9.1 of the SoCG between SCC and Highways England [REP5-009].</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>As regards the proposed cycle route along Old Lane, the diagram shown on page 18 of the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 shows an 'anticipated cycle improvement' broadly along the route of Old Lane between Ockham Lane and Effingham Junction. However, the proposal is not shown as a 'committed improvement' and no details are provided within the Strategy as to exactly what form the improvement would take, including whether on the existing highway or alongside. Highways England therefore maintains that there is insufficient design detail to have enabled this anticipated improvement to have been included within the traffic modelling assumptions with any confidence.</p> <p>Highways England does not agree that the Scheme will jeopardise the ability of GBC to secure a new off-site cycle route between the former Wisley Airfield site and Effingham Junction. The traffic modelling shows that the Scheme will not result in a significant increase in traffic flow on that section of Old Lane between Ockham Lane and Effingham Junction in the 2022 opening year. Only once the former Wisley airfield site is fully developed, does the modelling predict a larger increase in traffic flows (30%). This is most likely to be attributable to the reassignment of local traffic avoiding congestion elsewhere on the local road network once both the airfield and the</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>Scheme are built, rather than as a result of the Scheme specifically. If GBC seeks to secure a closure to Old Lane as part of negotiations for the WPIL development it is likely that traffic flows on Old Lane would be less than those modelled, enabling a suitable arrangement for cycling to be designed in detail.</p> <p>Overall, Highways England considers that the closure of Old Lane to southbound traffic is a matter that should be addressed in connection with any planning application that comes forward for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site. Particularly having regard to the fact that significant growth in traffic flows on Old Lane are predicted between 2022 and 2037 whether the Scheme comes forward or not.</p>	
<b>Ockham Lane</b>				
4.3.7	REP2-047 para. 7.2.5	Policy A35(2) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan requires the development of the former Wisley Airfield site to provide a ‘through vehicular link’ between the Ockham Park junction and Old Lane to mitigate against the Scheme increasing traffic flows on Ockham Lane. This through vehicular link will have the potential to reduce traffic flows on Ockham Lane.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>4.4 Ockham South-Facing Slips</b>				
4.4.1	N/A	There is no policy requirement in the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 for south-facing slip roads at the Ockham Park junction to facilitate development on the former Wisley Airfield site or in connection with	<b>Agreed.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		any other development allocated in the Plan in the period up to 2034.		
4.4.2	REP2-047 para. 6.6	GBC (and the Joint Councils) has stated that the Burnt Common slips would provide the most effective solution for mitigating the impacts of proposed development on the former Wisley Airfield site (in terms of transport benefits) when compared with the provision of south-facing slips at the Ockham Park junction.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
4.4.3	RR-062 page 2; REP2-032(1.13.7)	There is no highway related justification for the provision of south-facing slips at Ockham Park junction as mitigation for the Scheme's effects, including as mitigation for effects arising from the closure of the Wisley Lane junction or to provide sufficient capacity for the operation of the Ockham Park junction.	<p><b>GBC defers to Surrey County Council on this matter as the relevant local highway authority.</b></p> <p>Highways England has submitted its evidence to the examination setting out the reasons why it considers south-facing slips are not required. As set out in REP2-014 (see comment on REP1-020-20 on page 33) the Ockham Park junction will operate within design capacity in the future, with the Scheme in place and taking into account any forecast traffic likely to be generated by the Wisley Airfield development and other forecast or planned growth. This point has been agreed by Surrey County Council (see issue 2.6.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between Highways England and SCC being submitted at Deadline 8).</p> <p>Highways England's traffic modelling predicts that the Scheme will increase traffic flows through Ripley by approximately 5% AADT</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>(and 2% in the am peak), which are not significant or sufficient to justify the need for south-facing slips to be provided by the Scheme. In responding to ExQ 3.13.2 see Highways England’s Deadline 7 submission [REP7-004], Highways England has reiterated its position that the forecast demand for south-facing slips at Ockham Park junction is not sufficient to justify them being provided. They are unlikely to offer acceptable economic benefits compared with the cost of providing them. Highways England is submitting further modelling results on this matter to the Examining Authority at Deadline 8.</p> <p>In addition, any requirement for the Scheme to provide the south-facing slips as mitigation for the relatively small changes in journey times for the 21.4% of RHS Wisley visitors (affected by the closure of Wisley Lane travelling to and from the south) would be disproportionate and contrary to the statutory tests on planning obligations as regards being fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. The signposted route will be just one minute longer than routing through Ripley and the number of trips involved would be well below that required to justify such a level of investment.</p> <p>Highways England refers to paragraph 6.6 of the LIR [REP2-047] which states that GBC considers the Burnt Common slips would be the most effective means of dealing with</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>mitigation for the development of the former Wisley Airfield site and not south-facing slips at the Ockham park junction. However, should that view change, the Scheme does not prejudice the provision of the slips in the future should funding become available and their feasibility be confirmed.</p> <p>Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that the provision of south-facing slips at the Ockham Park junction would be necessary to make the Scheme acceptable in planning terms. Moreover, there is no funding available for the slips to be provided as part of the Scheme. If a decision were to be taken contrary to Highways England's view, then the current DCO could not proceed, which would have a very significant detrimental effect on the ability of GBC to deliver its Local Plan development strategy.</p>	
<b>4.5 Loss of HGV Lorry lay-by</b>				
4.5.1	REP2-047 (paras 3.2 and 7.3.1 to 7.3.3)	The closure of one designated HGV layby (comprising approximately five HGV parking spaces) on safety grounds is reasonable and appropriate.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>It is accepted that there are reasonable grounds for closing the HGV layby for safety reasons and that the loss of approximately five</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>HGV spaces is a matter that will need to weigh in the balance against the Scheme.</p>	
4.5.2	REP2-047 (para 7.3.3)	<p>There are no suitable sites within the vicinity of the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange on which to build replacement HGV parking facilities as part of the Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Given the sensitive environmental designations surrounding the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange it is acknowledged that there are no suitable sites which can be used for the provision of replacement of HGV parking places.</p>	<p>Highways England will consider the need for HGV laybys and parking/resting places as part of its wider Strategic Road Network remit.</p>
<b>4.6 Impact on non-motorised users</b>				
4.6.1	REP2-047 (see para. 7.2.4.2).	<p>There are no matters of contention between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council as regards the Scheme's effects on non-motorised users (NMU) or in relation to any of the proposed improvements for NMUs included within the Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b></p> <p>There is one matter of contention between GBC and Highways England, relating to the effects of the Scheme on the ability of GBC to secure a suitable off-site cycle route along Old Lane in connection with the development of the former Wisley Airfield site. GBC is concerned that the increase in traffic on Old Lane that would be generated by the Scheme would make Old Lane less attractive for the average cyclist to negotiate. GBC has raised its concern on this point in the Joint Councils' Local Impact Report [REP2-047].</p> <p>Highways England notes that GBC's concerns regarding the implementation of a new off-site cycle route between the Wisley Airfield development and Effingham Station are</p>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>addressed at item 4.3.6 of this SoCG above. In summary, the Scheme will not give rise to a significant increase in traffic on Old Lane between Ockham Lane and Effingham Junction. Moreover, if it is GBC's preference to agree a closure of Old Lane to southbound traffic as part of off-site mitigation for the WPIL development, then traffic flows on the relevant section of Old Lane to Effingham Junction are likely to be lower than modelled and will not prejudice the realisation of this policy requirement.</p>	
<b>5.0 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS AND POLICY ACCORDANCE &amp; IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY A35</b>				
<b>5.1 Facilitating planned growth</b>				
5.1.1	REP2-047 (para 5.8.1)	The Spatial Vision of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 (on page 19 of the Local Plan) references the delivery of the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange scheme.	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Improved journey times and reduced congestion as a result of the Scheme will bring economic benefits for businesses and will improve access to employment opportunities.</p>	
5.1.2	REP2-047 (para 5.8.2)	Policy ID2: Supporting the Department for Transport's Road Investment Strategy sets out Guildford Borough Council's commitment to facilitating major, long-term improvements to the A3 trunk road and the M25 motorway in terms of both capacity and safety. The reasoned justification for Policy ID2 states that the implementation of the Scheme (along with Highways England's other M25 junctions 10-16 and A3 Guildford	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>The Scheme will provide the additional highway capacity that is required to facilitate the delivery of new development being planned to meet local housing and other community needs in this part of Surrey.</p>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		RIS schemes) are required to accommodate future planned growth both outside and within the borough.		
<b>5.2 Implications for Policy A35 delivery</b>				
5.2.1	7.2.4.4	The Scheme will support the delivery of development on the former Wisley Airfield site allocated under Policy A35 by providing sufficient highway capacity at the Ockham Park junction, on the A3 and at the M25/junction 10 interchange to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by that development.	<b>Agreed.</b>  Highways England notes that paragraph 5.8.1 of the LIR [REP2-047] refers to Highways England's 3 RIS schemes, including the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange Scheme as being crucial for the delivery of development in the Guildford Borough Local Plan.	
5.2.2	N/A	The engineering design of the Scheme, including the alignment of the proposed Wisley Lane diversion will not compromise the ability to develop the former Wisley Airfield site in accordance with the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
5.2.3	REP2-047 (para 4.4.8)	The location of the proposed SPA compensation land will not extend the 400m exclusion zone or the 5km zone of influence in such a manner so as to prejudice or constrain any planned housing delivery in the Borough.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>5.3 Impact on the RHS Wisley Garden Master Plan development</b>				
5.3.1	REP2-047 (paras 7.1.5 and 7.2.1.4)	It is not appropriate for the Scheme to retain a direct connection between Wisley Lane and the A3 if this would increase the risk of road casualties or collisions, both for people travelling on the A3 as well as those seeking to gain access or exit Wisley Lane.	<b>GBC defers to Surrey County Council as the local highway authority on this matter.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>However, GBC is concerned about the long-term impacts of RHS Wisley traffic using the B2215 through Ripley to access Wisley Lane to and from the south.</p> <p>See Highways England's response to issues 4.3.1 to 4.3.4 of this SoCG above.</p>	
5.3.2	RR-062 page 2	<p>As set out in the Transport Assessment in support of RHS Wisley's planning application, most of RHS visitors travel to the Gardens from the north. Their journeys will increase by no more than 1.6 miles in total (for each return trip) as a result of the Scheme. For the 21% of trips made between RHS Wisley and the south via A3, journey distances will increase by up to 5.2 miles in total (for each return trip) when following the signposted route via M25 junction 10. The inconvenience of these additional journey distances is a matter that will need to be balanced against the need to ensure the safety of all road users, both on the A3 and those seeking to access Wisley Lane.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b></p> <p>Reference should also be made to the SoCG between Highways England and RHS Wisley submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-050], which sets out agreed changes in journey times and distance.</p>	
<b>6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
<b>6.1 Methodology of assessment, baseline and robustness of assessment</b>				
6.1.1	REP2-032 (1.8.1 and)	<p>The methodology for the environmental assessment is robust, is predicated on appropriate baseline information, addresses a suitable study area and identifies the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme.</p>	<b>Agreed.</b>	
6.1.2	RR-062 page 2;	<p>The application documentation provides sufficient detailed information to enable robust conclusions to</p>	<b>Not agreed.</b>	<p>Guildford Borough Council will be a</p>

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
	<p>REP2-032 (1.4.3 and 1.8.18))</p> <p>See also GBC's response to Ex Q.2.8.3 in REP5-038.</p>	<p>be drawn as regards the visual impact of the Scheme, without the need for photomontages.</p>	<p>As set out in GBC's response to ExQ1 [REP2-032] and to ExQ 2.8.3 [REP5-038] GBC shares Surrey County Council's view that the applicant should have submitted photomontages as part of its application documentation. GBC's relevant representation (RR-062) expresses concern about the Scheme having a significant impact in local views.</p> <p>Highways England has responded to this issue in REP3-007 (see comment regarding para 4.6.1 of the LIR [REP2-047] on page 7), in REP3-008 (see page 10) and in REP5-014 (see comment on Ex Q 2.8.3). In summary, the submission of photomontages is not a requirement under the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges IAN135/10 and as no significant views were identified that would be likely to experience a notable change, Highways England considered that photomontages would offer little benefit to the assessment process.</p>	<p>consultee under a number of the DCO requirements and will have the opportunity to comment on further design details at that stage</p>
<b>6.2 Cumulative effects / in combination effects</b>				
6.2.1	N/A	<p>The ES (Table 9.14 of APP-054), the HRA, the WFDA, the FRA and the TA appropriately assess the effects of the Scheme in combination with other planned and committed developments known at the time of the assessment as being likely to take place in the study area.</p>	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>6.3 Adequacy of environmental mitigation and compensation measures and proposed management and monitoring</b>				

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
6.3.1	REP2-032 (1.8.23) and REP2-047 (para 4.4.10)  REP7-022 (see ExQ 3.9.2)	The package of environmental mitigation and compensation measures for the Scheme appropriately addresses the Scheme's likely significant effects.	<b>Agreed.</b>  In responding to the Examining Authority's question 3.9.2, GBC also confirmed that it considers the ratios for the replacement of special category land as proposed in the Scheme to be appropriate.	
6.3.2	REP2-047 (para 4.4.10)	The measures identified in the SPA management and monitoring plan and the Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan provide an appropriate framework for the future maintenance, management and monitoring of the environmental mitigation measures.	<b>Agreed.</b> Subject to provision being made to include provision for badger sett and botanical monitoring.	Highways England will update the SPA management and monitoring plan when applying to discharge requirement 8 of the DCO.
<b>7.0 NOISE, AIR QUALITY AND DISTURBANCE</b>				
<b>7.1 Noise and Vibration effects - Ripley</b>				
7.1.1	RR-062 (page 2)	The methodology for the assessment of noise and vibration effects is robust and appropriate.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
7.1.2	N/A	The provision of low noise surfacing as part of the Scheme is appropriate and will bring noise benefits for receptors.	<b>GBC has no comments on this matter.</b>	
7.1.3	N/A	The location and extent of new and replacement noise barriers to be provided as part of the Scheme along	<b>GBC has no comments on this matter.</b>	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		the A3, M25 and at the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange is appropriate and will bring noise benefits for receptors.		
7.1.4	RR-062 page 2 and REP2-047 (para 4.2.4)	The assessment conclusions that there would be no significant noise or vibration effects on receptors at Ripley, including as a result of traffic, are sound and appropriately justified.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>7.2 Air Quality effects - Ripley</b>				
7.2.1	RR-062 (page 2) and REP2-047 (paras 4.2.4 and 4.2.6) and REP2-032 (ExQ1 – 132)	The methodology for carrying out the air quality modelling is robust and appropriate and is predicated on the most up to date data available at the time of the assessment.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
7.2.2	RR-062 page 2 and REP2-032 (ExQ1 – 1.3.3)	The assessment conclusions that there would not be an overall significant adverse air quality effect including at receptors at Ripley during the operation of the Scheme or due to an increase in traffic flows on the B2215 Portsmouth Road and Ripley High Street as a result of the Scheme are sound.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>7.3 Other environmental effects on local communities</b>				
7.3.1	RR-062 (page 2) and REP2-047 (para 4.2.4)	The conclusions of the environmental assessment that the Scheme would not result in any significant amenity or environmental disturbance effects at Ripley are robust.	<b>Agreed.</b>  However, GBC continues to have concerns in respect of the additional traffic movements	

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
			<p>through Ripley. GBC considers that the additional requirement set out at item 4.3.4A of this SoCG would mitigate this impact.</p> <p>Highways England's reiterates that the increase in traffic through Ripley on account of the Scheme will be small and will not give rise to any significant amenity or environmental effects at Ripley. Nonetheless, as set out at issue 4.3.4A of this SoCG above, Highways England has put forward a form of wording for an additional DCO requirement should the Examining Authority recommend and the Secretary of State determine that a mitigation scheme is required.</p>	
<b>8.0 CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS</b>				
<b>8.1 Outline CEMP, CEMP and HEMP</b>				
8.1.1	RR-062 page 2; REP2-032 (1.15.8)	The CEMP (approval of which will be required under DCO requirement 3) will provide suitable and enforceable safeguards as regards environmental protection measures to be applied during the construction of the Scheme and for the preparation of a handover environmental management upon completion of the authorised development.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
8.1.2	REP2-032 (ExQ1 - 1.10.8)	The Undertaker/Principal contractor will be required to obtain consent from GBC under S61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and this will provide a further mechanism for the control of construction noise as regards the Scheme.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>9.0 LAND REINSTATEMENT</b>				

SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
9.1.1	RR-062 (page 2)	Requirement 17 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO makes suitable and enforceable provision for any land used temporarily during construction to be fully reinstated.	<b>Agreed.</b>	
<b>10.0 PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT</b>				
10.1.1	REP2-047 (para 1.4)	Highways England and GBC are in discussions on the terms of a planning performance agreement to address issues raised in paragraph 1.4 of the Local Impact Report.	<b>Not agreed.</b> GBC has as part of the Joint Councils' Local Impact Report [REP2-047] expressed disappointment that a planning performance agreement has not been agreed.	
<b>11.0 PROPOSED SCHEME CHANGES</b>				
<b>11.1 Changes 1-6</b>				
11.1.1	See also GBC's response to Ex Q3.8.4 in REP7-022	There are no points of contention between GBC and Highways England as regards proposals to make six changes to the dDCO application as set out in (REP4a-004).	<b>Agreed.</b>  In responding to the Examining Authority's questions 3.1.4 and 3.8.4 [REP7-022] GBC confirmed that it supports the extension of the green element of Cockcrow Bridge and that the amendment would provide greater visual connectivity between the land on either side of the A3 and would improve landscape character.	
<b>11.2 Change 8– Amendment to the DCO boundary at Old Lane</b>				
11.2.1	N/A	The clearance of 0.06ha of vegetation on the north side of Old Lane is necessary to ensure that an adequate standard of forward visibility can be achieved at the junction between Old Lane and Elm	<b>Agreed.</b>	



SoCG Reference Number	Relevant examination document	Relevant Issue	Position as regards agreement between Highways England and Guildford Borough Council and reasons for any differences in views	Matters to be addressed/agreed post DCO examination
		Lane and will not give rise to a materially new or different significant environmental effect.		
<b>11.3 Change 9 – Wisley Airfield Construction Compound</b>				
11.3.1	N/A	The amendment of the DCO application to make provision for the siting of staff welfare facilities and traffic management facilities at the Wisley Lane Structure Worksite and for the processing of materials to be carried out on the southern most part of the proposed topsoil and materials storage area off Elm Lane will have a negligible effect on the conclusions of the Environmental Statement.	<b>Agreed.</b>	

© Crown copyright (2020).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/)  
write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU,  
or email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ  
Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363

